



Faculty of Economics, University of Niš, 13 October 2016

International Scientific Conference

**THE PRIORITY DIRECTIONS
OF NATIONAL ECONOMY DEVELOPMENT**

**STRATEGIC PLANNING – BLIND FOLLOWERS VS. CRITICAL
THINKING**

Ivaylo Dargov*

***Abstract:** The discoveries in cognitive psychology raise a number of issues with respect to strategic planning and management concepts that should be recognised and studied. The goal of the paper is to initiate a discussion about appearance of cognitive biases in strategic planning and organisational management.*

Affects like conformism, group pressure and obedience to authority are considered in the context of organisational plans and targets. The main thesis is to prove that these affects could lead to blind following of ideas, reduced individualism and loss of innovative potential.

***Keywords:** Conformism, Group pressure, Obedience to authority, Management concepts, Innovative potential*

1. Introduction

Besides the positive aspects of successful implementation of strategic plans and programmes there are also some downsides. Drawbacks also should be studied in as much detailed analyses as advantages. One of the major shortcomings to be described in deeper detail here is the take-away of employees' critical thinking – a tool with unparalleled and indispensable benefits. Damping critical thinking results in blindly following the course of action without any availability of a corrective mechanism to ensure for going in the right direction.

The paper aims to prove that conformism, need for recognition, group pressure, obedience to authority and others cognitive affects are all valuable tools for the implementation of plans but also could be an obstacle for the achievement of organisational goals. This “dissociative” nature of cognitive affects in goal achievement is the topic of the discussion that follows. While their positive effects are known and have been studied by various branches of science such as management, forecasting and planning (Drucker, 1954; Anthony, 1965; Porter, 1992; Kaplan, Norton, 1992; Neely, Adams, 2002), the focus of the present paper will be on negative features and risks which cognitive affects imply for the achievement of personal and organisational goals and aspirations.

* University of National and World Economy, Bulgaria, ✉ i_dargov@abv.bg
UDC 005.32

2. Indoctrinated Blind Followers

Let us examine one theoretically founded plan. In this plan people were involved in the goals and organisational values at such an early stage and so successfully that conformism suppresses the ego, the social context takes precedence over personality. Conformism and authority result in systematic obedience to the plan regardless of its characteristics. Critical thinking has been deadened completely.

Kim Hyun Hee was brought up in the totalitarian rule of the communist Republic of North Korea. At school and university she was taught that her country is the greatest in the whole world and its citizens are honoured and privileged to be headed by the greatest leader ever born on this world – Kim Il-sung, whose image is rendered divine tinge. Kim's zeal and diligence, combined with her appropriate background, brought forth a proposal for a career in North Korea's foreign intelligence.

One special day Kim was honoured to be selected to go on a special mission by order of the great leader Kim Il-sung himself. The destiny of the North Korean nation, or more precisely, of the Korean nation, depended on this mission because the result of its completion was finally going to bring forth the accession of South Korea to the communist ideology and the union between the two countries.

The plan was to have Kim Hyun Hee and her assistant detonating a South Korean passenger airplane. The explosion was going to result in cancellation of the forthcoming Olympics in Seoul and ultimately, to the union between the two Koreas under the common totalitarian communist rule of Kim Il-sung.

Later, in her autobiographical book "The tears of my soul" Kim Hyun Hee admitted that she was never in a single moment able to understand how killing tenths of tourists could possibly result in the accession of South Korea to the northern regime but she had never raised this issue in front of her superiors and had taken on trust the positive outcome which the plan was supposed to deliver. After all, as she had known ever since her childhood, her leader was boundlessly wise and good. Since the mission was by his personal order it was undoubtedly bound to deliver the desired outcome.

Kim Hyun Hee never had any doubts nor felt any guilt or sympathy for the victims of her actions. Instead, her mind was busy figuring out the specific details and elements of the action plan throughout the entire duration of the mission. "The act of sabotage was purely a technical operation", she admitted later.

Psychologists Roy Baumeister and Brad Bushman have examined the story of Kim Hyun Hee and identified in it several significant themes related to human nature. Among these are (Baumeister, Bushman, 2011, 98-99):

- Hee's behavior was guided by the values and systems of her culture: Blowing up an airplane was not her idea, but she accepted it and carried it out on faith that it would benefit her nation.
- She trusted that her leaders were good people and knew what they were doing, and she obeyed them without question. She did not notice the moral dilemma in advance and thought only of doing her duty.
- The plans were overly optimistic. ...

Strategic Planning – Blind Followers Vs. Critical Thinking

- Her actions followed carefully made plans, with minor adjustments during the mission.
- During the mission, she focused herself on the steps and details, never really questioning whether the project was a good idea in the first place. She focused on how, not why.

When she was captured and left on her own accompanied only by her thoughts far away from her comfort zone Kim became conscious of the moral aspect of what she had done. Confused by her own reactions and feelings, by what she had done, she started having nightmares. Subsequently, this brought forth her repentance and perhaps she had gone through some form of catharsis. Kim Hyun Hee made full confessions about her acts and was sentenced to death. Later she was pardoned by South Korean authorities.

3. We are all conformists

The idea of the snow-ball effect of spreading behaviour, opinions, attitudes, interpretations and beliefs among a given group distinctly formed within a cultural socium is a popular idea in social psychology. Psychologist discovered and studied this phenomenon long ago. It accounts equally well for both fashion trends and degenerative social phenomena such as the Holocaust. The scientific term for the process leading to such exploding spread of ideas is “conformism”. The meaning of the latter is to follow a pattern of behaviour which is the individual’s response to the pressure exercised by the authority, the group and the surroundings, trying to be in agreement with them and avoiding confrontation. A similar idea is embodied in Heidegger’s *das Man* – a person seeking to avoid expressing any kind of individuality by becoming “the fashion” of society.

Examples of conformism could be found in every area of our surrounding reality, from fashion trends, through the boom of the Facebook social network, and up to the idealisation of specific actors or political characters. Similarly, the instance of Kim Il-sung’s personality cult. Such a “cult” to the organisation, perhaps to a lower extent, is what a number of management concepts are trying to achieve.

The popularity of a given item results in giving it even higher preference. Positive attitude spreads like an epidemic outbreak. Sociology’s term for the snow-ball effect of popularity is “increasing advantages”. A wonderful illustration of this idea is the increase in use of English as a linguafranca. The Latin term is used to signify the common language used among people having different mother tongues.

In his humoristic book “My life and hard times” James Thurber gives an excellent description of one of the manifestations of conformism and how a social avalanche is generated. In his story several people start running in a busy street, perhaps they are in a hurry to go somewhere or just for no reason. Other people around them also quicken their steps until someone mentioned the word “dike” and suddenly the crowd bolted it at a trot while the word spread from mouth to mouth that the dike of the nearby river had broken. When finally people stopped running and realized the absurd situation their faces expressed shame. But they would have felt far worse had the dike really broken and they hadn’t started running.

So, is conformism a good thing or not? There is no clear-cut answer to this question. In many situations occurring in life conformism, imitation and snow-ball effect of spreading are all a sort of teachers for acceptable behavior to deliver an appropriate response to the effects of external factors. In a managerial process of implementation of strategies conformism among employees could result in obedience and following imposed programmes. However, such semi-blind following (which builds up with time and as a result of habit) could prevent the organisation from identifying deviations from set goals. More or less, it also renders the organisation less flexible and to a large extent deprives it of its innovation potential. It is hard to change the course of an avalanche, isn't it!

Conformism and obedience to authority are inherent characteristics of each organisation and each social system regardless of the fact whether it is a governmental organisation, a university students' club or a business company. Management books and strategic planning concepts dedicate significant amount of space to recognition by the company's employees of its goals. Detailed examination is given to the concept of uptake of strategies and plans, of the sense of belonging to the common whole and to the common course adopted by the organisation.

A majority of management systems that gained popularity in the recent decades, such as the Japanese Management Movement popular in the 80s of the 20th century, the Stakeholder Theory, the Michael Porter theory of competitive advantages, the Strategic Scorecards developed by Kaplan&Norton, and a number of other management concepts, emphasize on the importance of making all company employees aware of the ideas, goals and plans of the organisation and accepting them as their own. Employees should be associated with the mission of the organisation. They have to believe in the effectiveness of adopted strategies and the feasibility of plans which follow.

Acceptance by employees undoubtedly brings a number of advantages and it is highly beneficial for the achievement of organisation's goals. The sense of belonging to the group is a strong motivator for the fulfillment of assigned tasks in the best possible way while bringing internal satisfaction. Building up a solid team is in the essence of establishing a properly functioning and focused system. Acting in conformity at the work place captures the employees in a common wave of activities thus implementing the effect of increasing advantages. On the other hand, when conformism is intensified by obedience to authority (regardless of the fact if it is a specific person acting as a leader or the institutional role of the organisation), following the adopted concepts, attitudes and plans and programmes is intensified tremendously. This, of course, is a substantial precondition for their implementation and ultimately, for the achievement of long-term goals of the organisation. Thus, even far too brave organisational visions seem feasible.

However, at the same time individuality is blurred and possibilities for giving birth to a number of good ideas are missed. The lack of criticism results in unreserved following of the "crowd" of colleagues even when the general direction leads the organisation to an abyss. In parallel, a possibility is missed for some noble ideas to emerge and develop so as to make the organisation more successful and to implement an even braver vision. When the individual sticks to the averaged *das Man* and is afraid to express a different opinion and a bright personality he or she would not dare to deliver his/her ideas as an opinion. Instead, he/she would abandon them and even forget about them. If, however, he/she decides to give these ideas as an opinion the general avalanche would most probably overtake and stifle them.

Strategic Planning – Blind Followers Vs. Critical Thinking

The lack of stimuli for creativeness deprives the organisation of multiple possibilities and unexpected benefits. Human history has demonstrated that it is exactly the innovative and different thinking that leads to build-upon and progress. Conformism and obedience to authority urge employees to follow and reinforce the general course but also keep their eyes shut for the direct unbeaten paths. Which is worse, such conformism and obedience could distort the judgement about the general course, the vision and the goals.

4. Obedience to the group pressure

People may tend to accept the opinion of the organisation or the team and to act in conformance in the name of the collective body. Perhaps it is the social instinct that drives them to adopt the common opinion and the common position on a given issue as a result of their natural desire to become part of the coherent whole. Ultimately, perhaps a collective decision is wiser and more experienced, and following the common path is maybe a more successful strategy. But people tend to develop conformism not only when it is a matter of ideas, knowledge and strategies. Conformism develops even in judgements made based on sensory perceptions. One axiomatic example in proof of this is the experiment run by Solomon Asch in 1955 (Asch, 1955).

In his experiment participants were divided into groups of seven to nine people and they were told they will be participating in a psychological experiment on visual judgements. The person running the experiment informed them that they will be requested to compare the length of lines, and after that placed in front of them two large white cards. The first one had one vertical line drawn on it and it was used as a reference in the comparison, and the second card had three vertical lines that the participants were asked to compare to the reference on the first card. The exercise is easy in its own because the right answer is rather obvious since the difference between the reference and the other possibilities is in the range of 3-6cm. Participants provide their answers by the order in which they took their seats in the room. In the first two trials all participants provided the correct answers but from the third trial onwards all participants except one from those who answered last gave obviously wrong answers. In all of the trials that followed afterwards almost all participants gave, again, obviously wrong answers.

In fact, all participants in the group of 7-9 except one were instructed in advance by the person running the experiment to provide the same wrong answer after the second trial group of cards. Actually, only the answers of this single participant were studied and he/she was let to believe that he/she was expected to provide the right answers. Thus, Asch very elegantly created what psychologists call “group pressure”. And regardless of the fact that Asch himself was not expecting to observe a substantial obedience to the group pressure in reality, the results of the experiment indicated the opposite. After twenty wrong answers in a row approximately 75% of the people submit to the group at least once and make a wrong judgement. If we study all given answers as a whole it becomes clear that around 35% of them followed the wrong answers provided by the interposed participants instructed in advance to do so by the person running the experiment.

We can assume that the participants in Asch’s experiment had two main goals: to give the right answer and to meet the expectations of the group which they joined. However, these two goals contradict each other and the participants actually have to make a choice which one of them to achieve. As Asch’s results demonstrate in 35% of all cases

participants had chosen the second goal and have satisfied the group pressure. Instead of making the right choice they gave preference to the group answer and thus, they had chosen conformism instead of success.

Solomon Asch's experiment has been run repeatedly hundreds of times ever since with various groups of recipients belonging to various cultural communities. Regardless of the skepticism of some scientists a number of studies confirm that the inclination to conformism and collectivism is not only present in modern society but also seems to be increasing when compared to the time when Asch run his first experiment. Such studies were carried out in the United Kingdom (Abrams, Wetherell, Cochrane, Hogg, Turner, 1990), the Netherlands (Vlaander, van Rooijen, 1985), Belgium (Doms, van Avermaet, 1985), Portugal (Neto, 1995), etc.

Following a specified development path that has been deeply assimilated by the employees of the company intensifies their consistent performance and determination but suppresses birth of new ideas or at least expressing them openly. Often group pressure and conformism are intolerable to different thinking and change of the status quo. Organisational authority and team environment are forcing on employees to accept group judgements and commonly established patterns of behaviour. Moreover, this is done regardless of the fact if such judgements or patterns are right or not. Critical opinions and constructive doubts contradict spreading of ideas in a snow-ball effect. In fact, they are the epistemological brakes of such spreading.

5. Obedience to authority

Unfortunately, the effects of conformism and obedience to authority can have extremely destructive social expression. They can exalt both altruistic behaviour or behaviour resulting in development, and the degenerative and destructive type of behaviour. Moreover, both seem to be manifested to an equal extent. The results of a study made by Stanley Milgram by the end of the 70s of the 20th century had become extremely popular far beyond the scientific community due to the horrific findings they suggested (Milgram, 1974). Shocking observations have shaken strongly trust in the thinking, independent and rational humans and their moral values.

Milgram was provoked by the mass genocide against the Jews during the Second World War and by the story of a German army officer describing the brutalities he had committed based on the obedient following of orders, power and social context. In this experiment Milgram decided to study how people tend to obey authority and situational requirements refraining from any political, ethical or moral judgements.

The results of the experiment are horrific and for these reason it has been run multiple times and still confirmed the same data. Around 70% of all people follow authority and become torturers killing in a cruel and sadistic way (this is only how they think about it) the person in front of them.

The conclusion which cannot be neglected is that people are extremely influenced by the surroundings and by the authority. This is observed both in isolated laboratory conditions and in the complex social reality. It is also demonstrated by the story of Kim Hyun Hee who as a child was brought up in a culture dominated by obedience to authority, and as a grown up individual she strictly followed the orders she was given not thinking

Strategic Planning – Blind Followers Vs. Critical Thinking

whether the acts of execution contribute to the achievement of set goals. Conscientious following of her part of the plan is a fact but the results are an obvious failure in terms of achieving the main goal. Empirical tests and observations demonstrate that the individual is capable of performing what at first sight appear to be unimaginable acts. Such acts may not correspond with his personal judgements but are rather dictated by the situational settings, provoked by the obedience to authority and stimulated by the effects of conformism.

In a real organisational setting we have no grounds to believe that obedience to authority (personal or organisational) would be lower compared to what was observed in Milgram's experiment. Management and control authorities should clearly realize that this will be true whether the direction given by them or by a middle-level manager they respect leads the organisation to prosperity and absorption of market advantages or to a total collapse. When we add to this the snow-ball effect of spreading the course and if we give consideration to the moral aspect and the consequences for the society, the cognitive affect of obedience resembles a social bomb. However, such negative aspects of obedience are unfortunately rarely considered by authors in the field of management. Similarly, they are not included when developing organisational, micro- or macro-economic, social or other types of plans and programmes.

6. Hard way of non-conformism

Above examples and reflections are likely to lead us to the conclusion that individualism and non-conformism are wonderful qualities. But you will notice however, that "non-conformist" is synonymous with "deviant". The latter implies a very different judgemental aspect, doesn't it? Even when judgements are given after a certain period of time (usually years later) non-conformist did not enjoy wide popularity by the time they expressed their individual thinking, and this is what the participants in Asch's experiment felt rightly. This is true both generally speaking and also, in the context of the specific organisational system.

The classical experiment of Stanley Schachter (In 2002 *Review of General Psychology* ranked Schachter as the seventh most influential psychologists of the 20th century) provides empirical justification that participants in Asch's experiment were right to feel that individualists do not enjoy tolerance and respect by their community. In his experiment Schachter divided participants into groups of approximately nine people, three of them being interposed participants instructed in advance by the person running the experiment (Schachter, 1951). These interposed participants in the groups played in turn each one of the following roles they had rehearsed in advance: the role of the average person – the participant expressed the averaged views of "real" participants in the experiment; the role of the deviant person – the interposed participant expressed an opinion entirely different from the views of the group; the role of the sneaker – the views of this interposed participant coincided initially with the views of the deviant person but gradually, it changed in the direction of the more comfortable average opinion. The ex-post evaluation of opinions and attitudes of "real" participants in the experiment speaks for itself when compared to the evaluation of views of interposed participants. Convincingly, the most popular participant is the one who adopted the average position and the least popular one is the deviant person.

This experiment along with everyday empirical observations indicate that non-conformists are definitely in an uncomfortable position. It is easy to qualify them as being “disliked”. But this is in conflict with the natural human inclination of seeking approval or to be liked. Generally, the individual has a positive opinion of himself or at least wishes to have it. The individual usually considers himself as being good, intelligent and liked. Encountering the opposite reaction which contradicts such an understanding and self-esteem makes the person sink into a state of psychological dissonance. On the one hand, here stands the personal self-esteem of the ego, and on the other, the response of the group, of the community. In order to overcome the discomfort caused by the psychological dissonance the individual tends to seek recognition or, in the given case, to adopt the common opinion, to join the group’s reasoning.

Whether useful or not non-conformism is harder to follow than conformism. Instead of resulting in a psychological dissonance conformism brings forth recognition of the positive personal self-esteem. Generally, the human brain seeks recognition. Empirical experiments confirm that the individual is more inclined to recognition rather than rejection. This is true whether it is a matter of recognizing a personal esteem or accepting the rightness of a specific strategy, plan, act or judgement.

Now let’s go back to the organisational plan. On the one hand the individual is inclined to recognition, and on the other, non-conformists are usually disliked and rejected by the group. In such a case it is very likely that imposed plans and programmes are followed by the collective body while its members are not giving much thought to the rightness of the plan or whether it provides the best solution to the identified issues. Even if some member of the system acts individually the common group behavior is very likely to blur this act of non-conformism. How exactly will this happen depends on the common values of the organisation. It could be expressed as a mere disregard or even scolding by his colleagues about this break-away act. And in cases such as Kim Hyun Hee’s non-conformism could be extremely life threatening.

Strategic concepts and management approaches usually give praise to the path chosen by the company, presenting it as an exceptional and unique way sure to win the competitive struggle. This is, on one hand, motivational for the employees and definitely infuses the organisation with vital optimism. But, on the other hand, it does not allow for expressing beneficial criticism and ultimately, for finding a more efficient and effective approach. The imposed conformism and obedience with respect to the organisation’s strategy and its authority are not stimulating but rather blurring employees’ urge for innovation and improvement.

7. Stimulation of non-conformism

Let us now consider what is the cause for increasing or suppressing conformism in individuals. Hopefully, when organisations understand the preconditions encouraging or restricting conformism they could better prevent risks arising from its negative manifestations. One of the most influential social psychologists in the recent decades, Prof. Elliot Aronson, describes five variables influencing the extent of expression of conformism. These are unanimity, accountability, commitment, personality and culture, and the group exerting pressure (Aronson, 2009).

Strategic Planning – Blind Followers Vs. Critical Thinking

Asch's experiment and its multiple reproductions throughout the years demonstrate that one of the factors having the strongest influence on respondents' susceptibility or resistance to group pressure is the unanimity in the group. If only a single person from the respondents gives an answer which is different from the common wrong answer provided by the rest the inclination to conformism is significantly reduced.

However, what is interesting is that when there is unanimity the size of the group is rather irrelevant. Studies demonstrate that when the size of the group is reduced five times this has almost no impact on the inclination to act in conformance. Hence, we can conclude that regardless of the size of the collective body it is hard and even distressing to resist a common view or opinion already adopted within a specific team, as illustrated by a study made based on fMRI by Gregory Berns and his collaborators (Berns, Chappelow, Zink, Pagnoni, Skurski, Richards, 2005).

Accountability to the group could also intensify the manifestations of conformism. When the individual is expected to subsequently present and justify his views in front of the members of the group he or she is more susceptible to group pressure and inclined to act in conformity.

Means to fight conformism include commitment. Based on Asch's experiment Morton Deutsch and Harold Gerard ran an experiment where they included commitment as a factor (Deutsch, Gerard, 1955). Part of the participants were asked to provide their judgement after hearing the judgements of a number of other people as in the case of Asch's ingenious experiment. However, another part of the participants were initially forced to give their opinion in public before hearing other people's judgements, and after that they had to deliver their final opinions. Results illustrated that when advance commitment is introduced answers in conformity are reduced from 25% to 6%.

Personality and cultural environment clearly have substantial significance for manifestations of conformism. The higher the confidence of the individual for his own capabilities and capacity to manage a specific task, the lower the probability of giving in to group pressure and the higher the probability of acting individually.

Another significant factor is how comfortable and how secure the individual feels in the specific group. The better he or she feels accepted by the collective body, the more inclined he/she is to expressing his personal different opinion.

Throughout the years a number of studies have been dedicated to the influence which cultural differences have on conformism. These include the work of Geert Hofstede (Hofstede, 1983), Fons Trompenaars (Trompenaars, 1993) and Shalom Schwartz (Schwartz, 1994). Their results give convincing proof that there is a strong link between the cultural environment where individuals live and their susceptibility to giving in to group pressure.

The other factor influencing the extent of expressing conformism described by Aronson is the nature of the group exerting pressure. He arrived at the conclusion that the group is in position to cause conformism more effectively when 1) it includes experts; 2) its members have high social standing (ex. popular high-school students); 3) there is some basis for comparison between the group and the individual (Aronson, 2009). These catalysts are also valid when considering the influence of a specific person not only of a group. In Milgram's experiment we can observe a manifestation of obedience to the

authority of the expert. Likewise, people are much more prone to receive the influence of the ones who resemble them or the ones they would like to resemble and not the strange and different ones. It is easy to explain all this by means of the social factor.

8. Conclusion

A number of determinants intensifying or reducing the inclination to conformism could be used by organisations to overcome the negative effects of the tendency toward agreement and to stop imposing opinions in a snow-ball effect. But first, organisations should recognise the need to counteract the negative effects of conformism. Strategies, plans and programmes should be in conformity not only with the expected benefits of their implementation but also, with the negative aspects in introducing them. Among the significant negative features, as illustrated above, are increased conformism within the organisation, blindness with relation to the goals and path, suppression of good ideas and the emergence of disastrous biases.

We have examined how cognitive affects could lead to irrational decisions both at organisational and personal level. What is worse is that people subjected to contextual pressure resulting in cognitive dissonance often don't realize this. Disengagement from a specific idea, opinion or prospect after breaking off the situational pressure is not so easy. Most people feel the need for positive self-esteem and a sense of being right. They find it hard to admit to themselves that they have given in to a specific suggestion (if at all they happen to realize they had been subjected to such influence). Thus, once adopted concepts are stable and show an inclination for self-recognition. Unfortunately, both experiments of psychologists and human history illustrate how biases imposed in such a way are self-justified and recognised. In an organisational setting biases are also spread in a similar way (as part of the so called corporate culture) and thus, in some degree, always depriving the organisation of its potential. In specific instances they can lead it to a complete collapse and what is worse, they inevitably influence the lives and personalities of the members of this organisation.

Management concepts often make use of conformism, obedience to authority, spreading ideas in a snow-ball effect, and group pressure in order to impose managerial concepts and manage the organisation as an organism. But let us not deceive ourselves that this is not having any harmful effects. The boundary between the useful effect of these cognitive forces and building a room with distorting mirrors is not just thin, it is really illusionary. Before one realizes or is aware of it, the tomorrow's face of the organisation, of the group, of the individual, could be replaced by something else.

References

1. Abrams, D., Wetherell, M., Cochrane, S., Hogg, M.A., Turner, J.C, (1990), Knowing what to think by knowing who you are: Self-categorization and nature of norm formation, conformity and group polarization, *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 97-119.
2. Ackoff, R., (1974), *Redesigning the Future: System Approach to Societal Problems*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Strategic Planning – Blind Followers Vs. Critical Thinking

3. Anthony, R.N., (1965), *Planning and Control Systems: A Framework for Analysis*, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard Business School.
4. Asch, S., (1955), Opinions and Social Pressure, *Scientific American*, 193(5), 31-33.
5. Baumeister, R., Bushman, B., (2011), *Social Psychology and Human Nature*, USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
6. Berns, G.S., Chappelow, J., Zink, C.R., Pagnoni, G., Martin-Skurski, M.E., Richards, J., (2005), Neurobiological correlates of social conformity and independence during mental rotation, *Biological Psychiatry*, 58(3), 245-253.
7. Bond, R., Smith, P., (1996), Culture and conformity: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Using Asch's (1952b, 1956) Line Judgment Task, *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(1), 111-137.
8. Burger, J.M., (2009) Replication Milgram: Would People Still Obey Today, *American Psychologist*, 64(1), 1-11.
9. Deutsch, M., Gerard, H., (1955), A study of normative and informational social influence upon individual judgment, *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 51(3), 629-636.
10. Dittes, J., Kelley, H., (1956) Effects of different conditions of acceptance upon conformity to group norms, *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 53(1), 100-107.
11. Dooms, M., Van Avermaet, E., (1985), Social support and minority influence: The innovation effect reconsidered, In S. Moscovici, G. Mugny and Van Avermaet, *Perspective of Minority Influence*, Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.
12. Drucker, P., (1954), *The Practice of Management*, New York: Harper & Row.
13. Hofstede, G., (1983), Dimensions of national cultures in fifty countries and three regions in J. Deręgowski, S. Dzuirawiec & R. Annis (Eds.), *Explication in cross-cultural psychology*, 335-355.
14. Hee, K.H., (1993), *The Tears of My Soul*, New York: William Morrow & Co.
15. Kaplan, R.S., Norton, D.P., (1992), *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*, Harvard Business School Press.
16. Kruglanski, A., Webster, D., (1991), Group members reaction to opinion deviates and conformists at varying degrees of proximity to decision deadline and of environmental noise, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 212-225.
17. Milgram, S., (1974), *Obedience to Authority*, New York: Harper & Row.
18. Neely, A., Adams, C., (2002), *Performance Prism: The Scorecard for Measuring and Managing Stakeholder Relationship*, Financial Times/Prentice Hall.
19. Neto, F., (1995), Conformity and independence revisited, *Social Behavior and Personality*, 23(3), 217-222.
20. Porter, M.E., (1992), Capital Disadvantage: America's Falling Capital Investment System, *Harvard Business Review*, 70(5), 65-82.
21. Schachter, S., (1951), Deviation, rejection, and communication, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 46(2), 190-208.
22. Schwartz, S., (1994), Cultural dimensions of values: Towards an understanding of national differences in U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method and Applications*, 85-121, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

23. Speer, A., (1970), *Inside the Third Reich: Memoirs*, New York: Macmilian.
24. Thurber, J., (1933), *My Life and Hart Times*, New York and London: Harper & brothers.
25. Trompenaars, F., Hampden-Turner, Ch., (1997), *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*, London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
26. Vlaander, G.P., Van Rooijen, L., (1985), Independence and conformity in Holland: Asch's experiment three decades later, *Gedrag*, 13, 49-55.
27. Арънсън, Е., (2009), *Човекът – социално животно*, София: Дамян Яков.
28. Бюканън, М., (2011), *Социалният атом*, София: Изток – Запад.
29. Канеман, Д., (2012) *Мисленето*, София: Изток – Запад.
30. Стърнбърг, Р., (2012) *Когнитивна психология*, София: Изток – Запад.

STRATEŠKO PLANIRANJE – „SLEPI“ SLEDBENICI VS. KRITIČKO RAZMIŠLJANJE

Apstrakt: Otkrića u kognitivnoj psihologiji pokreću niz pitanja u vezi sa strateškim konceptima planiranja i upravljanja koje treba priznati i proučavati. Cilj rada je da pokrene diskusiju o izgledu kognitivnih sklonosti u strateškom planiranju i organizacionom menadžmentu. Uticaji kao konformizam, grupa za „pritisak“ i poslušnost autoritetu su razmatrati u kontekstu organizacionih planova i ciljeva. Osnovna teza je da se dokaže da su ovi uticaji mogli dovesti do slepog praćenja ideja, smanjenje individualizma i gubitka inovativnog potencijala.

Ključne reči: konformizam, pritisak grupe, poslušnost autoritetu, menadžerski koncepti, inovativni potencijal.