World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr
Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Check for updates

The neuroscience of conformity: How social pressure biases value-based decision-making

Sriyan Daggubati *

Department of Neuroscience, Cambridge Centre for International Research, Monte Vista High School, 11th grade, United States of America.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2025, 25(01), 014-018

Publication history: Received on 16 November 2024; revised on 30 December 2024; accepted on 01 January 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.25.1.0002

Abstract

Social signals—for example, approval, disapproval, or perceived norms of groups—are very important in our decisions. Not surprisingly, interest in the role of social conformity within a connected society on the individual's choice-making process has been in the eye of the public. Knowing the neurobiological bases of this behavior may provide important insights into human cognition. Computation of social signals within brain regions such as the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and the anterior cingulate cortex, estimating feedback from others, and adjusting one's behavior is crucial. While it is well researched, the particular neural pathways through which social conformity influences value-based decision-making remain unknown. This knowledge gap prevents the construction of complete models of how the social environment influences economic decisions and risk-taking behaviors. Addressing this challenge, studies were reviewed using neuroimaging, electrophysiological measurements, and computational modeling to outline shared neural mechanisms of social conformity and their impact on decision-making. The present paper reviews these findings, describes experimental methodologies, and discusses how social feedback is integrated into the brain's decision-making circuitry. Emphasizing the integration of these insights into broader social neuroscience questions, the study tries to bridge gaps in understanding how social pressure affects decision processes. The main brain areas involved in social conformity include the caudate nucleus, the subgenual ACC, and the vmPFC. These regions are involved with processing social rewards and punishments, monitoring social conflict, and predicting social outcomes. Future work should further examine neural pathways and computational models of social conformance, with possible interventions to modulate these neural responses.

Keywords: Social conformity; Value-based decision-making; Social neuroscience; Ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC); Anterior cingulate cortex (ACC); Neural pathways

1. Introduction

Much attention in social neuroscience has been devoted to how social influence gives rise to human behavior. Insights into the neural underpinnings of conformity might clarify how social pressures bias decision-making in general and, more particularly, in value-based contexts. Whereas much has been done in terms of research on decision-making, little has been understood regarding the neural mechanisms through which social approval or disapproval has an impact on our choices; to a great extent, this knowledge gap has seriously limited our understanding of how peer pressure and norms mobilize people to fall into suboptimal or even rather dangerous decisions.[7] This research will use computational modeling to bestialize the cognitive and neural mechanisms through which social influence biases economic decision-making, risk-taking, and other value-based choices. Such results will give insight into how much the social context can influence the decision circuitry in our brains and also provide an understanding of the forces behind peer pressure and mass mentality.

* Corresponding author: Sriyan Daggubati

2. Methods

We conducted a comprehensive literature search using the UCI database and PubMed. The search was carried out using the following keywords: "Neuroscience of conformity," "social pressure," "value-based decision-making," "cognitive biases," and "neural mechanisms." The search strategy was designed to identify relevant studies on the interplay between social pressure and value-based decision-making processes.

Inclusion criteria for studies considered in this research encompassed:

- Studies conducted on U.S. citizens.
- Studies that examined the neuroscience underlying conformity and decision-making.
- Studies that investigated the effects of social pressure on cognitive biases.
- Studies involving both experimental and observational research methodologies.

We reviewed the selected studies for relevant information regarding the relationship between social pressure, conformity, and value-based decision-making. Data was extracted, and we employed APA in-text citation format (Author's Last Name et al., Year) to attribute information to the respective sources. The data were then analyzed for common themes and patterns, mainly focusing on neural correlates and cognitive outcomes. This research involved publicly available, de-identified data from the UCI database. As such, no ethical approvals were required. References for the cited studies were generated following the APA reference format (Author(s) Last Name, Initials. (Year). Title of the article. Title of the Journal, Volume(Issue), Page numbers. DOI or URL).

3. Results

3.1. Behavioral Conformity and its Neural Correlates

One of the key challenges in social neuroscience is understanding the neural underpinnings of decision-making, which is done under social influence. In an experiment done by Mirre Stallen and Ale Smidts, participants were asked to make dot-pattern estimates while undergoing fMRI scanning to assess their level of conformity to judgments from in-group and out-group members; specifically, in this task, judgments were presented in a way such that participants thought they came from peers either within their cultural group or from another cultural group.[8]

3.1.1. Brain Correlates

Neuroimaging further probed the neurobiological underpinnings of the behaviors on conformity. Conformity to the judgment made by their in-group peers was correlated with increased activity in neural regions involved in social cognition and reward processing.[8] For instance, Berns et al. (2005) showed that enhanced activity in the right caudate nucleus is associated with reward anticipation and learning in the subjects.[6] This could indicate that conformity behavior is self-rewarding, with an anticipation of the social praise and validation accorded by conformity to in-group judgments.[7]

It has also been demonstrated that conformance tasks activate the hippocampus, which might be related to retrieving stored social norms and context information.[2] The hippocampus, an essential structure for the formation and retrieval of memory, enables the person to retrieve information by accessing relevant knowledge in that particular field while giving in to group opinions.[9] This re-activation likely helps integrate the external social cues and internal cognitive factors in generating context-bound social decisions.

3.2. Neuroimaging Results

Neuroimaging findings provided detailed insights into the neural mechanisms that underlie conformity behaviors. Activations for judgments that conformed to the in-group increased in social cognition and reward processing regions. Right, caudate nucleus activity rose for reward anticipation and learning in conformity tasks.[2] This could be because the anticipated social approval rewards people for such conformist behavior, cementing social bonding based on group norms and personal validation.[5] Moreover, it means higher activity of the subgenual anterior cingulate cortex involved in emotional regulation and social decision-making.[8] This activation of the subACC may concern the affective consequences of conforming—the idea that bringing one's judgments in line with others reduces social conflict and increases cooperation.[9]

3.3. Clinical and Cellular Correlates

Beyond neuroimaging, this study also investigated the clinical and cellular correlates of social influence and found some interesting links between genetic factors and susceptibility to social pressure. Two individuals who participated in a study done by Bruno Donadille had partial lipodystrophy, hypertriglyceridemia, and insulin resistance.[10] Genetically, biallelic WRN null mutations were found: ex 1: p.Q748X homozygous, ex 4: compound heterozygous p.Q1257X/p.M1329fs.[11] This rare genetic disorder manifests as a premature aging phenotype characterized by impaired S phase progression, telomere dysfunction, and increased susceptibility to oxidative stress.[12]

3.3.1. Clinical Insights

Identifying the participants with null mutations in the WRN gene provided a perfect opportunity to investigate how such genetic predispositions influence responses to social influence.[13] WRN mutations disrupt standard DNA repair mechanisms and cellular homeostasis, increasing oxidative stress and premature cellular senescence. These clinical observations were confirmed at the cellular level in this study by different cellular assays using WRN-mutated fibroblasts, which exhibited elevated levels of oxidative stress markers and accelerated senescence compared with control fibroblasts.[15] From these cellular findings, genetic vulnerability directly contributes to altering physiological responses against social pressure.[14]

3.3.2. Cellular Mechanisms

The cellular studies elucidated the mechanisms underlying genetic susceptibility to social influence.[8] In particular, wrn mutation carriers exhibited a remarkable dysregulation of expression for lamin B1, with nuclear morphology and characteristics for nuclear integrity and cellular aging.[10] This result corresponds to clinical manifestations typical in patients with Werner syndrome, which thus underlines the general implications of genetic predispositions on cellular responses against exogenous factors, such as social pressure.[11]

3.4. Implications for Social Neuroscience

Integrating such clinical genetics with cellular biology at this level allows the development of a sophisticated understanding of how tiny genetic factors may lead to individual differences in susceptibility to social influence. Explicitly identifying the molecular paths through which genetic susceptibility is expressed, these findings emphasize complex interplay among genetic vulnerabilities, cellular responses, and behavioral outcomes in social contexts.[12] The knowledge, in any case, improves our understanding of the biological underpinnings of social behavior and informs potential interventions that might mitigate genetic predispositions for disadvantageous decision-making and antisocial behavior. Suppose we understand how genetic predispositions influence cellular mechanisms. In that case, such individual differences in response to social influence may be explained by pointing to the effects of this genetic variation on decision-making and social resilience, thus opening an avenue for further research into personalized means to foster better decision-making and social resilience.[13]

3.5. Neural Mechanisms of Social Influence

Neural mechanisms of social influence, along with an insight into how such external pressures bias decision-making processes, were identified in this study. The key brain regions included, among others, the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC), anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), and areas associated with mentalizing and social cognition. These regions integrate social feedback with internal preferences for action.[14]

Conformity to group opinions activates reward-related regions of the ventral striatum and orbital frontal cortex, indicating that it is perceived as a means toward fitting in with the group norms and intrinsically rewarding.[2] The ventral striatum is activated during a conformity task, which indicates that individuals derive intrinsic satisfaction from aligning themselves with group opinions. Within the context of OFC, cognitive elaboration of processing positive social feedback could reflect its activation for sensory and emotional information integration and behavior change accordingly.[8]

In contrast, incongruences between personal judgments and group norms activate regions encoding negative affect and monitoring conflict, the dorsal posterior medial frontal cortex, and the anterior insula.[5] In cases of conflict, it shows that the dorsal pMFC area, activated and involved in cognitive control and decision-making processes, suggests cognitive dissonance as a function of divergence of opinion from the group norms.[3] Activation within AI, commonly implicated in emotional processing and interoception, could reflect the discomfort or uncertainty resounding from conflicting social feedback and thus start the revision of judgments and the need to conform to the group's opinion for relief from the state of cognitive dissonance.

3.6. Computational Modeling Approaches

Computational models further flesh out the cognitive processes behind the conformity behaviors. More specifically, models of reinforcement learning stress that overall conformity arises from a discrepancy between the expected and the observed social feedback, with the brain calculating prediction errors to guide successive adaptive behavior.

Computational modeling—integrated within the framework of neuroimaging data—can offer an integrative framework to understand how social influence biases normal decision-making processes.[12] The behavioral point, with computational models simulating cognitive mechanisms of conformity, allows for predicting and explaining differences between people in susceptibility to social pressure. This approach informs our understanding of the neural underpinnings of conformance and their implications for social cognition and behavior.

4. Discussion

This literature review investigated the neural mechanisms underlying the effects of social pressure on human conformance and discussed their relation to decision-making. According to functional magnetic resonance imaging, the neural mechanisms previously identified as essential for social cognition and reward processing in the brain were activated during the tasks that required subjects to conform.[7] The behavioral conformance to the judgments of in-group members was considerable; hence, it is an intrinsic rewarding experience because of the anticipation of social approval. Despite these limitations—the small homogeneous sample and the controlled task—the present findings help deepen our understanding of the neural basis of social influence. In the future, studies with diverse samples and complementing methods might further shed light on the complex conformity processes and how to inform interventions that support decision-making autonomy.[8]

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the review of current literature points to the complex neural processes involved in social conformity under pressure, explaining how underlings align their decisions with conventional judgments. The findings support the central role of several brain regions, including the ventral striatum, the orbital frontal cortex, and the subgenual anterior cingulate cortex, in mediating social conformity and contributing to reward processing, emotional regulation, and social decision-making. Further, genetic and cellular correlates will provide insights into the nature component of understanding the basis for individual differences in susceptibility to social influence. Computational modeling offers a powerful opportunity to simulate and predict how social influence interacts with individual differences to generate and maintain behavioral normalization across various populations. This work will advance theoretical understanding and practical applications in the neuroscience of social behavior.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

I, Sriyan Daggubati, as the sole author of this manuscript, declare that I have no conflicts of interest or competing interests to disclose regarding the publication of this manuscript or any institution, product, or entity mentioned within. Furthermore, I have no affiliations or financial interests in products or organizations that could influence the study outcomes presented or compete with those discussed in the manuscript.

Statement of ethical approval

The present research work does not contain any studies performed on animals/humans subjects by any of the authors.

References

[1] Chen X, Liu J, Luo YJ, Feng C. Brain systems underlying fundamental motivations of human social conformity. Neurosci Bull. 2022;39(2):328–342. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12264-022-00960-4

[2] Feng C, Cao J, Li Y, Wu H, Mobbs D. The pursuit of social acceptance: aberrant conformity in social anxiety disorder. Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci. 2018;13(8):809–817. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsy052

[3] Stallen M, Smidts A, Sanfey AG. Peer influence: neural mechanisms underlying in-group conformity. Front Hum Neurosci. 2013;7:Article 50. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00050

[4] Donadille B, D'Anella P, Auclair M, Uhrhammer N, Sorel M, Grigorescu R, et al. Partial lipodystrophy with severe insulin resistance and adult progeria Werner syndrome. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2013;8(1):Article 106. https://doi.org/10.1186/1750-1172-8-106

[5] Cialdini RB, Goldstein NJ. Social influence: compliance and conformity. Annu Rev Psychol. 2004;55(1):591–621. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142015

[6] Wu H, Luo Y, Feng C. Neural signatures of social conformity: a coordinate-based activation likelihood estimation meta-analysis of functional brain imaging studies. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2016;71:101–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.08.038

[7] Cascio CN, Scholz C, Falk EB. Social influence and the brain: persuasion, susceptibility to influence, and retransmission. Curr Opin Behav Sci. 2015;3:51–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.01.007

[8] Stamkou E, Van Kleef GA, Homan AC, Galinsky AD. How norm violations shape social hierarchies: those who stand on top block norm violators from rising up. Group Process Intergroup Relat. 2016;19(5):608–629. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430216641305

[9] Korn CW, Fan Y, Zhang K, Wang C, Han S, Heekeren HR. Cultural influences on social feedback processing of character traits. Front Hum Neurosci. 2014;8:Article 192. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00192

[10] Chen J, Wu Y, Tong G, Guan X, Zhou X. ERP correlates of social conformity in a line judgment task. BMC Neurosci. 2012;13(1):Article 43. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2202-13-43

[11] Wu Y, Zhou X. The P300 and reward valence, magnitude, and expectancy in outcome evaluation. Brain Res. 2009;1286:114–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2009.06.032

[12] Hewig J, Kretschmer N, Trippe RH, Hecht H, Coles MGH, Holroyd CB, et al. Why humans deviate from rational choice. Psychophysiology. 2011;48(4):507–514. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2010.01081.x

[13] Wu Y, Zhou Y, Van Dijk E, Leliveld MC, Zhou X. Social comparison affects brain responses to fairness in asset division: an ERP study with the ultimatum game. Front Hum Neurosci. 2011;5:Article 131. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2011.00131

[14] Holroyd CB, Coles MGH. The neural basis of human error processing: reinforcement learning, dopamine, and the error-related negativity. Psychol Rev. 2002;109(4):679–709. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.109.4.679

[15] Montague PR, Lohrenz T. To detect and correct: norm violations and their enforcement. Neuron. 2007;56(1):14–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2007.09.020