

Authority and Conformity: Does it Deter or Motivate Deviance in a Work Setting?

Nestor Parada

Department of Sociology
California State University, Los Angeles

Traditionally, sociological theories are concerned with criminal behavior being traced to ones socioeconomic status, race, and gender. Other theoretical frameworks also mention the distribution of wealth and resources as factors inherently linked to the motivation of criminal behavior. However, most of these theories fail to describe the role of authoritative figures in affecting people's behavior. This paper will discuss how individuals are influenced by authoritative figures and their own rational choice to commit acts of deviance. Questions included in this research assess whether or not people would execute orders at the behest of their superiors. Overall, this research proposal looks to examine the role of authoritative figures in influencing people's ability to make decisions and behave in a certain way.

INTRODUCTION

¹There are numerous social forces that are responsible for cultivating deviance in society, such as psychological, economic, and structural changes. Therefore, for every behavior type, there are many explanations providing insight as to why deviance occurs and why it is apparent in many societies. For instance, functionalists examine the role of criminal behavior as being necessary for society to function as a whole. In

other words, the sanctioning of behavior considered detrimental to the larger society is able to self-regulate and deter deviance. As a result, society normalizes criminal behavior because it is functional for the preservation of the status quo (Durkheim in Traub & Little Eds. 1999). This perspective offers the explanation that criminal behavior evolves with society, and the meaning of these behaviors is to redefine themselves with the changes in time. To some extent, the functionalist perspective does provide some motivational factors regarding why people continuously defy social norms.

Another theory that tries to explain the emergence of crime and deviance in society is the social disorganization theory, which links

Nestor Parada is a graduate student in the Department of Sociology. His paper was originally submitted to SOC. 580 Criminology Seminar, taught by Dr. Sharon Oselin in Winter 2011.

social environments as being responsible for generating criminal behavior. For instance, these communities are characterized as a “crude rural-urban comparison of rates of dependency, crime, divorce, and deviance, suicide, and vice have shown these problems to be more severe in the cities, especially the largely rapidly expanding industrial cities” (Faris and Dunham in Traub & Little Eds:74). Consequently, the lack of control in these environments and the lack of solidarity among the community leads to the breakdown of norms. One of the many limitations of this theory is that it neglects to take into consideration rational choices that are responsible for motivating people’s actions. An important idea to explore is examining the ability of people to make decisions and how the rewards justify their deviation from social norms, as the inner motivations of people can propel them to perform deviant acts, which they define desirable. In fact, none of these strategies provide any explanations as to the effects of conformity and whether or not conforming to social norms leads to deviance. For instance, Merton (1934) believed conformity is not regarded as deviance because people who adhere with both the institutional means and the culturally prescribed goals have no desire to deviate. However, there are other motivational aspects where criminal behavior is learned and, eventually, becomes rationalized.

Criminal behavior is not biologically transmitted, but rather it is learned, rationalized, and committed by people who have learned to rationalize the behavior based on personal and social experiences. The role of authoritative figures is either to deter

people from engaging in criminal behavior by instilling the notion of consequence for belligerent behavior or to legitimize criminal behavior because it provides rewards. As an example, some findings suggest that family discipline facilitates conformity (Eckhardt 1974). However, in some cases authoritative people promote criminal behaviors in others. With that being said, the same rules, morals, and ethics which govern society are not applicable to all its members. For instance, Sykes and Matza believed that individuals learn to neutralize the meaning of rules, and certain behaviors considered deviant by some might not be defined as deviant in the legal system (Sykes and Matza in Traub & Little Eds. 1999). One could debate that criminal behavior is a reflection of the structural dynamics, where criminal behavior is correlated to socioeconomic status. In a sense, authoritative figures are responsible for instilling conformity among people in hierarchical structures as being the norm. By acknowledging authoritative figures, people rely on receiving instructions from people of higher status. By examining conformity as one of the essential factors why uncontested authority exists, one can better understand why people learn to accept criminal behavior because of the normalization of the acts.

Social conditioning from parents and educational institutions ultimately prepare people to obey authority because they have been prepared to comply. Symbolic interactions with others are vital in the learning process where people assume roles and, eventually, perform and replicate the activities they had previously learned, thus reinforcing

the behavior. In other words, the meaning of the interaction and the understanding of the behavior becomes a legitimized form of human action (Sandstrom et al. 2006). The power dynamics in the relationship between people of higher status and those of lower status has an effect in instilling conformity or deviation on to others. In many cases, the exercise of power is used as a coercive tactic to gain compliance and, more importantly, the application of “threats” or possibly a “reward” makes people perform tasks (Willer et al. 1997). Therefore, people, who obtain power over those in lower status positions, can coerce others to perform activities for the approval and rewards they would gain from those authority figures. The exchange of rewards themselves could vary based on the given situation. The exchange itself is motivated by the possibility of gaining acknowledgment or positive reinforcement, which subordinates gain from their interaction with superiors. Another explanation why subordinates adhere to authority is because of fear of retribution from their superiors. For instance, authority figures such as parents and other influential adults establish “values and roles” for youth to follow (Sandstrom et al. 2006).

Authoritative figures can maintain their control of subordinates by exerting punitive behavior not in accordance with their valued norms.. Authoritative figures can either deter or promote criminal behavior. In a sense, authoritative figures instill inner constraint mechanisms that deter people from committing deviant acts. However, those authoritative figures also have the ability to control and shape people’s

behavior. In some cases, the “attachment” to others demonstrates that relationships are control mechanisms directing people’s behavior. For instance, “Attachment to parents is the most obvious source of social control, particularly among youth” (Kubrin et al. 2009:170). The strength of authoritative figures in life is influential enough to exert power over others. Perceptions about fear and punishment when social norms are violated can deter people from engaging in behavior that will bring upon them negative sanctions, however, on the other hand, influential authority figures have the capability to alter people’s behavior and force them to conform.

This paper will describe the theoretical effectiveness of the social learning, rational choice, and control theories in explaining the role of authoritative figures, as they influence action that lead to deviance. The main implications behind this research is to demonstrate that predispositions of fear drive people’s desire to conform to authority, and that people’s inability to challenge authority reinforces the strength of authoritative figures. Thus, the purpose of this research is to provide an analysis of a psychological problem and how it is examined socio-psychologically.

SOCIAL LEARNING

In many ways, authoritative figures influence people’s behavior, while having the ability to have others execute orders for them. The exercise of power is defined as the act of achieving and accomplishing ones subjective goals (Kelman 1958). People are conditioned

to adhere to hierarchy and comply with people of higher status. The social learning theory is applicable to explain how people learn deviance from interaction with others. This framework illustrates deviance as being reflective of the authoritative structure and people then abandon their principles to satisfy the interests of their superiors. The strength of authority is sociologically relevant because the exercise of power between superior and subordinate is applicable in many settings such as work, school, and almost every other aspect of social life. The dynamics of the relationship between people is brought about by mutual interests and exchanges. Whether or not authority is taken by force or gained by charisma, it remains an influential force in the development of social learning, and replication of the behavior is a product of the multiple interactions with the people of authority. As a result, the behavior is a product of social interactions.

In a sense, influential authoritative figures have the ability to govern others to legitimize their principles and convince people that their actions are correct. Another definition of power is having the ability to modify people's beliefs and attitudes (Willer et al. 1997). As Zimbardo asserted, "The power of authorities is demonstrated not only in the extent to which they can command obedience from followers, but also in the extent to which they can define reality and alter habitual ways of thinking and actions"(2007:283). This demonstrates that people of higher authoritative status can validate their actions because of their ability to create their own perception of reality, which in

return validates and reinforces their power. The same figures of authority can either sanction crime or legitimize the criminal behavior.

For instance, those authoritative figures that exert power use intimidating tactics to restore their role. Intimidating tactics are often applicable in controlling people and, by generating fear; people eventually comply with the orders of the superiors. As Athens cited, "Brutalization is a composite experience consisting of three more elemental experiences: violent subjugation, personal horrification and violent coaching" (1992:27). Essentially, authoritative figures have the means to instill fear in and also instill conformity upon their perceived subordinates. Once again as Athens discussed:

When a subordinate is perceived as being disobedient or disrespectful, any authority figure may exert or threaten to exert extreme physical force in a brutal attempt to make the subordinate obedient and respectful....Because authority figures use extreme physical force for the purpose of bringing the conduct of a perceived subordinate under their control, their use of violence has a strong utilitarian flavor to it. (1992:28-9)

Subsequently, these authoritative figures apply multiple methods to legitimize their actions and to neutralize previously learned norms. For instance, these forms of conditioning give rise to unquestioned authority. Zimbardo claimed, "We can see that this program

utilizes a variety of social psychological and motivational principles to assist in turning collective hatred and general frenzy into a dedicated, seriously calculated program of indoctrination and training for individuals to become youthful living martyrs” (2007:292). By subscribing to this idea, they are privileged to be under the leadership of these authoritative figures, while subordinates assimilate to the ideals around them. This demonstrates that people are capable of performing tasks that they perceive as beneficial in bringing out certain social rewards for conforming.

RATIONAL CHOICE

Additionally, people are subject to many experiences that teach them the motives and the rationalization of their authoritative figures. Individuals are conditioned to obey or conform without yielding any dismay or disobedience. Once people are integrated into a group, eventually they learn to “calculate the cost and benefits associated with their efforts to improve their financial well-being” (Janowski in Rubington & Weinberg Eds. 2008:296). The rewards for performing activities make the behavior justifiable, as part of the “cognitive mechanisms” and the ability to control behavior leads to choices people make (Clarke & Cornish 1985). In a sense, criminal behavior is “learned” with what actions are favorable or unfavorable” for the individual to pursue (Sutherland & Cressey in Traub & Little Eds.1999). This reinforces the idea that people who find themselves in bureaucratic situations are conditioned to refer back

to the way they rationalize things. By acknowledging the belief in others, individuals further disassociate from the norms they were taught as being traditional. By disassociating themselves from systems of beliefs that govern the larger social whole, people become detached and further create their own ideals of what is favorable or not favorable.

The rational choice theory places an emphasis on demonstrating that people are responsible for their actions because of their ability able to calculate the rewards before performing activities. As Homans (1964) cited, people routinely perform activities because of how valuable and how feasible the activity is in attaining the rewards. Furthermore, individuals rationalize their behavior, which drives their desire to attain social rewards.

The legitimization of routine activities or the performance of activities is taught by interaction with people of higher status. Individuals learn to personify the behavior of others, and in return people engage in deviant behavior because it is successful for them. In addition, “Performance of observationally learned behavior is influenced by three major types of incentive motivators – direct, vicarious, and self-produced. People are more likely to adopt modeled strategies produced valued outcomes, rather than unrewarding or punishing effects” (Wood & Bandura. 1989:363). Once people take on criminal roles, they learn the “technical, cost-benefit-ratio aspect of crime: the opportunities for crime available in the environment and the risk attached to the criminal activity” (Downes & Rock Eds. 2007: 209).

Therefore, people engage in deviance because of the success achieved from performing such activities. Not only does performing criminal behavior reinforce the idea that crime is learned, but it also validates the notion that crime is not reduced to being a psychological abnormality if many people in society do so.

AUTHORITY/ CONFORMITY

Authoritative figures are those people of higher social status who have the ability to define morality within a given context. As an example, parents assume the role of being authoritative figures to their children. To elaborate, "Primary socialization refers to the process by which children learn to become mature, responsible members of society....Secondary socialization, by contrast, refers to more a specific formal training that individuals experience throughout their lives, such as learning how to drive, learning how to parent, or learning an occupation" (Sandstrom et al. 2006:58). In many ways, the social conditioning of people has an effect towards how they perform routine activities. The consequences for performing the activities are essentially the same in both the home and the workplace setting. Both situations consist of people having to adhere to the rules of people of higher status because of fear of punishment for not performing activities that represent their rule. In a work setting, authoritative figures are bosses and the subordinates are their employees. In both situations, those in subordinate positions are coerced into complying with those people of higher status. Conformity is a product of the

fear and authoritative pressure being placed on the individual to follow social norms.

Feldman (2003) argued that people who assume authority roles for the most part "redirect" their hostility towards others they characterize as being "weak" or "inferior." In a sense, domination is taken by force. The process in which authority takes control of others is often by force. The exercise of power in praxis is operationalized as the "ability to mobilize resources for the achievement of individual or collective goods" (Feldman. 1973: 640). Their rationale motivates their necessity for controlling others, which in return ranks authoritative figures as instructors and entrepreneurs of the people they perceive as subordinates. The differences in socialization, education, and social experiences have an effect on how authoritative figures perceive those people they dominate (Feldman 2003). In addition, the conflict emerges when force is tactically used to diminish the role of the person. Not only is the person dehumanized, but the dominant party is able to pressure or coerce the person into conforming to expectations. The initial response to authority is fear, which usually is a reaction to threats brought forth by the pressure of conformity or severe consequences (Feldman 2003). Kelman (1958) described three processes in which individuals learn how to obey from figures of authority. First, he elaborated that "compliance" is when a person adopts the learned behavior because he or she gains rewards and avoids punishment from the people of the group. Second, the person "identifies" himself as being a member of that group

and learns to conform to the expectations of the group. Third, individuals “internalize” and learn to modify their value system after the group. Not only do people learn to imitate behavior, but they also assume the same attitudes of the people around them (Sutherland & Cressey in Traub & Little Eds 1999). This exemplifies that people are learning and are instrumental in pleasing authoritative figures and others they perceive as being in a higher status.

Forced compliance gives authoritative figures the reasoning to legitimize their rules, regulations, and systematic beliefs. By incorporating beliefs, individuals ultimately comply because conforming to the idea is in their best self-interests. However, if people inherently defy these rules, they would be subjected to antagonism by authority. In other words, “They do things that give them satisfaction and a sense of self-worth, and refrain from behaving in ways that violate their moral standards. Moral agency is thus exercised through the constraint of negative self-sanctions for conduct that violates one’s moral standards, combined with the support of positive self-sanctions for conduct to personal moral standards” (Osofsky et al. 2005). These forms of psychological conditioning are not just restricted to individuals, but are applicable to observing bureaucratic organizations which have their own set of beliefs. The application of power being used as a mechanism of status and authority has the ability to alter people’s ability to make wise decisions. Subsequently, by conforming to the influence of authority, people are made to feel that complying is the norm. Whether the behavior is

criminal or not, people eventually comply with their superiors. On an individual level, people comply with authority because they are convinced that not complying is a deviant act. In some cases, the “power relations” determine the kind of interaction between those considered subordinates and superiors (Gariner 1973). Despite the power relations between the authority and subordinate, individuals gradually rationalize the rewards from performing deviant behavior.

Conformity is validated by the “obedience” of the orders transmitted from a superior to a subordinate (Eckhardt 1974). However, in a hierarchical structure/system people are coerced into complying with authority because the bureaucracy exerts pressure on its subordinates to be part of the collective norm where complying is considered good for the organization as a whole. For example, people are expected to situate their behavior for the greater good of the group or organization because of the pressure of having to satisfy those in hierarchical status (Campbell & Mc Cormack 1957). Moreover, the pressures of conformity undermine the person’s ability to rebel or even question authority because of simultaneous consequences that could either place the person in eminent danger or bring forth sanctions which brand the person as being detrimental to the organization. In many ways, authority reinforces its superiority through “legislative decisions” or through the “law” as an instrument to assure obedience (Campbell & Mc Cormack 1957). Therefore, deviance is thus a byproduct of the interaction between those who learn deviant behavior from

authoritative figures because they either punish the behavior or reward the behavior. Either people conform to social norms because they benefit from conforming to authority or they deviate because the authority that they interacted with has conditioned them to rationalize the rewards of performing the activity. Both conformity and deviance are interrelated in the sense that both behaviors bring forth social rewards. Another similarity between conformity and deviation is that both are taught behaviors.

CONTROL THEORY

Control theory offers the best explanation as to why the pressure of conformity makes people adhere to the rules of society. This perspective looks at how people have the ability to “control impulses and desires” (Kubrin et al. 2009: 167). The strength of punishment and retribution of deviant acts is what forces people to comply in society. In a sense, compliance is brought about by the potential sanctions against one’s behavior and, as a result, individuals are constrained by the strength of the social bonds. In many cases, having attachment to others can serve as a deterrent limiting the desire to engage in deviance. Thus, the levels of interaction with authoritative figures are also responsible for enabling the desire to commit deviant acts. Social learning, rational choice, and control theories all intersect with the strength of authority figures. People learn to conform to the rules from their parents. People rationalize the rules, motives, and rewards from performing activities. The response from society to deviant

behavior is what people have learned even before they commit the acts themselves. In many ways, deviance occurs when there is an “absence” of governing social rules and the lack of enforcements of social rules that give rise to the opportunity to perform deviance (Kubrin et al. 2009). Authority serves as an aspect of social control that deters people from deviating from social norms regardless of their commonality and dominance. The pressure of conforming convinces people that acknowledging people of authoritative status such as parents, employers, or even people with higher status automatically gains compliance from subordinates.

In many cases, social control is systematic on a micro and macro level. The pressure placed on the individual to comply is brought about by the punishments associated with deviance. People outweigh the cost and benefits before performing activities and, at the same time, rationalize deviance, but the social controls greatly influence people’s behavior more than the rewards themselves. In fact, one could argue that automatic compliance with authority is rationalized to be more beneficial for the individual. Gottfredson and Hirshi mentioned that “the impulsive or short sighted person fails to consider the negative or painful consequences of his acts; the insensitive person has fewer negative consequences to consider; the less intelligent person has fewer negative consequences to consider (has less to lose)” (Gottfredson and Hirshi in Traub & Little: 339). People rationalize the performance and the punishment for potential acts that in return reaffirm the control that society has over the

individual. Given the context of the behavior, the constraints adequately govern and deter people's impulses to engage in the behavior that would bring them success. The idea that authority is a beneficial control mechanism ideally makes people more conscious of their actions. In many ways, people of higher status are primarily responsible for the regulation of deviance, but they can create their own forms of deviance. By status being used to deter belligerent behavior, they can control those subordinates to perform their activities.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

The proposed research hypothesis will examine the role of authoritative figures as being responsible for forcing people to comply and not disobey people of authoritative status. The social learning theory illustrates that people are receptive to knowledge, attitudes, and, more importantly, beliefs of those people from whom they learn. People also learn to assume the role of the person that they interact with and, at the same time, model their behavior after them. People rationalize the activities they were conditioned to perform. In a sense, people learn to perceive that activities they are doing as legitimate because they have learned to calculate the costs and the benefits of performing such activities. In addition, people conform to authority because of psychological/sociological conditioning from people of higher status (parents, educators, and employers) and, as a result, fail to challenge them. The control theory emphasizes how people conform to those of higher status in society. The punishment for

disobedience can vary by any given context, but individuals internalize the consequences of their actions. The emphasis on adhering to authoritative figures obliges people to comply because they either gain some benefits for complying with those of higher status or are fearful of retribution from these people. In a sense, people have been conditioned throughout their lifetime to acknowledge the status of parents, teachers, and seniors, but are never taught to question them.

This research will look at people in the work setting. It will examine whether or not people will commit deviance under the leadership of someone of higher status in a work setting. In addition, this research will also evaluate whether people commit acts of deviance because they gain rewards for performing deviant acts. Not only will this research look at the benefits of complying with those of higher status, but it will also examine if people are fearful of retribution from those people they perceive as having more status.

Hypothesis 1: The benefits of complying with authority will cause people in a workplace setting to perform illegal activities.

Hypothesis 2: People comply with authoritative figures because they are fearful of sanction for not obeying instruction.

METHODS

Data Collection:

In order to test the hypotheses, a survey will be administered at public gatherings such as conventions, athletic, and cultural events to gain a larger

variety of responses. The respondents are going to be asked questions regarding deviant behavior that they would be likely to commit in a work setting. Furthermore, the research will point out that people have the potential to commit deviance under leadership. Respondents are not asked their name in order to ensure their confidentiality. By distributing this survey to the public, there is a larger possibility of gaining an equal representation of responses. In addition, this research will demonstrate that women are more likely into conform and seek the rewards of performing illegal activities than men.

For the most part, most studies examining authority have used controlled settings in order to see the causal effects of authority. This research will look at the effects of authority on a larger scale to see if people are capable of carrying out the orders of those people in higher status. Previous research has looked at the role of unquestioned authority in a controlled setting. This research will attempt to look at the role of authority in a work setting. In addition, this research will examine unquestioned authority, conformity, and deviance on a larger scale.

Benefits of Compliance: Key Independent Variable

The central research hypothesis is to demonstrate that criminal behavior stems from benefits acquired through authoritative figures. The question to be asked to respondents is “Do you feel it is beneficial to comply with authority in a work setting?” The response categories were “Yes, No.” This is a dichotomous variable. (See attached research survey

question 9) Authority is defined as being people that you perceive of higher status or those who have the ability to command orders and have you carry out the orders.

Performed Deviance: Dependent Variable

The dependent variable explores the benefits of performing deviant acts. This question asks respondents, “Would you perform an illegal activity at work if you gained a reward for it?” The response categories are, “Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, & Strongly Disagree.” This is an ordinal variable. (See attached research survey question 13)

Fear & Punishment: Dependent Variable

The dependent variable examines the relationship between benefits of compliance and fear/punishment. This question asks respondents, “Would you perform illegal activities under the supervision of one of your supervisors in fear of punishment?” The response categories were, “Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, & Strongly Disagree.” This is an ordinal variable. (See attached survey question 11)

Control Variables:

Age is a variable that will be examined because the possibility of the change over time could affect people’s opinions towards authority. This is an ordinal variable. The reason why age is relevant is because of the potential effect of producing different results. Younger respondents may have different opinions than those older respondents.

Race is a variable that will be examined because the possibility of

ethnic identification could have an effect on people's opinions towards authority. This is a multinomial variable. This variable will be transformed into dichotomous variables. The differences in race can produce different responses. For instance, one group might be more inclined to perform deviant acts under conditions where it is in their best interests to adhere to authority.

Gender is a variable that will be examined because different genders could have differences in opinions relating to authority. This is a dichotomous variable. The differences in genders could produce differences in income. One gender could be more inclined to commit acts of deviance under pressure because of their role.

Monthly *income* is a variable that will be examined because the differences in finances could produce differences in opinions to authority. This is an ordinal variable. The reason why monthly income is being examined is because the differences in finances could produce different responses. People with fewer resources could feel more inclined to conform in a work setting. In a sense, people with higher resources might not feel obliged to conform or engage in illegal activities because it is not in their best interests to do so.

Religion is a control variable that will be examined because of the differences in religious backgrounds. Due to religion being a multinomial variable, the variables must be transformed into dichotomous variables to eliminate bias and not rank religious beliefs as being superior or inferior to one another. The differences in religious beliefs can have an effect towards how they perceive committing deviant acts.

In some cases, the pressure of conformity and having to adhere to people of higher status obliges people to comply.

ANALYSIS

The research methods that will be used for this research is univariate analysis and logistic regression. Univariate analysis will look at the mean and the standard deviation of the variables. The logistic will analyze the regression coefficients and the P-level. Regression provides how the independent variable affects the dependent variable. This method would limit spurious findings and it proves to be more accurate in demonstrating the relationship between the variables.

UNIVARIATE STATISTICS

The univariate statistics of the key independent variable involves the benefits of compliance and the dependent variable perform illegal activities, are going to be examined. The benefits of conforming to authority can stem from the acknowledgment that people gain from complying with authority. Whether activities being performed are legal or illegal, people can gain rewards from them. The reward itself from performing activities can either be tangible or intangible, but people are driven to perform them. Also, the univariate statistics will look at the frequency distribution of the independent variable (benefits of compliance) and dependent variable (performing illegal activities out of fear or punishment).

The univariate analysis will also examine the control variables of, age, race, gender, religion and monthly income.

demonstrate that people who comply with those of higher status are willing to perform illegal activities because it would be in their best interest to do so.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION

The logistic regression analysis will be provided for the ordinal dependent variable, which is performing activities. The reason why it is a suitable analysis is because of the more distinct connection between the key independent (benefits of compliance) and dependent variable (performing activities). The regression will demonstrate whether the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable. In addition, the regression will examine the relationship between the key independent variable (benefits of compliance) and the dependent variable (performing illegal activities out of fear or punishment). The regression will also demonstrate whether the key independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable.

The logistic regression will also analyze the control variables such as age, race, gender, religion, and monthly income. The reason the regression is a suitable method is to see if the control variables in conjunction with the key independent variable have an effect on the dependent variable.

In short, this research will point out the role of authority being responsible for cultivating deviance. People are intent on satisfying those people of higher status even if the activities are criminal because of the fear of retribution/ punishment for not complying. This research will

REFERENCES

- Athens, Lonnie. 1992. *The Creation of Dangerous Violent Criminals*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Campbell, Donald T. & Thelma H. Mc Cormack. 1957. "Military Experience and Attitudes Towards Authority." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 62 (5): 482-490.
- Clarke, Ronald V. & Derek B. Cornish. 1985. "Offenders Decisions: A Framework for Research and Policy." *Crime & Justice*. 6: 147-185.
- Downes, David & Paul Rock Eds. 2007. *Understanding Deviance 5th Edition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Eckhardt, William. 1974. "A Conformity Theory of Aggression." *Journal of Peace Research*. 11 (1):31-39.
- Feldman, Ronald A. 1973. "Power Distribution, Integration, and Conformity in Small Groups." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 79(3):639-644.
- Feldman, Stanley. 2003. "Enforcing Social Conformity: A theory of Authoritarianism." *Political Psychology*. 24 (1): 41-74.
- Gariner, Maurice. 1973. "Power and Ideological Conformity: A Case Study." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 79 (2): 343-363.
- Homans, George. 1964. "Bringing Men Back In." *American Sociological Review*. 29 (6): 809-818.
- Kubrin, Charis E., Thomas D. Stucky, & Marvin D. Krohn. 2009. *Researching Theories of Crime and Deviance*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kelman. Herbert C. 1958. "Compliance, Identification, and Internalization." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 2 (1): 51-60.
- Merton, Robert K. 1938. "Social Structure and Anomie." *American Sociological Review*. 3 (5):672 682.
- Osofsky, Michael J., Albert Bandura, & Phillip G. Zimbardo. 2005. "The Role of Moral Disengagement in the Execution Process." *Law and Human Behavior*. 29 (4): 371-393.
- Rubington, Earl. & Martin S. Weinberg Eds. 2008. *Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective 10th Edition*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Sandstrom, Kent L., Daniel D. Martin, & Gary Alan Fine. 2006. *Symbols, Selves, and Social Reality*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Traub, Stuart H. & Craig B. Little, Eds. 1999. *Theories of Deviance 5th Edition*. Belmont, CA: Thompson & Wadsworth.
- Willer, David, Michael J. Lovagila, & Barry Makowsky. 1997. "Power & Influence: A Theoretical Bridge." *Social Forces*. 76 (2): 571-603.

- Wood, Robert. & Albert Bandura. 1989.
“Social Cognitive Theory of
Organizational Management.”
Academy of Management. 14(3):
361-384.
- Zimbardo, Phillip. 2007. *The Lucifer
Effect: Understanding How
Good People Turn Evil*. New
York, NY: Random
House.

APPENDIX 1:

Authority Survey

1. Respondents Age:

10-19__	20-29__	30-39__	40-49__
50-59__	60-69__		
70-79__	80- & Over__		

2. Respondent's gender?

Female__	Male__
----------	--------

3. What race do you consider yourself?

White__	Black__	Other__
---------	---------	---------

4. Please specify which monthly income from the following category:

Under \$1,000__	\$1,000 to 2,999__	\$3,000 to
3,999__		
\$4,000to 4,999__	\$5,000 to 5,999__	\$6,000to
6,999__		
\$7,000to7,999__	\$8,000to 8,999__	\$9,000
to 9,999__		
\$10,00 to 10,999 __	\$11,000 to 11,999__	\$12,000 to
12,999__		

5. Please identify your religious affiliation:

Protestant__	Catholic__	Jewish__	Other__
--------------	------------	----------	---------

Given the definition of authority are those people you perceive as having higher status and those people who have the ability to administer orders and persuade you perform actions.

6. Where you always taught to comply with people of authoritative status?

Yes__	No__
-------	------

7. Have you ever been intimidated by a person of authority?

Yes__	No__
-------	------

8. In a work setting, would you ever question your supervisor(s)?

Yes__	No__
-------	------

9. Do you believe it is beneficial to comply with authority in a work setting?

Yes__ No__

10. Do you feel that it is beneficial to follow the orders of your supervisor at work?

Strongly Agree__ Agree__ Disagree__

Strongly Disagree__

11. Would you perform illegal activities under the supervision of your supervisors in fear or punishment?

Strongly Agree__ Agree__ Disagree__

Strongly Disagree__

12. Would you perform an activity if you gained the rewards for it?

Strongly Agree__ Agree__ Disagree__

Strongly Disagree__

13. Would you perform an illegal activity at work if you gained a reward for it?

Strongly Agree__ Agree__ Disagree__

Strongly Disagree__

14. Have you ever performed task(s) that you did not agree with under the orders of a supervisor(s)?

Yes__ No__