CARITAS UNIVERSITY AMORJI-NIKE, EMENE, ENUGU STATE

Caritas Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Humanities

SELF ESTEEM AND LEVEL OF EDUCATION AS FACTORS IN RELIGIOUS CONFORMITY

Anike, Raphael U.

Authors' Affiliation
Department of Psychology
anikeugwu@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The study investigated self esteem and level of education as factors in religious conformity. A total of 100 participants comprising of 57 junior students and 43 senior students, out of which 51 are females and 49 are males drawn from the population of Day Secondary School Independence Layout Enugu. Two sets of questionnaire were used in this investigation: (i) 25-item Index of self esteem (ISE) and (ii) 17-item religious conformity scale (RCS) was administered on the participants based on cross sectional design. A 2×2 Analysis of variance F-test statistic using the method of unweighted means for unequal cell frequency based on two levels of self esteem (low/high), level of education (JSS/SSS) and religious conformity as a dependent variable. The findings revealed no significant outcome on self esteem $F(1,96) = 1.26$ at $P>.05$; a significant outcome on level of education $F(1,96) = 4.58$ at $P <.05$; and no interaction between self esteem and level of education $F(1,96) = 0.08$ at $P>.05$ on religious conformity among adolescents. The findings were discussed in relation to literatures reviewed and suggestions made.

INTRODUCTION

Self esteem is a person's overall emotional evaluation of his or her own worth. It is a judgment of oneself as well as an attitude towards the self. Self esteem encompasses beliefs (for example, "I am competent", "I am worthy") and emotions such as triumph, despair, pride, and shame. Smith and Mackie defined it by saying "The self concept is what we think about the self, self esteem is the positive or negative evaluations of the self, as in how we feel about it. Self esteem is also known as the evaluative dimension of the self that include feelings of worthiness, prides and discouragement. One`s self esteem is also closely associated with self – consciousness. Self esteem is a disposition that a person has which represents their judgments of their own worthiness.

In the mid – 1960s, Morris Rosenberg and social – learning theorists defined self esteem as a personal worth or worthiness. Nathaniel Branden in 1969 defined self esteem as the experience of being competent to cope with the basic challenges of life and being worthy of happiness. "According to Branden, self esteem is the sum of self – confidence (a feeling of personal capacity) and self – respect (a feeling of personal worth).

Self esteem exists as a consequence of the implicit judgment that every person have their ability to Face life`s challenges, to understand and solve problems and their right to achieve happiness and be given respect. As a social psychological construct, self esteem is attractive because researchers have conceptualized it as an influential predictor of relevant outcomes, such as academic achievement (Marsh, 1990).

Self esteem can apply specifically to a particular dimension (for example, "I believe I am a bad person, and feel bad about myself in general"). Psychologists usually regard self esteem as an enduring personality characteristic ("trait" self esteem) though normal, short – term variations ("state" self esteem) also exist. There are young people who have undergone puberty but who have not reached full maturity; these people also known as teenagers undergo adolescence which is viewed as a transitional period between childhood adulthood with the central purpose of preparing the children for adult roles. They are accompanied by an increased independence allowed by the parents or legal guardians and less supervision. Adolescents are often attributed to physical changes and what is called hormones which often urge them to behave in ways which they themselves normally or even being mature naturally wouldn`t have done.

Conformity is such a strong influence in the society that it is impossible to understand human behaviour without it. Psychological experiments show that people will deny the evidence of their own eyes in order to conform to other people. Conformity is the tendency to align your attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours with those around you. It is a powerful force that can take the form of overt social pressure or subtler unconscious influence. As much as we like to think of ourselves as individuals, the fact is that we are driven to fit in

Conformity is a type of social influence involving a change in belief or behaviour in order to fit in with a group. This change is in response to real (involving the physical presence of others) or imagined (involving the pressure of social/norms/expectations) group pressure. Social conformity can also be simply defined as "yielding to group pressures" (Crutchfield, 1955).

Group pressure may take different forms for example bullying, persuasion, teasing, criticism etc. Conformity is also known as majority influence (or group pressure). The term conformity is often used to indicate an agreement to the majority position, brought about either by a desire to be correct, in or be liked (normative) or because of a desire to be correct (informational) or simply to conform to a social role (identification).

The pressure to conform affects everyone therefore; understanding when we conform has all kinds of practical real world benefits, depending on your aims.

It can help one understand one's own behaviour as well as understand how others will behave under a variety of different situational pressures. In 1951, Solomon Asch discovered the power of conformity in everyday situations. In his famous experiment, he realized that individuals conformed to the group even with very simple tasks, such as determining which of three lines is the longest. His work encouraged many to follow – up with different variables added.

Purpose of the study

The aims of the study are stated below:

To determine whether there will be a significant influence of self esteem on religious conformity.

To examine whether there will be a significant influence of level of education on religious conformity.

Statement of the problem

The study intends to address the problem stated below:

Will there be a significant influence of self esteem on religious conformity?

Will there be a significant influence of level of education on religious conformity?

Theoretical background of the study

From the research carried out previously both high and low self esteem can be emotionally and socially harmful on adolescents but most especially low self esteem tend to be more harmful as it makes one loose sense of self worth and be vulnerable to conformity. Research has it that individuals or rather adolescents found at the optimum level of self esteem tends to be socially dominant while those at the lower level of self esteem tends to be weak and easy to conform to social pressure. Those with high self esteem focus on growth and improvement whereas people with low self esteem focus on not making mistakes in life thereby conforming socially.

This low self esteem can result from different ways and tend to determine the rate at which our adolescents conform socially. It can be through genetic factors which explain that is not competent enough to satisfy them and that even if their self efficacy is high they themselves always believe they cannot perform because their self worth is low and they depend on others for direction and follow up. It can also result from others socio economic status which explains the relationship between social and economic status of individuals. Some adolescents exhibit low self esteem by withdrawing or submitting under people whom they believe are higher than them socially and allowing themselves to be controlled by them thereby conforming. Again more physical appearance can contribute to low self esteem, perceiving others to be more attractive, making themselves less attractive and wanting to be like others there by conforming. Researches conducted exposes the fact that level of education one way or the influences social conformity as it gives rise to low self esteem.

Gender and self esteem

Self esteem continues to decline during adolescence particularly for girls. Researchers have explained this decline to body image and other problems associated with puberty. Although boys and girls report similar levels of self esteem during childhood, a gender gap emerges by adolescence, in that adolescent boys have higher self esteem than adolescent girls (Robins et al, 2002). Girls with low self esteem appear to be more vulnerable to perceptions of the ideal body image perpetuated in western media (through methods such as airbrushing models on magazine covers). When considering self esteem, it is important to note that both high and low levels of self esteem can be emotionally and socially harmful to the individual. Indeed it is thought an optimum level of self esteem lies in the middle of the continuum; individuals operating within this range are thought to be more socially dominant with relationships. Research has shown key differences between individuals with high and low self esteem for

example, people with high self esteem focus on growth and improvement whereas people with low self esteem focus on not making mistakes in life.

Rosenberg and Owen (2001) offer the following description of low self esteem people based on empirical research: people with low self esteem are more troubled by failure and tend to exaggerate events as being negative for example; they often interpret non critical comments as critical. They are more likely to experience social anxiety and low levels of interpersonal confidence. This in turn makes social interaction with others difficult as they feel "awkward, shy, conspicuous, and unable to adequately express themselves when interacting with others". Furthermore, low self esteem individuals tend to be pessimistic towards people and groups within society.

Longitudinal study on self esteem

A study done by Ruth Yasemin Erol and Ulrich Orth from the University of Basel examined the development of self esteem in adolescence and young adulthood. The aim of the study was to determine the trajectory of self esteem development; as in when does self esteem development occur in life and in what direction. Another aspect of the study was to discover potential modifiers to individual difference in self esteem development after recording trajectories. It was expected that self esteem development would continuously increase during adolescence and young adulthood as per previous studies results.

Erol and Orth found that self esteem increases moderately through adolescence and continues in young adulthood at a slower rate. A high sense of mastery, low risk taking and better overall health predicted higher self esteem in participants at each age level. Emotionally stable, extroverted and conscientious participants experienced higher self esteem as well. An individual's sense of mastery proved to be an important moderator of self esteem trajectory for all participants. Erol and Orth's study

documents the importance of adolescence as a possible critical period for self esteem development.

Controversy characterizes the extent to which self esteem changes during adolescence and whether there are gender differences in adolescents' self esteem. In one study, both boys and girls had particularly high self esteem in childhood, but their self esteem dropped considerably during adolescence (Robbins and others, 2002). The self esteem of girls declined more than the self esteem of boys during adolescence in this study. One explanation on decline in self esteem of girls points to girls' negative body images during pubertal change. Another explanation involves the greater interest young adolescent girls take in social relationships and society's failure to reward that interest (Impett and others, 2008). Self esteem reflects perceptions that do not always match reality (Krueger, Vohs, & Baumeister, 2008). An adolescent's self esteem might indicate a perception about whether he or she is intelligent and attractive, for example, but that perception may not be accurate.

Components of self esteem

According to one definition (Braden 1969), there are three key components of self esteem:

- self esteem is an essential human need that is vital for survival and normal healthy development
- self esteem arises automatically from within based upon a person's beliefs and consciousness
- Self esteem occurs in conjunction with a person's thought, behaviours, feelings and actions.

Conformity is a type of social influence involving a change in belief or behaviour in order to fit in with a group. It is referred to as "yielding to group pressures" (Crutchfield, 1955). Kelman (1958) distinguished between three different types of conformity.

Compliance

This is publicly changing behaviour to fit in with the group while privately disagreeing. In other words, conforming to the majority (publicly) in spite of not really agreeing with them (privately), this is seen in Asch's line experiment.

Internalization

This refers to publicly changing behaviour to fit in with the group and also agreeing with them privately, this is seen in Asch's line experiment.

Identification

This refers to conforming to the expectation of a social role. This is similar to compliance and does not have to be a change in private opinion. A good example is zimbardo's prison study.

Factors that affect the degree of social conformity

Several factors affect the degree to which conformity will occur.

Group cohesiveness

This is the degree to which we are strongly attracted to group and desire to maintain membership in it. Group cohesiveness increases the occurrence of conformity for example, countless research studies exist which displays the degree of conformity in sororities and fraternities. In a like manner, the number of persons exerting pressure increases the amount of conformity. This is true only to a certain point: a group size of about three to four people will exert pressure to conform. However, a larger group size does not increase the likelihood of conformity. Finally, having an ally, someone who disagrees with the majority results in much less conformity than when no social support exists for the target of conformity.

Reasons for non conformity

Why don't we all conform?

Some people never seem to conform and most of us don't conform all the time. There are a number of reasons to explain this:

Asch's three categories of independence

- Confidence in their perceptions (for example Perrin and Spencer)
- Withdrawal: which is the need to act as individuals (this can be seen by an avoidance of eye contact to isolate themselves)
- Tension and doubt: the participants who gave the 'correct' answer despite the discomfort that they felt.

Individual factors

- Individuation: this is the wish to be distinct from others and maintain personal identity.
- Control: some people have a great need for personal control. This can be seen in those people who are not willing to ask for directions despite the fact that they are lost.

There have been many experiments in psychology investigating conformity and group pressure.

Jenness (1932) was the first psychologist to study conformity. His experiment was so ambiguous situation involving a glass bottle filled with beans. He asked participants individually to estimate how many beans the bottle contained. Jenness then put the group in a room with the bottle and asked them to provide a group estimate through discussion. Participants were then asked to estimate the number on their own again to find whether their initial estimates had altered based on the influence of the majority. Jenness then interviewed the participants individually again and asked if they would like to change their original estimates or stay with the group's estimate. Almost all changed their individual guesses to be closer to the group estimate.

Solomon Asch – conformity experiment

Solomon Asch (1951) conducted an experiment to investigate the extent to which social pressure from a majority group could affect a person to conform. He

used a lab experiment to study conformity, whereby 123 male students from Swarthmore College in the USA participated in a "vision test". Using the line judgment task, Asch put a naïve participant in a room with four to six confederates. The confederates had a agreed in advance what their responses would be when presented with the line task. The real participant did not know this and was led to believe that the other seven participants were also real participants like themselves. Each person in the room had to state aloud which comparison line (A, B or C) was most like the target line. The answer was always obvious; the real participant sat at the end of the row and gave his or her answer last. In some trials, the seven confederates gave the wrong answer. There were 18 trials in total and the confederates gave the wrong answer on 12 trials (called the critical trials). Asch was interested to see if the real participant would confirm to the majority view. Asch measured the number of times each participant conformed to the majority view. On average, about one third (32%) of the participants who were placed in this situation went along and conformed to the clearly incorrect majority on the central trial. Over the 12 critical trials about 75% of participants conformed at least once and 25% of participants never conformed. When they were interviewed after the experiment, most of them said that they did not really believe their conforming answers but had gone along with the group for fear of being ridiculed or thought "peculiar". A few of them said that they really did believe the group's answers were correct. Apparently, people conform for two main reasons: because they want to fit in with the group (normative influence) and because they believe the group is better informed than they are (informational influence).

Sheriff (1935) auto kinetic effect experiment

Sheriff (1935) conducted an experiment with the aim of demonstrating that people conform to group norms when they are put in an ambiguous (unclear) situation. Sheriff used a lab experiment to study conformity. He used the auto kinetic effect. This is where a small spot of light (projected onto a screen) in a dark room will appear to move even though it is still (i.e. it is a visual illusion). It was discovered that when participants were individually tested their estimates on how the light moved varied considerably (for example from 20cm to 80cm). The participants were then tested in groups of three. Sheriff manipulated the composition of the group by putting together two people whose estimate of the light movement when done was very similar and one person whose estimate was very different. Each person in the group had to say aloud how far they thought the light had moved. Sheriff found that over numerous estimates (trials) of the movement of light, the group converged to a common estimate. The person whose estimate of movement was greatly different to the other two in the group conformed to the view of the other two. Sheriff said that this showed that people would always tend to conform. Rather than make individual judgments they tend to come to a group agreement.

Social conformity among adolescents

Young adolescents conform more to peer standards than children do. Around the eighth and ninth grades, conformity to peers especially to their antisocial standards peaks (Brown & Larson, 2009; Brown & others, 2008). At this point, adolescents are most likely to go along with a peer to steal hubcaps off a car, draw graffiti on a wall, or steal cosmetics from a store counter. Mitchell Prinstein and his colleagues (Cohen & Prinstein, 2006; Prinstein, 2007; Prinstein & Dodge, 2008) have recently conducted research suggesting that adolescents who feel uncertain that their social identity, which may be evident in low self esteem and high social anxiety are most likely to conform to peers. This uncertainty often increases during times of transition such as changing circumstances in school and family life. Also, adolescents are more likely to conform to peers whom they perceive to have higher status than they do.

Self esteem and conformity

A research conducted by Jennifer Hernandez on the purpose to see if there is a negative correlation

between self esteem and conformity. A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between conformity and self esteem. A moderate negative correlation was found [r (21) = -.483, p=.02], indicating a significant linear relationship between the two variables. Those individuals with high conformity tend to have lower self esteem. An independent t-test compared the mean conformity score to the mean self esteem score. The conformity score [t (21) = -1.35, p>.05] was not significantly different from the self esteem score (t (21) = -0451, p>.05). It therefore found out that there was a moderate negative correlation between conformity and self esteem. People who scored high on the conformity scale tended to score lower on the scale of self esteem. Individuals who scored low on the conformity scale scored significantly higher on the scale of self esteem.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested:

There will be no significant influence of self esteem on religious conformity.

There will be no significant influence of level of education on religious conformity.

METHOD

Participants

A total of 100 participants comprising of 57 junior students and 43 senior students, out of which 51 are females and 49 are males drawn from the population of Day Secondary School Independence Layout Enugu. They are within the ages of 12-17 years with a mean age of 14.3 years and standard deviation of 2.1 years.

Instrument

Two sets of instrument were used in this investigation: (i) Index of self esteem (ISE) and (ii) Religious conformity scale (RCS) respectively. The ISE is a 25 item inventory developed by Walter W. Hudson

(1982) for individuals above 12 years of age. The items are scored using direct and reverse scoring. Items under direct scoring are: 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 24 while under reverse are: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, 23, and 25.

Psychometric properties: Hudson (1982) provided the original psychometric properties for American samples while Onighaiye (1996) provided the properties for Nigerian samples.

Reliability: Hudson (1982) obtained a coefficient alpha of .93 and a two-hour test-retest co-efficient of .92.

Validity: Onighaiye (1996) obtained the following coefficients of validity by correlating ISE with the stated test: Concurrent validity wit SCL-90 by Derogatis et al (1973) in scale C – interpersonal sensitivity = .46; scale D – Depression = .38. Discriminant validity with Ego identify scale (EIS) by Tan et al (1977) = -.42. EIS and ISE measure opposite ends of self esteem.

The religious conformity scale is made up of 17 items in a multiple choice format formulated by the researcher, designed to measure the degree of religious conformity and level of engagement in moral behaviour. The options are SA – Strongly agree, A – Agree, U – Undecided, D – Disagree, SD – Strongly disagree. The items were scored using likert format whereby the positively worded items are scored from SA the highest mark(5) to the least SD(1); and the negatively worded items are scored from SD the highest mark(5) to the least SA(1). Except for items 15 and 16 that negatively worded, all other items are positively worded. Having formulated the religious conformity scale, it was taken to experts for face validity at which the items were accepted. They were taken for pilot study using 20 participants drawn from Command Day Secondary School Abakaliki Road Enugu at which the split half reliability coefficient of 0.31 was obtained.

Procedure

The two sets of instrument were distributed across the target population. 140 copies of each of the questionnaire were taken to the students of Day Secondary School Independence Layout Enugu. The teachers served as research assistants and participated in administering the copies of the questionnaire. The administration took the form of group testing. 137 copies out of the number distributed were collected by the teachers from their students. Also, 100 copies that are correctly filled were scored and tabulated for analysis, and 37 were discarded.

Design/statistics

A cross sectional design was adopted based on different categories of participants; while a 2×2 Analysis of variance F-test statistic using the method of unweighted means for unequal cell frequency based on two levels of self esteem (low/high), and two levels of education (JSS/SSS) on religious conformity as a dependent variable.

RESULTS

Table I: Summary table of means on self esteem and level of education as factors in religious conformity.

Level of education

		JSS	SSS
Self esteem	Low	$\overline{x}11 = 54.68$	$\overline{x}12 = 52.09$
	high	$\overline{x}21 = 50.20$	$\overline{x}21 = 48.63$

From table 1 above, adolescents in junior secondary school categorized under low self esteem obtained the highest group of mean score of 54.68, followed by adolescents in senior secondary school categorized under low self esteem (x = 52.09); adolescents in junior secondary school categorized under high self esteem (x = 50.20); and adolescents in senior secondary school categorized under high self esteem (x = 48.63). Generally, adolescents in junior secondary school with a group mean of 104.88 showed high disposition of religious conformity than adolescents in senior secondary school with a group mean of 100.72; while adolescents categorized under low self esteem with a group mean of 106.77 showed high disposition of religious conformity than adolescents categorized under high self esteem with a group mean of 98.83. Thus, a high mean indicates high level of religious conformity; while a low mean indicates low level of religious conformity.

Table II: Summary table of 2x2 Anova on self esteem and level of education as factors in religious conformity.

Source of variation	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	P
Row (Self esteem)	63.00	1	63.00	1.26	>.05
Columns (level of education)	229.31	1	229.31	4.58	<.05
Interaction (self esteem versus level of education)	3.78	1	3.78	0.08	>.05
Within cells	4808.42	96	50.09		

From the above summary table, some interpretations could be made: Since the F calculated value of self esteem 1.26 is found to be less than the critical value of 3.94 at P<.05 level of significance, a non significant outcome is obtained. Hence, hypothesis I which stated that "there will be no significant influence of self esteem on religious conformity" is hereby accepted. This means that adolescents with low self esteem do not vary remarkably from adolescents with high self esteem on religious conformity.

Also, F-calculated value of 4.58 is found to be greater than F-critical value of 3.94 at P<.05 level of significance, indicating a significant outcome. Hence, hypothesis II which stated that "there will be no significant influence of level of education on religious conformity" is hereby rejected. This means that adolescents in junior secondary school vary remarkably from adolescents in senior secondary school on religious conformity.

Based on F-calculated value of 0.08 which is found to be less than F-critical value of 3.94 at P<.05 level of significance, a non significant interaction effects of self esteem and level of education is hereby obtained in relation to religious conformity.

Summary of the results

Self esteem yielded no significant influence on religious conformity at P >.05; level of education yielded a significant influence on religious conformity at P<.05; and a non significant interaction effects of self esteem and level of education was observed on religious conformity at P>.05.

DISCUSSION

From other researches done on self esteem and other related fields, it was deduced that: boys and girls

report similar levels of self esteem during childhood but changes hence forth as adolescent boys have higher self esteem than adolescent girls (Robins et al., 2002). Rosenberg and Owen (2001) also said that low self esteem adolescents are more likely to exhibit difficulty in social interaction with others as they feel awkward, shy and unable to adequately express themselves.

The outcome of this study revealed that the hypotheses tested was confirmed in relation to self esteem, and disconfirmed in relation to level of education. Hence, hypothesis 1 which stated that "there will be no significant influence of self esteem on religious conformity" was confirmed. This shows that adolescents categorized under low self esteem do not differ remarkably from adolescents categorized under high self esteem in religious conformity. Although, adolescents with low self esteem obtained a higher group mean than adolescents with high self esteem in religious conformity, indicating that they may have high need for moral affiliation or group cohesiveness. This may account for the variation on the degree of religious conformity between low and high self esteem adolescents.

The second hypothesis tested which stated that "there will be no significant influence of level of education on religious conformity" was disconfirmed. This means that a remarkable difference was observed between adolescents in junior secondary school and adolescents in senior secondary school in religious conformity, although adolescents in junior secondary school showed high disposition towards religious conformity. This indicates that adolescents in junior secondary school revealed high tendency to affiliate and engage in peer group behaviour than adolescents in senior secondary school; while on the other hand adolescents in senior secondary school may reveal a disposition of stable moral relation as compared to younger adolescents in junior secondary school whose moral needs and peer group behaviour may be gregarious than others. In addition a non significant interaction effects of self esteem and level of education was obtained in relation to religious conformity indicating that an adolescents level of self esteem and his or her level of education do not account for any remarkable difference in religious conformity.

Nevertheless, as proposed by Rosenberg and Owen (2001) the research revealed that low self esteem reduces the level of engagement in social behaviour due to one reason or the other as most of the adolescents who scored low on the self esteem inventory do not often engage in social behaviour.

Finally, having pointed out all this, with statistics being applied, the research found out that there is no significant difference between low and high self esteem on religious conformity in the sense that self esteem does not necessarily determine religious conformity as some participants who scored low on self esteem inventory, scored high on religious conformity and some who scored high on self esteem, scored low on religious conformity but it wasn't persistent as some of them equally scored low on religious conformity irrespective of scoring high on self esteem. From all indications, the typical adolescent who has high need for religious conformity as revealed by the outcome of this study, is a junior secondary school adolescent categorized under low self esteem.

Implications of the findings

The findings of this study indicates that self esteem which revealed no remarkable difference in relation to degree of religious conformity portrays that an adolescent's self esteem may not really account for his or her degree of religious participation or group harmonization. But, in relation to level of education a reasonable judgment was found based on the remarkable difference between junior secondary and senior secondary adolescents to show that intellectual growth is a strong factor that determines ones degree of religious conformity.

Limitations of the study

Limitation in this study include atmosphere, the research was carried out during the students' lesson

period where they were closely sited and engaged in casual conversations. Since the research is concerned with conformity and self esteem this could have affected the results in the study.

Another limitation of the study include that the research inter locked with students lessons which couldn't create room for full concentration as some of them rushed through the filling of the questionnaire while other students attention were divided to the extent that they filled it without acknowledging what they were doing.

Third limitation of the study is that the level of understanding among the adolescent students was too poor because the researcher passed through difficulty trying to explain the questionnaires to the students which at the end of everything some of them gained insight towards the objective completion of the questionnaire.

Suggestions for further study

Based on the findings of this study the researcher hereby suggests that future researchers should carryout a similar research on this topic as a measure to cross validate the outcome of this study. Future researcher should also study some factors like age and gender in addition to the self esteem and level of education as a way to expand the scope of this study. Finally, further research should be carried out with larger samples in order to enhance wider generalization in relation to religious conformity.

Summary and Conclusion

The findings of this study are summarized as follows:

A non remarkable difference was obtained between low and high self esteem adolescents in relation to religious conformity, although adolescents with low self esteem obtained a higher group mean than adolescents with high self esteem in religious conformity. A remarkable difference was obtained between junior and senior secondary school adolescents in relation to religious conformity, although adolescents in junior secondary obtained a

higher group mean than adolescents in senior secondary in relation to religious conformity. A non remarkable interaction effect of self esteem and level of education was obtained in relation to religious conformity. Based on the findings of this study the researcher hereby concludes that cognitive growth based on level of education is a strong factor that influences the degree of religious conformity.

REFERENCES

Asch, S. E. (1951). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion   of judgment in H. Guetzkow (Ed) Groups, leadership and men. Pisburgh, PA: Carnegie press.

Baumeiter, R.F; Smart, L.; Boden, J. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of self esteem". *Psychological review 103*(1): 5-33. Doi: 10.1037/0033-295x.103.1.5 PMID 8650299.

Branden, N. (1969). The psychology of self esteem. New York: Bantan.
Brown & Larson, 2009; Brown & others, 2008, social conformity among adolescents

Chirkou, Ryan, Kim & Kaplan, 2003; La Guardia, Ryan, Couchman & Deci, 2000 as cited in Ryan & Deci, 2004) social conditions provide support and to opportunity fulfill basic needs to enhance personal growth and well being.

Crutchfield, R. (1955) conformity and chapter American psychologist, 10, 191 – 198.

Derogatis, L. R., Lipman, R.S. & Covi, L. (1973). SCL – 90: An outpatient psychiatric rating scale preliminary report. *Psychopharmacology Bulletin, 9,* 13-28.

Deutsch, G. (1955) formulates "the dual process dependency model".

Erol, R.Y.; Orth, U. (2011). Self esteem development from age 14 to 30 years: A longitudinal study.

Journal of personality of social psychology 101(3): 607-619. Doi: 10.1037/a0024299

Eysenck, M.W. (2004). Psychology: An international perspective. New York: psychology press, LTD.

Hewit, J. P., (2005) The social construction of self esteem. Synder, C. R., and Lopez S.J. (Eds.). *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp 135 – 148) New York: Oxford University press.

Hewit, J.P. (2009). *Oxford Handbook of positive psychology*. Oxford University press. Pp. 217 – 224. ISBN 978 – 0 -19 – 518724 – 3.

Hudson, W.W. (1982). Index of self esteem. *The clinical measurement package: A field manual.* Chicago: Dorsey Press.

Impett & others (2008), younger adolescent girls take in social relationships & society's failure to reward that interest.

Jenness A. (1932). The role of discussion in changing opinion regarding a matter of fact. The journal of abnormal and social psychology, 27, 279 – 296.

Jose – Vicente Bonet. Se amigo de ti ismo: manual de autoestima. 1997. Ed. Sal Terrae. Maliano (Cantabria, Espana). ISBN 978 – 84 – 293 - 1133 – 4.

Kelman H, C. (1958). "Compliance, identification and internalization, three processes of attitude change" journal of conflict resolution, 2, 51-60.

Kling, K.C.; Hyde, J.S.; Showers, C.J.; & Buswell B.N. (1999). Gender differences in self esteem: A meta – analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 125(4), pp 470 - 500.

Krueger, Vohs & Baumeister, (2008). Self esteem reflects perceptions that do not always match reality.

Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K. & Downs D. L. (1995). Self esteem as an interpersonal monitor: the sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 68*(3), pp. 518 – 530.

Leary, M. R.; Baumeister, R. F. (2000). "The nature and function of self esteem: Sociometer Theory". *In Zanna, M. P. Advances in experimental social psychology 32.* san Diego CA: Academic press pp. 1-62. ISBN 0-12-015232-0

Marsh, H.W. (1990). Causal ordering of academic self concept and academic achievement: A multiwave, longitudinal path analysis. *Journal of educational psychology 82*(4): 646-656. Doi: 10.1037/0022-0663-82.4.646.

Maslow, A.H. (1987). Motivation and personality (third ed.) New York. Harper & Row. ISBN 0-06-041987-3.

Mikuliner, F. & Hirschberger, (2003) as cited in pyszcynski et al., 2004, proposal for integration of attachment theory and terror management theory.

Mitchell, P. Cohen & Prinstein, (2006); Prinstein, 2007; Prinstein & Dodge, (2008) adolescents' uncertainty about their social identity.

Onighaiye, M.A. (1996). *The impact of the length of time in the university on ego identify, self esteem and stress manifestations in students.* Unpublished B.Sc. Thesis, Psychology Department, University of Lagos.

Robins et al, (2002). Gender difference in adolescents' self esteem.

Rosenberg & Owen (2001). Characteristics of people with low self esteem based on empirical research.

Ryan M. R. & Deci E. L., (2004). Avoiding death or engaging life as accounts of meaning and culture: comment on pyszcynski et al.; (2004). *Psychological bulletin, 130*(3), pp. 473 – 477.

Pyszcynski, T., (2004) "why people need self esteem"?

Seligman M. (1996), the optimistic child. New York: HarperCollins.

Scheff, R. & Ryan (1989). cited et al., 1995 "changes in self esteem in the form of pride, high self esteem and shame with low self esteem.

Sheriff M. (1935) a study of some social factors in perception archives of psychology, 27(187).

Smith & Mackie (2007). Social psychology (third ed.) hove. Psychology press. ISBN 978, 84169-4085.

Spicy (1989). Translates the changes in self esteem to be levels of anxiety.

Swann, M. & Polzer (2000). States that self verification processes are adaptive for groups and society to facilitate social interaction.

Tan, A.L. Kendi, R. J., Fine, J.T. & Porac, J. (1977). A short measure of Eriksonian Ego Identity. *Journal of personality Assessment 41,* 279-284.

Thorne, A.; Michaelleu, Q. (1996). Situating adolescent gender and self esteem with personal memories. *Child development 67*(4): 1374-1390. Doi 10.1111/1467-8822601802.

Tuner H. (1991). states that we conform to the group because we identify ourselves as part of the group "self stereotype"