

Investigating the Genetic Basis of Social Conformity: The Role of the Dopamine Receptor 3 (*DRD3*) Gene

Chunli Zhao^{a, b, e} Jinting Liu^{f, g} Pingyuan Gong^h Jie Hu^{a, b} Xiaolin Zhou^{a–d}

^aCenter for Brain and Cognitive Sciences, ^bSchool of Psychological and Cognitive Sciences, ^cBeijing Key Laboratory of Behavior and Mental Health and ^dPKU-IDG/McGovern Institute for Brain Research, Peking University, Beijing, ^eDepartment of Psychology, Shihezi University, Xinjiang, ^fChina Centre for Special Economic Zone Research and ^gResearch Centre for Brain Function and Psychological Science, Shenzhen University, Guangdong, and ^hKey Laboratory of Resource Biology and Biotechnology in Western China (Ministry of Education), Northwest University, Shaanxi, China

Key Words

Dopamine · *DRD3* · Social conformity · Reinforcement learning · Ser9Gly

Abstract

Background: People often change their opinions or behavior to match the responses of others, a phenomenon known as social conformity. Conforming behavior varies substantially across individuals. However, little is known about the genetic basis underlying individual differences in social conformity. A recent study demonstrated an association between enhanced dopaminergic function and increased conforming behavior. Given the effect of the dopamine receptor 3 gene (*DRD3*) Ser9Gly polymorphism (rs6280) on dopamine release in the striatum, this study investigated to what extent this polymorphism affects conforming behavior. **Methods:** We categorized Han Chinese individuals according to the polymorphism and tested them with a facial-attractiveness rating task. **Results:** We found that individuals with a greater number of the Gly alleles, which are related to an increased dopamine release in the striatum, were more susceptible to social influence and more likely to change their ratings to match those of other people. **Conclusions:** This

finding demonstrates the importance of *DRD3* Ser9Gly as a genetic basis for social conformity and in predicting individual differences in social learning.

© 2016 S. Karger AG, Basel

Introduction

Social conformity occurs when people change their opinions to act in accordance with others [1]. This phenomenon is highly pervasive, as conforming to the social group enables us to learn about the value of an object or event efficiently and accurately. In addition, social conformity ensures that we behave in a socially approved manner, particularly under circumstances of uncertainty [1].

Conforming behavior varies substantially across individuals [2, 3]. Recent twin studies suggest that individual differences in conforming behavior could be partly attributed to differences in gene expression, with the estimated heritability ranging from 28 to 47% [4, 5]. However, little

Chunli Zhao and Jinting Liu contributed equally to this work.

is known about the genetic basis underlying individual differences in social conformity. The purpose of this study was to investigate to what extent the dopamine receptor 3 gene (*DRD3*) affects conforming behavior.

Previous studies have strongly implicated the dopaminergic system in reward-related incentive learning, such as reinforcement learning and social conformity [6]. On the one hand, studies have demonstrated that reinforcement learning is carried out by the phasic activity of midbrain dopaminergic neurons [6]; social conformity draws on mechanisms that comply with reinforcement learning principles [3, 7]. On the other hand, studies have also shown that the reward salience of a stimulus is heightened by dopamine release [8] and that conforming behaviors evoke activity in midbrain dopaminergic neurons similar to that of nonsocial rewards [7, 9]. These studies collectively suggest a role of dopaminergic neurotransmission in social conformity. Indeed, a recent work found that enhancement of dopamine responses via direct administration of a dopamine and noradrenalin agonist promotes conformity to group opinion [10]. Thus, it is possible that a receptor with the ability to regulate dopamine responses could modulate individuals' conforming behavior, which is related to social and reinforcement learning (see Discussion).

The dopamine D₃ receptor is 1 of the 5 (D₁ to D₅) dopamine receptors. Among these dopamine receptors, the D₃ receptor is primarily localized in limbic areas and highly expressed in the ventral striatum [11], a brain region involved in reward-related incentive learning [3, 7, 12]. Animal studies have demonstrated that blockade of the D₃ receptor impairs reward-related incentive learning, such as responding to cues for cocaine [13] and behavioral adjustment according to changing relationships between stimuli and rewards [14], while activation of the receptor enhances stimulus-reward learning [15]. In humans, the density of D₃ receptors is increased in cocaine abusers, suggesting an association between increased expression of the D₃ receptor and the reinforcing effects of cocaine [16]. Human studies have also reported an association between activation of the D₃ receptor and reward-related incentive learning [17, 18]. These findings demonstrate a prominent role of the D₃ receptor in reward-related incentive learning and suggest a possible involvement of the D₃ receptor in social conformity, a social form of reward-related incentive learning.

The dopamine D₃ receptor is encoded by the *DRD3* gene which is located on chromosome 3q13.3. Ser9Gly (rs6280) is one of the most investigated functional polymorphisms in the *DRD3* gene [19]. A thymine (T)-to-cy-

tosine (C) substitution leads to a mutation of serine (Ser) to glycine (Gly) in the D₃ receptor, thereby causing an increase in the dopamine-mediated cyclic adenosine monophosphate response in dopaminergic neurons and a 5-fold increase in the dopamine affinity of the D₃ receptor [20, 21]. A neuroimaging study reported that the Ser9Gly polymorphism affects dopamine responses to reward, with the Gly allele related to an increased dopamine release in the ventral and dorsal striata during receipt of an unpredictable reward [22]. As striatal dopamine signaling in response to a reward predicts individual differences in reinforcement learning [23, 24], it is possible that the Gly allele facilitates reinforcement learning. Previous studies have also shown that the Ser9Gly polymorphism is implicated in a variety of reward-seeking behaviors, particularly substance dependence, such that the Gly allele contributes to susceptibility to drug taking [25, 26] and reinstatement of drug-seeking behavior [27]. As drug taking and reinstatement are consequences of positive reinforcement derived from increased dopamine levels following drug administration [28], the association between the Gly allele and substance dependence could also suggest a contribution of the Gly allele to reinforcement learning.

Given the role of Ser9Gly in reward-related dopamine responses [22] and the role of dopamine responses in social conformity [3, 7, 10], it is possible that the Ser9Gly polymorphism is related to social conformity, with the Gly allele being associated with increased conforming behavior. In the present study, 152 participants were genotyped for the Ser9Gly polymorphism and tested with a facial-attractiveness rating task [3]. Participants in this task are asked to rate the attractiveness of faces twice; in between those two ratings, the others' ratings are conveyed to the participants. It has been shown that participants' second ratings are highly susceptible to the group's ratings, with their ratings getting closer to the group's ratings [3, 10]. This task can precisely quantify the degree of social conformity, providing a much more sensitive measurement of conformity than other coarse measurements (e.g. questionnaires) employed in certain previous studies [4, 5, 29]. One drawback of using this measurement is that the task takes each participant about 60 min to finish, which is much longer than coarse measurements.

Methods

Participants

One hundred fifty-two unrelated, unselected Han Chinese students (61 females, age range 18–27 years) from Tongji University participated in this study. All of the participants had normal or




Fig. 1. Procedure and timing of the conformity task. **a** Session 1 was composed of 120 trials. Each trial began by showing the participant a photograph of a smiling face and a 9-point Likert scale (1 = unattractive and 9 = attractive) (2 s). Faces were presented randomly. After that, a red box was presented in the middle of the scale and the participant was asked to rate the attractiveness of the face by pressing the corresponding arrow keys (<6 s). Following an interval of 0.7–0.9 s with a blank screen, the participant was shown

the group rating of the face, which was highlighted by a green box (2 s). Colors refer to the online version only. The next trial began after an interval of 0.5 s with a blank screen. **b** Half an hour later, session 2 began. Session 2 was also composed of 120 trials. The procedure and timing of the first, second, and last screens of each trial in session 2 were, respectively, identical to those in session 1. Faces were presented randomly.

corrected-to-normal vision. They provided written informed consents prior to the experiments. This study was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Ethics Committee of the Department of Psychology of Peking University. One participant was excluded from the analysis because she did not respond to a large number of questions (>25%); 3 other participants were excluded because of their psychiatric history or severe psychiatric symptoms (>3 SD) as assessed by the Symptom Checklist-90 [30, 31]. It is important to note that including these participants did not change the pattern of the results.

Genotyping

Genomic DNA was extracted from 3–5 hair follicle cells of each participant via the Chelex-100 method [32]. The Ser9Gly in the *DRD3* gene was amplified by polymerase chain reaction (PCR), with the upstream primer 5'-AGGTGTAGTTCAGGTG-3' and the downstream primer 5'-TCATTGCTCTATCTCC-3'. The PCR was carried out with an initial 4-min denaturation at 94°C, followed by 35 cycles of 94°C for 30 s, 55.5°C for 30 s, 72°C for 35 s, and a final extension period at 72°C for 5 min. The PCR product was digested by the restriction enzyme *HaeIII* (Fermentas) at 37°C overnight. The digestion system contained 1.0 µl PCR products, 0.40 µl (10 U/µl) *HaeIII*, 0.40 µl R buffer, and 3.2 µl H₂O. The incubated mixture was analyzed using 8% polyacrylamide gel elec-

trophoresis at 220 V for 3.5 h, followed by silver staining. The genotypes were read using BioImaging Systems software. The DNA band of 231 bp represents the Ser allele, and the DNA bands of 19 and 212 bp represent the Gly allele. In the current sample of 148 individuals, the distribution of genotypes (Ser/Ser = 71, Ser/Gly = 59, and Gly/Gly = 18) showed no deviation from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium ($\chi^2 = 1.08$, $p = 0.30$). The genotype frequencies were similar to those found in East Asian samples [26, 33].

Conformity Task

A facial-attractiveness rating task was used as the conformity task, which is similar to that described by Klucharev et al. [3]. The participants were informed that the experiment was a research project on the human perception of facial attractiveness. During the task, the participants were instructed to rate the attractiveness of 120 faces on a 9-point Likert scale (1 = unattractive and 9 = attractive). They were also told that, after the rating in each trial, they would learn the average rating of the face given by a group of 200 students from universities in Beijing (fig. 1a). The participants then rested for about 30 min, during which time they were asked to complete a battery of questionnaires unrelated to the current study. After the break, the participants were unexpectedly asked to rate the faces again in the second session (fig. 1b). The long break between sessions ensured that the ratings in the second session in-

indicated the participants' own judgments rather than their explicit memory of their previous ratings or the group's ratings. All of the participants were debriefed after the experiment. No one reported any suspicion of the cover story or the task in the postexperiment interviews.

One hundred twenty digital color photographs of Chinese young adults (aged 18–35 years, 60 females) with a slight smile and moderate attractiveness (mean = 4.97, SD = 0.96) were used. These photos were drawn from a database [34] and additionally from the Internet. All the photos were taken in similar styles.

The group ratings were preprogrammed by an adaptive algorithm to ensure that the deviation (i.e. the difference between the participants' initial ratings and group ratings during the first session) ranged from –4 to 4, and the conflict level (i.e. the absolute value of the deviation) ranged from 0 to 4. The deviation (and the conflict level) was 0 in 40 trials. For the remaining 80 trials, each conflict level (i.e. 1, 2, 3, and 4) had 20 trials and each deviation level (i.e. ± 1 , ± 2 , ± 3 , and ± 4) had approximately 10 trials. The average number of trials for each deviation level ranged from 9.70 to 10.28 across the participants.

Results

Raw Conformity Score

Behavioral data were analyzed according to the procedures described by Klucharev et al. [3]. For each participant, we performed a regression analysis, with the deviation as a single predictor and the rating change (i.e. the difference between the participants' initial ratings and the second ratings) as the outcome variable, to generate individual standardized coefficients (β), which were used as a raw conformity score (i.e. an index of the individual tendency to conform) [35]. The mean raw conformity score (mean \pm SD: 0.263 ± 0.095 , range 0.016–0.511) was significantly higher than zero [$t(147) = 33.726$, $p < 0.001$], indicating that overall the participants changed their ratings of attractiveness in accordance with the group's ratings [3, 35].

We also used a simple reinforcement learning algorithm (Rescorla-Wagner) to model the rating change between the initial and second ratings. The Rescorla-Wagner rule probes learning through a prediction error signal [36, 37]. Unlike typical reinforcement learning models in which each stimulus is repeated several times, the learning model in our study was based on only 2 observations per face stimulus. Thus, the prediction error signal was defined as the difference between the participants' initial ratings and group ratings during the first session (i.e. deviation). The prediction error signal could be used to subsequently update the second ratings weighted by a fixed learning rate (i.e. α : $\text{rating}_2 = \text{rating}_1 + \alpha \cdot \text{deviation}$). We fitted the Rescorla-Wagner model to the participants'

Table 1. Effect of the *DRD3* Ser9Gly polymorphism on conforming behavior

	Raw conformity score	Adjusted conformity score	Corrected conformity score	Probability of conforming adjustments, %
Ser/Ser	0.251 \pm 0.099	0.067 \pm 0.099	0.090 \pm 0.109	43.7 \pm 7.8
Ser/Gly	0.263 \pm 0.088	0.076 \pm 0.088	0.101 \pm 0.101	44.0 \pm 6.7
Gly/Gly	0.314 \pm 0.086	0.125 \pm 0.076	0.160 \pm 0.084	48.5 \pm 6.9

Values are presented as means \pm SD.

second ratings using a linear regression model to derive the best-fitting model parameter (α). Because there were only 2 observations for each face stimulus, the parameter α was mathematically equivalent to the raw conformity score. Consequently, we focused on the raw conformity score in the following analysis.

To examine the relationship between the *DRD3* Ser-9Gly polymorphism and an individual's conformity score, we performed a regression analysis with the genotype (0 = Ser/Ser, 1 = Ser/Gly, and 2 = Gly/Gly) as a single predictor of the raw conformity score. The result indicated that the polymorphism accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in the conformity score [$F(1, 146) = 5.292$, $p = 0.023$, $\beta = 0.187$, $R^2 = 0.035$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.028$]. Individuals with a greater number of Gly alleles, which are associated with a higher dopamine affinity of the D_3 receptor, were more likely to change their ratings in accordance with the group's ratings (table 1). ANOVA with the genotype as a between-participant factor also showed a significant main effect of genotype [$F(2, 145) = 3.272$, $p = 0.041$]. A post hoc t test revealed that the Gly/Gly carriers conformed significantly more than the Ser/Gly carriers (uncorrected $p = 0.034$) and the Ser/Ser carriers (uncorrected $p = 0.015$), although the difference between the Gly/Gly carriers and the Ser/Gly carriers became nonsignificant with Bonferroni's correction ($p = 0.135$). It is important to note that ANOVAs with genotype as a between-participant factor revealed no main effect of genotype on the initial ratings [$F(2, 145) < 1$] or on the second ratings [$F(2, 145) < 1$], suggesting that the significant genotype effect observed above resulted from differential impacts of conformity in different groups.

Adjusted Conformity Score

It is important to note that the adaptive algorithm was constrained such that the deviation was limited to a range

between '1 – initial rating' and 4 if the initial rating was lower than 5 and to a range between –4 and '9 – initial rating' if the initial rating was higher than 5. For example, in the case of an initial rating of 2, the range of the group ratings is constrained to 1–6 and the range of deviation is constrained to –1 to 4; whereas in the case of an initial rating of 7 the range of the group ratings is constrained to 3–9 and the range of deviation is constrained to –4 to 2. As a result, for each participant, the initial rating was negatively correlated with the value of the deviation (r ranged from –0.57 to –0.18) and with the subsequent rating change (r ranged from –0.77 to –0.09). Thus, the individual tendency to conform indexed by the raw conformity score (i.e. the correlation between the rating change and the deviation) could be overestimated because both the rating change and the deviation negatively covaried with the initial rating. To evaluate the net contribution of deviation to the subsequent rating change (i.e. the adjusted conformity score) for each participant, we followed the suggestions of Yu and colleagues [35, 38] and conducted hierarchical regression analyses with the subsequent rating change as the outcome variable as follows: step 1, enter the initial ratings, and step 2, enter both the initial ratings and the deviation. The adjusted conformity score (mean \pm SD: 0.078 ± 0.093 , range –0.156 to 0.297) was still significantly higher than zero [$t(147) = 10.124$, $p < 0.001$]. Regression analysis again revealed a significant association between the polymorphism and the adjusted conformity score [$F(1, 146) = 4.273$, $p = 0.040$, $\beta = 0.169$, $R^2 = 0.028$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.022$; table 1].

Additionally, Schnuerch et al. [39] introduced a new approach that could isolate and quantify the conformity effect from a different perspective. They added a control group in which no group rating was ever shown and estimated the average effect of the initial ratings on the rating change (i.e. average slope γ_{10}). Then, for each item, the rating change induced by the initial rating of each participant in the experiment group could then be estimated by weighting the initial rating with the parameter γ_{10} , and the deviation-induced rating change could be estimated by subtracting the initial rating-induced rating change from the total rating change. This corrected rating change was used in the regression analyses to gain a true conformity score. Figure 3A of Yu and Chen [38] and figure 2B of Schnuerch et al. [39] show that the sizes of the effect of the initial ratings on rating change were very similar even though the two studies were conducted in different cultures (one on Chinese and the other on Germans). Given that we used essentially the same task as Yu and Chen [38] and Schnuerch et al. [39] for the assessment of conformi-

ty behavior, we used the parameter γ_{10} (–0.374) from the control group of Schnuerch et al. [39] to estimate the corrected rating change for each item for each participant in the current study and conducted regression analyses with the corrected rating change as the outcome variable. The corrected conformity score (mean \pm SD: 0.103 ± 0.105 , range –0.168 to 0.419) was still significantly higher than zero [$t(147) = 11.887$, $p < 0.001$]. Regression analysis again revealed a significant association between the polymorphism and the corrected conformity score [$F(1, 146) = 5.074$, $p = 0.026$, $\beta = 0.183$, $R^2 = 0.034$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.027$; table 1]. Considering the potential group differences between our study and that of Schnuerch et al. [39], we also varied γ_{10} with ± 1 SE and ± 2 SE (i.e. –0.412, –0.393, –0.355, and –0.336). Regression analyses again confirmed a significant association between the polymorphism and the corrected conformity score (all p values < 0.029).

Probability of Conforming Adjustments

We also examined the genotype effect on the probability of conforming adjustments. Trials with no conflict were treated as fillers. For the remaining trials, those in which the participant changed his/her ratings in the second session in the same direction as the deviation between his/her initial rating and the group rating were considered conforming; those trials in which the rating changes were in a direction opposite from the deviation and the trials with no rating change were considered nonconforming. Thus, an index of conforming probability for each participant can be calculated by dividing the number of conforming trials by the total number of conforming and nonconforming trials. Regression analysis revealed a significant association between the polymorphism and the probability of conforming adjustments [$F(1, 146) = 3.991$, $p = 0.048$, $\beta = 0.163$, $R^2 = 0.027$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.020$; table 1].

Permutation Test

To confirm that the significant genotype effect on conforming behavior was not likely to have arisen by chance, we carried out permutation tests for the adjusted conformity score, the corrected conformity score, and the probability of conforming adjustments by shuffling the genotype across participants 20,000 times [40]. This procedure was to estimate the regression coefficient in each shuffled sample and the probability of the estimated regression coefficients being greater than the observed regression coefficient (i.e. permutation p). The permutation p values for the adjusted conformity score, the corrected conformity score, and the probability of conforming adjust-

ments were 0.039, 0.024, and 0.049, respectively, indicating that the observed genotype effect was significantly greater than that expected by chance alone.

Gender Differences

To avoid potential effects of mating motivation on facial attractiveness ratings, only female faces and female participants were selected in previous studies [3, 39]. However, in our study, both male and female participants were recruited to rate the attractiveness of both male and female faces. Given that cross-gender rating of attractiveness is related to mate selection [41], it may be the case that male and female participants changed their second ratings differently for the same-sex and opposite-sex faces. Therefore, we conducted regression analyses to estimate the adjusted conformity scores and the corrected conformity scores for male faces and female faces, separately. For the 2 indices, 2 (participants: male vs. female) \times 2 (faces: male vs. female) ANOVAs revealed neither main effects nor interactions (all p values >0.130), suggesting that the extent to which male and female participants changed their second ratings in accordance with group ratings was similar for the same-sex and opposite-sex faces. Moreover, 3 (genotype: Ser/Ser vs. Ser/Gly vs. Gly/Gly) \times 2 (participants: male vs. female) \times 2 (faces: male vs. female) ANOVAs on the 2 indices again revealed only significant or marginally significant main effects of genotype ($p = 0.039$ and 0.068 , respectively) but no significant interactions concerning genotype (all p values >0.131), suggesting that the genotype effect on conformity was similar across the gender of participants as well as the gender of faces.

Discussion

Previous research has demonstrated that enhancement of dopamine responses by direct administration of a dopamine and noradrenalin agonist (methylphenidate) facilitates the conformity effect [10]. The present study extended this finding by demonstrating that *DRD3*, an important player within the dopaminergic system, is associated with individual differences in conforming behavior. Individuals with a greater number of Gly alleles of the *DRD3* Ser9Gly polymorphism, which is related to increased dopamine affinity of the D_3 receptor, were more susceptible to social influence and more likely to adapt their own opinion to that of other people. On the surface, these findings are similar to those reported in a recent study demonstrating the genotype effect of a polymorphism (Val158Met) in the catechol-*O*-methyltransferase

(*COMT*) gene on conforming behavior [42]. Homozygous Met allele carriers, which have the lowest *COMT* enzyme activity to degrade dopamine and norepinephrine, were more conformist than Val allele carriers. Given that methylphenidate and the *COMT* enzyme have broad effects on catecholamines, including but not limited to dopamine, the effect of methylphenidate and the *COMT* gene on conforming behavior may arise from their effects on both the dopaminergic and the noradrenergic systems. Our finding of the effect of the *DRD3* Ser9Gly polymorphism on conforming behavior, however, provides supportive evidence for implication of the dopaminergic system in social conformity.

As reviewed in the Introduction, one mechanism for the effect of the Ser9Gly polymorphism on conforming behavior has been suggested by prior research. The Gly allele has been shown to increase dopamine release in the ventral and dorsal striata during receipt of an unpredictable monetary reward. The increased reward-related dopamine activity is assumed to reflect the amplification of phasic dopamine responses to appetitive stimuli [22]. Methylphenidate, a drug that amplifies the dopamine response to appetitive stimuli [43], has been shown to increase conforming behavior after moderate social conflict [10]. The authors suggested that the enhanced dopamine response increases the magnitude of the incentive salience of agreeing with others [10]. This hypothesis is supported by evidence showing that the magnitude of an incentive is determined by the dopamine response [8] and that conformity is rewarding [7]. As such, a mechanism for the current results would be that the Gly allele amplifies the phasic dopamine activity during social conflict, which is accompanied by increases in the incentive salience of agreeing with others. That is, the Gly allele might predispose individuals to seek the approval of the group and thus exhibit more conformity.

It is important to note that prior studies have also proposed a reinforcement learning framework for conformity [3, 7]. Within that framework, the learning rate gauges the extent to which one updates the value of an object from the previous prediction error [36]. Likewise, the raw conformity score (i.e. the regression coefficient of rating changes on deviation) from the current study can be interpreted as a social learning rate (i.e. the extent to which one learns from group conflicts). The learning rate can be elevated via drugs enhancing dopaminergic function (e.g. L-DOPA) and it can be impaired via drugs reducing dopaminergic function (e.g. haloperidol) [44]. Given the enhanced dopamine activity by the Gly allele, it is possible that this allele amplifies the phasic dopamine

activity during social conflict, which increases the learning rate during social interaction. Individuals with the Gly allele are thus likely to weight the group opinion more when updating the value of an object or event. Whether the dopamine-enhanced conformity is due to an increased incentive salience of conformity or an enhanced learning ability is a question for future research.

A recent work by Kitayama et al. [45] reported that the dopamine receptor 4 gene (*DRD4*) interacted with culture to affect social orientation. Compared to noncarriers, carriers of alleles linked to increased dopamine signaling showed higher levels of acquisition of cultural norms and values; that is, carriers in individualist cultures were more independent and less interdependent than carriers in collectivist cultures, but no cultural differences were apparent between noncarriers. One might wonder to what extent the current study extends our understanding of the relationship between dopaminergic genes and normative behaviors beyond the study of Kitayama et al. [45]. People in collectivist cultures showed higher levels of conformity than those in individualist cultures [46]. Both *DRD4*, examined by Kitayama et al. [45], and *DRD3*, investigated in the current study, may contribute to this conformity in collectivist cultures. However, Kitayama et al. [45] also showed that carriers of alleles linked to increased dopamine signaling would be more likely to behave in socially normative ways than noncarriers in individualist cultures (i.e. being more independent). As higher independence was found to be associated with less conformity [47], the pattern in individualist cultures [45] is different from the findings of positive associations between dopamine signaling and conforming behavior in pharmacological and genetic studies on individuals in individualist cultures (e.g. individuals in Denmark [10] or Germany [42]), suggesting that the acquisition of cultural norms is conceptually different from conformity to group opinions. The current study was conducted on participants in a collectivist culture. Given the universal existence of conformity phenomena and the positive associations between dopamine signaling and conformity in individualist cultures [10, 42] and a collectivist culture (the current study), we speculate that the impact of the *DRD3* gene on conforming behavior is similar across cultures. Obviously, further studies are needed to replicate the current findings in other collectivist cultures and, more importantly, in individualist cultures.

One might wonder whether the effect of *DRD3* on conformity observed in this study can be reduced to an effect of *DRD3* on memory. A participant with a good memory might actually recall his/her initial ratings and the group

ratings, which could affect the conforming behavior. To minimize the possible contribution of memory performance to attractiveness rating changes between sessions, we used a large number of stimuli and a long break between the sessions [3]. Importantly, previous studies found no association of the *DRD3* Ser9Gly polymorphism with digital and spatial working memory spans [48], or with episodic and semantic memories [49], suggesting that the effect of the *DRD3* Ser9Gly polymorphism on conforming behavior is unlikely to have been due to the polymorphism's effect on memory performance.

In conclusion, by differentiating individuals according to the polymorphism Ser9Gly of *DRD3* and testing them with a facial-attractiveness rating task, we demonstrated a positive association between the Gly allele and conforming behavior. This finding highlights the role of *DRD3* Ser9Gly in predicting individual differences in social conformity and extends our knowledge regarding the impact of this polymorphism on reward-related incentive learning. Our findings, together with previous studies [10, 42], support the idea that factors involved in dopaminergic neurotransmission, which could change the stimulus' desirability or the individual's learning ability, should be treated as candidate contributors to social conformity.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Rongjun Yu and Mr. Philip Blue for their help with the preparation of this paper.

This work was supported by grants from the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2015M582399) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31600928 and 31671158) to Jinting Liu, a grant from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31630034) to Xiaolin Zhou, and grants from the Western Resource Biology and Modern Biological Technological Lab Open Foundation of Northwest University (K00114 and JS11004) to Pingyuan Gong.

Authors' Contributions

C.Z., J.L., and P.G. designed the experiment and analyzed the data under the supervision of X.Z. C.Z., J.L., P.G., and J.H. performed the experiment. C.Z., J.L., P.G., and X.Z. wrote the paper.

Disclosure Statement

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests with respect to their authorship or the publication of this article.

References

- Cialdini RB, Goldstein NJ: Social influence: compliance and conformity. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2004;55:591–621.
- Campbell-Meiklejohn DK, Kanai R, Bahrami B, Bach DR, Dolan RJ, Roepstorff A, et al: Structure of orbitofrontal cortex predicts social influence. *Curr Biol* 2012;22:R123–R124.
- Klucharev V, Hytönen K, Rijpkema M, Smidts A, Fernández G, Hytö K: Reinforcement learning signal predicts social conformity. *Neuron* 2009;61:140–151.
- Schermer JA, Vernon PA, Maio GR, Jang KL: A behavior genetic study of the connection between social values and personality. *Twin Res Hum Genet* 2011;14:233–239.
- Pergadia ML, Madden PA, Lessov CN, Todorov AA, Buchholz KK, Martin NG, et al: Genetic and environmental influences on extreme personality dispositions in adolescent female twins. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2006;47:902–909.
- Glimcher PW: Understanding dopamine and reinforcement learning: the dopamine reward prediction error hypothesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2011;108:15647–15654.
- Campbell-Meiklejohn DK, Bach DR, Roepstorff A, Dolan RJ, Frith CD: How the opinion of others affects our valuation of objects. *Curr Biol* 2010;20:1165–1170.
- Tobler PN, Fiorillo CD, Schultz W: Adaptive coding of reward value by dopamine neurons. *Science* 2005;307:1642–1645.
- Falk EB, Way BM, Jasinska AJ: An imaging genetics approach to understanding social influence. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2012;6:1–13.
- Campbell-Meiklejohn DK, Simonsen A, Jensen M, Wohlert V, Gjerløff T, Scheel-Kruger J, et al: Modulation of social influence by methylphenidate. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2012;37:1517–1525.
- Bouthenet ML, Souil E, Martres MP, Sokoloff P, Giros B, Schwartz JC: Localization of dopamine D₃ receptor mRNA in the rat brain using in situ hybridization histochemistry: comparison with dopamine D₂ receptor mRNA. *Brain Res* 1991;564:203–219.
- Abler B, Walter H, Erk S, Kammerer H, Spitzer M: Prediction error as a linear function of reward probability is coded in human nucleus accumbens. *Neuroimage* 2006;31:790–795.
- Beninger RJ, Banasikowski TJ: Dopaminergic mechanism of reward-related incentive learning: focus on the dopamine D₃ receptor. *Neurotox Res* 2008;14:57–70.
- Lee B, Groman S, London ED, Jentsch JD: Dopamine D₂/D₃ receptors play a specific role in the reversal of a learned visual discrimination in monkeys. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2007;32:2125–2134.
- Hitchcott PK, Bonardi CM, Phillips GD: Enhanced stimulus-reward learning by intra-amygdala administration of a D₃ dopamine receptor agonist. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 1997;133:240–248.
- Segal DM, Moraes CT, Mash DC: Up-regulation of D₃ dopamine receptor mRNA in the nucleus accumbens of human cocaine fatalities. *Mol Brain Res* 1997;45:335–339.
- Burdick KE, Braga RJ, Gopin CB, Malhotra AK: Dopaminergic influences on emotional decision making in euthymic bipolar patients. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2014;39:274–282.
- Pizzagalli DA, Evins AE, Schetter EC, Frank MJ, Pajtas PE, Santesso DL, et al: Single dose of a dopamine agonist impairs reinforcement learning in humans: behavioral evidence from a laboratory-based measure of reward responsiveness. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2008;196:221–232.
- Staddon S, Arranz MJ, Mancama D, Perez-Nievas F, Arrizabalaga I, Anney R, et al: Association between dopamine D₃ receptor gene polymorphisms and schizophrenia in an isolate population. *Schizophr Res* 2005;73:49–54.
- Jeanneteau F, Funalot B, Jankovic J, Deng H, Lagarde J-P, Lucotte G, et al: A functional variant of the dopamine D₃ receptor is associated with risk and age-at-onset of essential tremor. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2006;103:10753–10758.
- Lundström K, Turpin MP: Proposed schizophrenia-related gene polymorphism: expression of the Ser9Gly mutant human dopamine D₃ receptor with the Semliki Forest virus system. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 1996;225:1068–1072.
- Savitz J, Hodgkinson CA, Martin-Soelch C, Shen PH, Szczepanik J, Nugent A, et al: The functional DRD3 Ser9Gly polymorphism (rs6280) is pleiotropic, affecting reward as well as movement. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e54108.
- Santesso DL, Dillon DG, Birk JL, Holmes AJ, Goetz E, Bogdan R, et al: Individual differences in reinforcement learning: behavioral, electrophysiological, and neuroimaging correlates. *Neuroimage* 2008;42:807–816.
- Cox SML, Frank MJ, Larcher K, Fellows LK, Clark CA, Leyton M, et al: Striatal D1 and D2 signaling differentially predict learning from positive and negative outcomes. *Neuroimage* 2015;109:95–101.
- Vandenbergh DJ, O'Connor RJ, Grant MD, Jefferson AL, Vogler GP, Strasser AA, et al: Dopamine receptor genes (*DRD2*, *DRD3* and *DRD4*) and gene-gene interactions associated with smoking-related behaviors. *Addict Biol* 2007;12:106–116.
- Kang S-G, Lee B-H, Lee J-S, Chai YG, Ko K-P, Lee H-J, et al: DRD3 gene rs6280 polymorphism may be associated with alcohol dependence overall and with Lesch type I alcohol dependence in Koreans. *Neuropsychobiology* 2014;69:140–146.
- Ton TGN, Rossing MA, Bowen DJ, Srinouanprachan S, Wicklund K, Farin FM: Genetic polymorphisms in dopamine-related genes and smoking cessation in women: a prospective cohort study. *Behav Brain Funct* 2007;3:22.
- Wise RA: Neurobiology of addiction. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 1996;6:243–251.
- Li XT, Zhang JD, Huang Y, Xu M, Liu J: Nurtured to follow the crowd: a twin study on conformity. *Chin Sci Bull* 2013;58:1175–1180.
- Wang X, Wang X, Ma H: Manual of Mental Health Rating Scale. *Chin Ment Health J*, 1999.
- Derogatis LR: SCL 90 R Administration, Scoring and Procedures Manual II for the Revised Version and Other Instruments of the Psychopathology Rating Scale Series. Baltimore, John Hopkins University, 1977.
- de Lamballerie X, Chapel F, Vignoli C, Zandotti C: Improved current methods for amplification of DNA from routinely processed liver tissue by PCR. *J Clin Pathol* 1994;47:466–467.
- Kuo S-C, Yeh Y-W, Chen C-Y, Huang C-C, Chang H-A, Yen C-H, et al: DRD3 variation associates with early-onset heroin dependence, but not specific personality traits. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry* 2014;51:1–8.
- Gong X, Huang Y, Wang Y, Luo Y: The revision of Chinese facial affective picture system. *Chinese Ment Health J* 2011;25:40–46.
- Huang Y, Kendrick KM, Yu R: Conformity to the opinions of other people lasts for no more than 3 days. *Psychol Sci* 2014;25:1388–1393.
- Daw ND, Tobler PN: Value learning through reinforcement: the basics of dopamine and reinforcement learning; in Glimcher PW, Fehr E (eds): *Neuroeconomics: Decision Making and the Brain*, ed 2. London, Elsevier, 2014, pp 283–298.
- Rescorla RA, Wagner AR: A theory of Pavlovian conditioning: variations in the effectiveness of reinforcement and nonreinforcement; in Black AH, Prokasy WF (eds): *Classical Conditioning II: Current Research and Theory*. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972, pp 64–99.
- Yu R, Chen L: The need to control for regression to the mean in social psychology studies. *Front Psychol* 2015;5:1–8.
- Schnuerch R, Schnuerch M, Gibbons H: Assessing and correcting for regression toward the mean in deviance-induced social conformity. *Front Psychol* 2015;6:1–9.
- Camargo A, Azuaje F, Wang H, Zheng H: Permutation-based statistical tests for multiple hypotheses. *Source Code Biol Med* 2008;3:15.
- Cloutier J, Heatherton TF, Whalen PJ, Kelley WM: Are attractive people rewarding? Sex differences in the neural substrates of facial attractiveness. *J Cogn Neurosci* 2008;20:941–951.

- 42 Deuker L, Müller AR, Montag C, Markett S, Reuter M, Fell J, et al: Playing nice: a multi-methodological study on the effects of social conformity on memory. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2013;7:79.
- 43 Volkow ND, Wang G-J, Fowler JS, Logan J, Jayne M, Franceschi D, et al: 'Nonhedonic' food motivation in humans involves dopamine in the dorsal striatum and methylphenidate amplifies this effect. *Synapse* 2002;44:175–180.
- 44 Pessiglione M, Seymour B, Flandin G, Dolan RJ, Frith CD: Dopamine-dependent prediction errors underpin reward-seeking behaviour in humans. *Nature* 2006;442:1042–1045.
- 45 Kitayama S, King A, Yoon C, Tompson S, Huff S, Liberzon I: The dopamine D₄ receptor gene (*DRD4*) moderates cultural difference in independent versus interdependent social orientation. *Psychol Sci* 2014;25:1169–1177.
- 46 Bond R, Smith PB: Culture and conformity: a meta-analysis of studies using Asch's (1952b, 1956) line judgment task. *Psychol Bull* 1996;119:111–137.
- 47 Petterson B, Paterson HM: Culture and conformity: the effects of independent and interdependent self-construal on witness memory. *Psychiatry Psychol Law* 2012;19:735–744.
- 48 Gong P, Zhang H, Chi W, Ge W, Zhang K, Zheng A, et al: An association study on the polymorphisms of dopaminergic genes with working memory in a healthy Chinese Han population. *Cell Mol Neurobiol* 2012;32:1011–1019.
- 49 Gong P, Zheng Z, Chi W, Lei X, Wu X, Chen D, et al: An association study of the genetic polymorphisms in 13 neural plasticity-related genes with semantic and episodic memories. *J Mol Neurosci* 2012;46:352–361.