

How Much Do You Need People and Why? (Need for Affiliation)

Appendix

Katie Hope Grobman

CopernicanRevolution.org

Introduction

You're welcome to use Copernican Revolution activities and essays for your thesis and studies. Having information about scholarly aspects like psychometric data, activity design details, and norm calculations may help. The primary focus of my essays is connecting educated laypersons with psychology. To help people like you, with advanced academic interests, I add an appendix like this one with each activity. Just to be sure it will work for your purposes, please complete each activity yourself before using it with your students or in your classes.

When citing, please reference the activity essay:

<https://copernicanrevolution.org/cognitive-psychology/memory>

A preferred citation in APA style is:

Grobman, K. H. (2013). Essay/Activity Title. CopernicanRevolution.org

Fodder

Everybody needs relationships - affiliations - with others sometimes. All of us especially need affiliation when we feel threatened (e.g., Schacter, 1959). But individuals vary widely, both in our overall need for affiliation and our motives for affiliation. You completed the Interpersonal Orientation Scale, which is the first individual difference measure of **need for affiliation (NfA)**. In his original study, Hill (1987) found people higher for need in affiliation spend more time with others, have more friends, are better team-members, but worse leaders. Those higher in need for affiliation also have less of a need for achievement. People need affiliation due to four related but separable motives: emotional support, attention, positive stimulation, and social comparison.

Emotional support means if you're sad you'll find it comforting to be with others. *Attention* means you feel good being with others who give you positive attention. *Positive stimulation* means getting to know others energizes you. *Social Comparison* means you find checking what you do against others comforts

you.

Need for Affiliation fits with relationships, such as attachment styles. People with an anxious-ambivalent attachment style are higher than others in NfA for attention, stimulation, and social comparison (but not emotional support). People with an avoidant attachment style are lower in NfA for emotional support and stimulation (Schwartz et al., 2007).

Need for Affiliation impacts working and school relationships. In group situations where each individual's particular contribution is less clear - making social loafing particularly likely - people who were high in NfA were least likely to socially loaf (Hilkenmeier, 2018). Service industry employees facing an angry customer are more likely to display positive emotions in their response, even though they are no less bothered than other employees (Yagil & Medler-Liraz, 2017). Third to twelfth graders with greater NfA felt a stronger bond with their schools (Hill, 2006)

Stereotypically, we might expect a gender difference where women have a greater need for affiliation than men. A meta-analysis suggests women actually do have a higher need for affiliation accounting for about 4% of the variance (Cohen's $d=.45$) (Drescher & Schultheiss, 2016). Consistent with these social expectations, teenage girls with higher NfA and teenage boys lower in NfA experienced better moods. Boys high in NfA were particularly likely to experience unpleasant moods (Wong & Csikszentmihalyi, 1991).

Below is a table showing you the mean and standard deviation for the overall scale and all four subscales in both the original sample and my sample of college students. Generally speaking, scores around 3.00 are average, scores above 3.67 are notably high, and scores below 2.33 are notably low. For example, if you look at my scores (bottom), I'm about average in Need for Affiliation but the overall score could be misleading because in three of the ways I'm actually pretty low. The exception is I find getting to know other people on a deep level extremely energizing far, far more than most people (i.e., positive stimulation subscale). I can tell because I'm almost two standard deviations above the norms (98th percentile).

Sample	N	NfA - Emotional Support	NfA - Attention	NfA - Positive Stimulation	NfA - Social Comparison	NfA - Overall
asian f	12	2.81 (sd 0.52)	2.67 (sd 0.65)	3.72 (sd 0.66)	3.12 (sd 0.74)	3.16 (sd 0.39)
black f	13	3.10 (sd 0.76)	2.58 (sd 0.74)	3.62 (sd 0.78)	2.88 (sd 0.84)	3.12 (sd 0.63)
hispanic f	167	3.07 (sd 0.95)	2.35 (sd 0.85)	3.18 (sd 0.80)	2.85 (sd 0.81)	2.91 (sd 0.68)
white f	67	3.32 (sd 0.92)	2.53 (sd 0.74)	3.43 (sd 0.74)	3.11 (sd 0.79)	3.14 (sd 0.64)
hispanic m	54	2.88 (sd 0.84)	2.5 (sd 0.96)	3.37 (sd 0.74)	3.01 (sd 0.75)	2.99 (sd 0.63)
white m	40	3.30 (sd 1.02)	2.61 (sd 0.93)	3.50 (sd 0.85)	3.11 (sd 0.85)	3.17 (sd 0.74)
f	274	3.15 (sd 0.92)	2.45 (sd 0.82)	3.31 (sd 0.80)	2.96 (sd 0.81)	3.02 (sd 0.67)
m	110	3.01 (sd 0.95)	2.52 (sd 0.94)	3.38 (sd 0.78)	3.03 (sd 0.78)	3.03 (sd 0.68)
all	384	3.11 (sd 0.93)	2.47 (sd 0.86)	3.33 (sd 0.8)	2.98 (sd 0.80)	3.02 (sd 0.67)
hill (1987) f	607	3.50 (sd 0.81)	2.91 (sd 0.83)	3.67 (sd 0.64)	3.33 (sd 0.71)	
hill (1987) m	403	3.11 (sd 0.89)	2.94 (sd 0.84)	3.35 (sd 0.71)	3.30 (sd 0.74)	
me		2.67	1.8	4.78	2.4	3.23

Additional Information about Activity for Researchers:

This activity is not based on any previous study. Instead it comes out of my hope to demonstrate the familiarity effect in class. I could have done an experimental manipulation, varying exposure to arbitrary stimuli (like Zanjong, 1968 original study), but then we wouldn't have concrete examples to discuss. The most real-life personally-relevant example felt like music to me. But to have students rate songs, they'd need to listen to them and that would require too much time. Since I like art, it felt like the perfect fit for the pragmatic and pedagogical constraints.