

Copyright

by

John Andrew Banas, Jr.

2005

**The Dissertation Committee for John Andrew Banas Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:**

**Is That All? Exploring the Cognitive and Affective Processes  
Underpinnings of the “That’s-Not-All” Technique**

**Committee:**

---

John Daly, Supervisor

---

Monique Turner, Co-Supervisor

---

Anita Vangelisti

---

Matthew McGlone

---

William Swann, Jr.

**Is That All? Exploring the Cognitive and Affective Processes  
Underpinnings of the “That’s-Not-All” Technique**

**by**

**John Andrew Banas, Jr., B.A.; M.A.**

**Dissertation**

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**The University of Texas at Austin**

**December, 2005**

## **Dedication**

This dissertation is dedicated with much love to John and Theresa Banas.

**Is That All? Exploring the Cognitive and Affective Processes  
Underpinnings of the “That’s-Not-All” Technique**

Publication No. \_\_\_\_\_

John Andrew Banas, Jr., Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2005

Supervisors: John Daly and Monique Turner

From late night television commercials to donation-soliciting telemarketers, the prevalence of compliance-gaining messages is ubiquitous in our society. Among the messages examined by scholars is the “that’s-not-all” (TNA) technique, in which an offer is improved before the message receiver has an opportunity to respond. Although the TNA procedure has been the subject of several experiments, there is a dearth of research examining why the technique works and why it does not. The purpose of this dissertation is to systematically investigate the cognitive processes mediating the effectiveness of the TNA procedure as well as boundary conditions for its use. Two studies were conducted on the TNA procedure, the first in a telemarketing context and the second in a television

commercial context. In both studies, the prosocialness of the organization, the presence of a negotiation message element, and the size of the TNA request were manipulated as independent variables. The dependent measures were compliance and cognitive and affective responses to the messages. Four theoretical explanations were tested against one another: perceptual contrast, reciprocal concessions, reverse TNA effect, and anticipated guilt. The results of the two studies were generally similar. The perceptual contrast explanation was most consistent with the compliance results. The results also indicated that anticipated guilt increases the effectiveness of the TNA technique. The results indicate the need for further examination of the cognitive and affective responses to compliance-gaining tactics. The dissertation concludes by outlining future directions of research on the TNA procedure.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	xi
List of Figures .....	xii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
“That’s-Not-All” Introduction .....	1
The State of “That’s-Not-All” Effect Research .....	2
Dissertation Purpose and Objectives .....	4
Preview of Dissertation Structure .....	4
Chapter Summary .....	5
Chapter 2: Compliance Gaining and the “That’s-Not-All” Technique .....	6
Compliance vs. Persuasion .....	6
Compliance Gaining .....	10
The “That’s-Not-All” Technique.....	13
Hypotheses.....	30
Perceptual Contrast Explanation.....	32
Reciprocal Concessions Explanation.....	35
Negative Affect and the Reverse TNA Effect .....	40
Anticipated Guilt Explanation .....	41
Chapter 3: Testing the Hypotheses .....	44
Method of Study 1: Telemarketing Experiment .....	44
Overview.....	44
Participants.....	44
Design .....	45
Procedure .....	45
Instrumentation .....	46
Experimental Inductions .....	50
Dependent Variables.....	51
Data Analysis.....	53

Results.....	53
Data Screening.....	53
Testing ANOVA Assumptions.....	53
Manipulation Checks.....	54
Testing Hypotheses.....	55
Discussion of Study 1.....	60
Discussion of the main findings.....	61
Implications for Scholars and Practitioners.....	65
Limitations of Study 1.....	68
Directions for Future Research.....	69
Method of Study 2: Television Commercial Experiment.....	70
Overview.....	70
Participants.....	71
Design.....	71
Procedure.....	71
Experimental Inductions.....	72
Dependent Variables.....	73
Data Analysis.....	74
Results.....	75
Data Screening.....	75
Testing Unidimensionality.....	75
Testing ANOVA Assumptions.....	76
Manipulation Checks.....	77
Testing Hypotheses.....	78
Discussion of Study 2.....	83
Discussion of the main findings.....	84
Limitations of Study 2.....	90
Directions for Future Research.....	91
Conclusion.....	91
Chapter Summary.....	92



Chapter 4: Conclusion.....	93
Discussion of Main Findings .....	93
Implications for Scholars and Practitioners .....	96
Future Research Directions.....	97
Summary.....	99
Appendix A: Pilot Test 1 Questionnaire.....	100
Appendix B: Phone Experiment Research Materials.....	106
Appendix C: Commercial Messages.....	114
Bibliography .....	118
Vita .....	122

## **List of Tables**

Table 3.1:	Means and Standard Deviations for Key Variables across All Experimental Conditions in Study 1.....	57
Table 3.2:	Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations for Key Measures Included in Study 1. ....	66
Table 3.3:	Means and Standard Deviations for Key Variables across All Experimental Conditions in Study 2.....	81
Table 3.4:	Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations for Key Measures Included in Study 2 .....	87

## List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Cell Identifiers .....	35
------------------------------------	----

## **Chapter 1:**

### **Introduction**

Chapter 1 consists of an introduction to this dissertation which examines the cognitive and affective mediators of the “that’s-not-all” compliance-gaining technique. The chapter begins with an introduction to the “that’s-not-all” tactic. Next, the relevant research on the TNA tactic is briefly reviewed. Subsequently, the theoretical and practical significance of investigating the explanatory mechanisms and limiting conditions of the “that’s-not-all” technique is established. The purpose of the dissertation is then explained. Chapter 1 concludes with a preview of the dissertation organization.

#### **“THAT’S-NOT-ALL” INTRODUCTION**

The compliance-gaining strategy, in which an initial offer is improved before the target responds, is labeled the “that’s-not-all” (TNA) technique (Burger, 1986). The TNA technique has been shown to elicit more favorable compliance outcomes than simply presenting a direct request for compliance. The TNA technique is distinct from other compliance-gaining tactics in that the receiver does not respond to the initial request and the improvement of the offer can occur with additional products or a price reduction (1986). Unlike other compliance-gaining strategies like the foot-in-the-door and door-in-the-face techniques, the paucity of research investigating the TNA procedure has yielded inconsistent results, leaving several important empirical, and theoretical, questions about the strategy unanswered.

There are three published studies of the TNA technique (Burger, 1986; Burger, Reed, DeCesare, Rauner, & Rozolis, 1999; Pollock, Smith, Knowles, & Bruce, 1998),

totaling 12 experiments. In the original TNA study, Burger (1986) presents seven separate experiments finding that the TNA message yielded higher compliance rates than presenting the improved deal initially. Burger posited that the reciprocal concessions explanation was a theoretical mechanism of the TNA effect, and he conducted two additional experiments that supported his assumption. Yet, in Burger's fifth experiment, the data indicated that perceptual contrast may also partially explain the TNA effect. To further complicate matters, experiment 6 resulted in a rejection of perceived bargaining (i.e. reciprocal concessions) as an explanation of the TNA procedure. Hence, although there are 12 studies (at the time) examining the TNA tactic, these studies leave readers with more questions than answers.

Following up on Burger's seminal work, Pollock et al. (1998) provided the first independent replication of the TNA effect and concluded the effectiveness of the tactic is limited to "mindless" influence interactions (Langer & Chanowitz, 1978). This explanation hinges on the idea that the effectiveness of the TNA is due to peripheral route processing, which is when decisions are less thoughtful or based on simple-decision making cues (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Pollock et al. believed that participants utilize peripheral cues and thus perceive the TNA message as a bargain. The TNA works, then, because individuals forego issue-relevant thinking and utilize simple decision making rules, like bargains should be taken advantage of.

### **THE STATE OF "THAT'S-NOT-ALL" EFFECT RESEARCH**

The extant literature points to the fact that the TNA technique works under certain circumstances, but it is still unclear *why* it works. This lack of clarity is the result of two significant dilemmas in the TNA technique literature. First, the results from Burger's

(1986) initial study of the TNA tactic suggest both reciprocal concessions and perceptual contrast as explanatory mechanisms, but Burger did not explicitly test these explanations against each other, or in combination with each other. Second, Pollock et al. (1998) argued that the TNA effect can be explained by the perception of a bargain (which they argue to be a heuristic), and that the TNA effect disappears when the TNA message is processed in a more mindful manner. Although this explanation is not necessarily inconsistent with Burger's (1986) proposed explanation(s), the conclusion that TNA is due to a perceived bargain contradicts Burger's results. Further research is necessary in order to understand the theoretical underpinnings of the TNA effect.

In addition to problems understanding why the TNA technique works, there are also problems understanding why it *does not* work. That is, the limiting conditions of the TNA tactic have not been clearly articulated. Burger et al. (1999) present four experiments that demonstrate that the TNA procedure can increase as well as decrease compliance rates compared to a control condition. Burger et al. explained the discrepancy by claiming that the effectiveness of the TNA procedure is moderated by the size of the initial request. However, Burger et al. failed to investigate the possible psychological mechanisms that they suggest account for their finding. They recommended "an obvious next step in research on the that's-not-all procedure is to pin down the psychological processes underlying the effects demonstrated here" (Burger et al., 1999, pp. 247-248).

Given the lack of agreement about the causes of the TNA effect, uncovering the underlying cognitive mechanisms and limiting conditions of the TNA procedure, is of significant theoretical and practical utility. Identifying the theoretical mechanisms that account for the various TNA findings will allow scholars to test and build theory

detailing why the tactic works, rather than claiming, simply, that it works occasionally. Developing an explanatory framework is also of practical utility for designing messages that capture the TNA effect while avoiding message elements that detract from its effectiveness. Given the prevalence of this tactic in advertising and interpersonal influence situations, the practical significance of studying the cognitive processes involved in the TNA procedure should not be underestimated.

### **DISSERTATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of this dissertation is to systematically investigate the cognitive processes moderating and mediating the effectiveness of the TNA procedure as well as boundary conditions for its use. The following literature review is divided into five parts. First, compliance is differentiated from persuasion. Second, the historical trends in compliance gaining research are outlined. Third, sequential request techniques, in particular, are reviewed. Fourth, the TNA literature is comprehensively reviewed. Fifth, the various theoretical explanations that have been proposed to account for why the TNA procedure does and does not work are described.

### **PREVIEW OF DISSERTATION STRUCTURE**

Chapter 2 contains a review of the relevant literature regarding compliance gaining and the “that’s-not-all” effect. Compliance is separated from persuasion, and each of the previous TNA studies are reviewed in detail. Chapter 2 culminates in the hypotheses for the dissertation experiments. Chapter 3 reports the methodology, results, and discussions of two studies exploring the mediating and moderating variables of the TNA technique. Chapter 4 consists of a general conclusion to the dissertation. The results

of the two experiments in the dissertation are discussed and the main findings are reviewed. Chapter 4 presents general implications and future directions for research.

#### **CHAPTER SUMMARY**

Chapter 1 provided an introduction to this dissertation examining the explanatory mechanisms and limiting factors of the TNA effect. The chapter began with an introduction to the “that’s-not-all” tactic. Next, the relevant research on the TNA tactic was briefly examined. Subsequently, the theoretical and practical significance of investigating the explanatory mechanisms and limiting conditions of the “that’s-not-all” technique was established. The purpose of the dissertation was then explained. Chapter 1 concluded with a preview of the dissertation organization. Chapter 2 will present a detailed literature review concerning compliance-gaining research with a specific focus on “that’s-not-all” technique research. This research will lead to the dissertation hypotheses.



## **Chapter 2:**

### **Compliance Gaining and the “That’s-Not-All” Technique**

Chapter 2 contains background information about compliance-gaining research, focusing on research regarding the TNA technique. Compliance gaining is first distinguished from the related concept of persuasion. The second section of Chapter 2 includes a brief overview of compliance-gaining research. Third, each of the studies about the TNA effect is detailed. Finally, the hypotheses of the dissertation are presented.

#### **COMPLIANCE VS. PERSUASION**

The distinct manners by which individuals influence one another are fundamental to understanding the larger process of social influence (Boster & Cruz, 2002). Central to separating the different social influence processes is the relationship of behavior change with attitude change. Persuasion is a broad term encompassing changes in beliefs, attitudes, intentions, and even behaviors; however, compliance “is more restrictive, typically referring to changes in a person’s overt behavior” (Gass & Seiter, 1999, p. 236). Distinguishing between changing individuals’ internal belief structures in order to change behaviors and merely changing behaviors has a great deal of practical and theoretical significance. Examining the difference between compliance gaining and persuasion in the social sciences came to the forefront of scholarship in the 1950s.

Beginning with the work of Festinger (1953), social psychologists made conceptual distinctions between persuasion and compliance gaining. Festinger’s (1953) social influence studies reveal the distinction between public conformity with private acceptance (persuasion) and public conformity without private acceptance (compliance).

Public conformity with private acceptance occurs when message receivers behave in a manner that is both consistent with their own attitudes and the recommendations of influencing agents. On the contrary, public conformity without private acceptance occurs when receivers of social influence messages behave according to the recommendations of influencing agents but in a manner inconsistent with their internal attitudes. Asch's (1955, 1956) experiments on the impact of unanimous group agreement on public judgments of line length clearly demonstrate Festinger's concept of conformity without private acceptance. In Asch's experiments, participants were asked to indicate which, from a set of lines of different length, was identical to the model line (called the "standard"). The correct choice was apparently obvious to isolated control subjects, who rarely made errors. Experimental subjects, however, rated the lines as consistent with a group composed of confederates who were instructed to give incorrect answers on specific trials. In these trials, the pressure to conform to the answers of the group caused 36.8% of the subjects to answer incorrectly. As learned in interviews with the subjects after the experiment, the subjects in the experimental trials outwardly conformed even though their internal beliefs were not changed.

Early conformity research confirmed that influence processes were indeed distinct, prompting Deutsch and Gerard (1955) to distinguish between normative influence and informational influence. Normative influence refers to communication about appropriateness whereas informational influence refers to communication that conveys "evidence about reality" (p. 629). Compliance is thought to occur through normative influence whereas persuasion occurs through informational influence.

Building upon the work of Festinger (1953) and Deutsch and Gerard (1955), Kelman (1961) introduced his own typology of social influence, which included compliance, identification, and internalization. Compliance occurs when targets change their behaviors to be in agreement with the influence agent. Compliance is influenced by normative processes, in which individuals seek to gain a favorable reaction or avoid an unfavorable reaction. Identification is the middle ground between persuasion and compliance, as it represents an internal change associated with the target's self-defining relationship with the influence agent. The change relies on the strength of the target-agent relationship since the internal changes are not integrated into the target's belief structure. Finally, internalization is critical to the classic view of persuasion. Internalization occurs when the position adopted by the target is consistent with the target's internal values and the message content is integrated into the target's relevant belief structures. Once a message is accepted in this way, a relationship between the target and the influence agent is unnecessary for the attitude or behavior to be maintained.

The dominant theoretical developments in persuasion and compliance gaining reveal the extent to which Deutsch and Gerard's (1955) distinction between normative and informational influence impacted the thinking of social influence scholars. Cialdini (2001) suggested that all compliance behaviors can be organized around six basic principles guiding human behavior in an automatic fashion: reciprocity, commitment and consistency, social proof, liking, authority, and scarcity. These basic principles exert normative influence on receivers in order to get them to conform. Cialdini (2001) claims that the principles are powerful because of the normative pressure they exert on us, and

because the principles are so ingrained into humans' behavioral patterns that they have come to serve as heuristic cues. Often, these rules help individuals by providing them with efficient and economical mental shortcuts, thereby saving time and energy, but when these principles are exploited by influence agents, people may act against their best interests. People frequently are influenced by compliance-gaining messages because they do not process them carefully (Cialdini, 2001).

Although the dominant view in compliance gaining focuses on mindless, peripheral (or heuristic) thinking, the prevailing view in persuasion research has stressed the importance of careful and deliberate message processing (e.g., Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Petty and Cacioppo argue that when individuals are presented with a persuasive message they will process it via a central route or peripheral route. Central route processing requires the ability and motivation to engage in message relevant thinking. Elaboration of a message requires the target to think about attitude-relevant information and critically examine the merits of the arguments and the quality of the evidence contained in the message. According to the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM), attitudes formed or changed through central processing will be stronger and more durable than those formed by peripheral processing. When individuals are motivated and able to process a message, then central route processing should occur. When individuals are either unmotivated or unable to elaborate on a message, then peripheral route processing should occur. Although the ELM is not portrayed to be a compliance gaining theory, it does reflect Cialdini's (2001) notion of automaticity.

Although research investigating persuasion and compliance has emphasized different processing routes and different message features, it is important to note that

behavior change is theoretically related to attitude change. Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance, specifically his forced compliance experiments (Festinger & Carlsmith, 1959), illuminated how behavior change can cause attitudinal changes that are consistent with those behaviors. This idea that humans understand their own attitudes from their behaviors became the basis for Bem's (1965) self-perception theory, for example<sup>1</sup>. Bem's work helped to establish the importance of studying behavior change as an antecedent to studying attitude change, and scholars soon began to focus on the methods by which individuals attempt to gain compliance.

### **COMPLIANCE GAINING**

Compliance-gaining techniques have been a popular topic of study for the past 50 years. Boster, in 1995, argued that "in the last 15 years, the study of compliance-gaining message behavior has held the attention of communication scholars as much as, if not

---

<sup>1</sup> The self-perception and forced compliance research demonstrate the difficulty in separating attitude-consistent behavior from attitude-inconsistent behavior. Since this creates a dilemma for separating the two concepts in everyday interaction, scholars have proposed criteria for determining compliance from persuasion. Kiesler and Kiesler (1969) suggested using the concepts of surveillance and resistance to distinguish them. Surveillance refers to the degree to which the target will continue to behave in accordance with the influence agent's requests when the influence agent is absent. If the conformity continues, then the target has been persuaded; however, if the conformity ceases, then it can be concluded that the target was compliant but not persuaded. Resistance refers to the degree that the target will continue to conform when an outside party attempts to convince the target to not behave in accordance with the influence agent's request. Persuasion is thought to have occurred if the target resists.

more than, any other single topic in the discipline” (p. 91). In one of the most influential early studies, Marwell and Schmitt (1967) conducted a thorough analysis of the types of messages persons might employ to cause compliance in another individual. Their study yielded 16 compliance gaining strategies: positive expertise, negative expertise, altruism, pre-giving, threat, moral appeal, positive altercasting, negative altercasting, liking, positive self feeling, negative self feeling, promise, aversive stimulation, debt, positive esteem and negative esteem. Other scholars (Kellerman & Cole, 1994; Wiseman & Schenk-Hamlin, 1981) have subsequently developed message taxonomies aimed at understanding the kinds of messages persons might use in compliance situations.

Nevertheless, these taxonomies are of limited explanatory value. Although they provide information about the universe of messages that might exist to influence other persons, they do not predict which messages *work* and why those messages work. Moreover, scholars have noted that Marwell and Schmitt’s list is not exhaustive; there are, in fact, several dimensions missing from the taxonomy, such as sequential request strategies (Kellerman & Cole, 1994).

The most successful message effect research in compliance has involved sequential request techniques. Among these sequential request strategies is the “foot-in-the-door” procedure (FITD; Freedman & Fraser, 1966), in which compliance with an initial small request increases the likelihood of compliance with the larger target request; the “door-in-the-face” procedure (DITF; Cialdini, Vincent, Lewis, Catalan, Wheeler, & Darby, 1975), in which the rejection of a large initial request increases the likelihood of compliance with a second, smaller request; and the “low ball” procedure (Cialdini,

Cacioppo, Bassett, & Miller, 1978), in which a commitment to buy a product at a lower price increases the likelihood of compliance when the price is raised.

Sequential request strategy research is an important advancement in compliance gaining research for several reasons. First, the sequential request research is theoretically grounded. The FITD is grounded in self-perception (Bem, 1972) and commitment and consistency (Cialdini, 2001), and the DITF technique has a host of explanatory mechanisms, including reciprocal concessions (Cialdini et al., 1975), perceptual contrasts (Miller, Seligman, Clark, & Bush, 1976) and perceived guilt (O’Keefe & Figge, 1997, 1999). These explanations aid in understanding why messages work and designing other messages that utilize the same theoretical principles. Second, sequential request research conceptualizes influence as a process, an idea that resonates strongly with communication researchers (e.g., Miller & Burgoon, 1978). Sequential request strategies highlight the importance of influencing a target with an initial message or message feature in order for the “real” request to have subsequent impact. Third, sequential request research is applied social influence research. The research on sequential request techniques was a response to Cialdini’s call for “full cycle social psychology,” in which scholars of persuasion would examine the influence tactics of everyday practitioners in order to uncover the psychological mechanisms and boundaries of their tactics (1980). Researchers have examined a series of strategies that are intended to increase compliance while keeping targets unaware of the fact that an influence attempt is being used.

The sequential request research has focused mostly on the FITD and DITF strategies, however, another technique included in the list of sequential strategies that has received little attention is the “that’s-not-all” (TNA) technique (Burger, 1986). The

proposition underlying the TNA procedure is that improving upon an initial offer before the target has a chance to respond increases compliance. The initial offer can be improved upon by either reducing the price or coupling something with the initial offer (e.g., Burger, 1986). The idea of the TNA technique emerged from the barrage of infomercials individuals are subjected to on television, whereby persuaders promote their product, but before potential buyers are given purchasing information they are told “But, that’s not all! If you buy this product, you will also receive a...” These infomercials motivated researchers to test the effectiveness of the TNA technique (Burger, 1986; Burger et al., 1999; Pollock et al., 1998).

#### **THE “THAT’S-NOT-ALL” TECHNIQUE**

Conceptually, the TNA is different from other compliance techniques in that it does not require a target to respond before the final request is made. In the FITD procedure, the target must first commit to a small request before the larger request is made. Similarly, the low-ball procedure (Cialdini, Cacioppo, Bassett, & Miller, 1978) requires an initial commitment to an offer before the cost of the offer is increased. The pre-giving tactic requires the target to receive something before the true compliance-gaining request is made (Marwell & Schmitt, 1967). Clearly, from a conceptual vantage point, these techniques are not similar to the TNA procedure.

Although the TNA strategy is distinct from other sequential request techniques, it does resemble the DITF, whereby a larger offer is followed by a smaller offer. Like the DITF tactic, the reduced cost version of the TNA message begins with a large request and is followed by a smaller request. The key difference between the two tactics is that the DITF requires the target to reject the initial request before the subsequent message is put



forward, whereas in the TNA procedure, the offer is improved before the target has a chance to respond to the initial offer. This represents a crucial difference in the two strategies that has obvious implications for application. Because the TNA message does not require a rejection of the initial request before the request is reduced, the TNA strategy can be used in commercials and other one-way communications, in addition to face-to-face encounters. The alternative version of the TNA technique, where the offer is improved by adding to the initial offer without raising the price, is more distinct from the DITF and other compliance gaining techniques.

Burger (1986), in his first empirical test of the TNA technique, described seven experiments aimed at documenting the effectiveness of the technique as well as exploring the reasons why it works. In experiment 1, he tested the effectiveness of the “added product” version of the TNA technique. Two experimenters set up booths on a college campus at an art fair, for a university’s “psychology club bake sale.” Cupcakes were displayed on the table but no prices were listed. As participants approached the table and inquired about the price of the cupcakes, they were randomly assigned to the TNA message or a control message. In the TNA condition, one experimenter told the participants that the cupcakes were \$0.75 each. Concurrently, the second experimenter tapped the first experimenter on the shoulder. The first experimenter held up his hand and asked the customer to “wait a second.” After a 2-3 second conversation between the experimenters, the first experimenter lowered his hand and told the participant that the price also included two medium-sized cookies. The experimenter then pulled a bag containing the cookies from behind a box on the table. In the control condition, the bag of cookies was revealed as soon as the participants asked about the price of the cupcakes

and were informed that the package sold for \$0.75. In both conditions, the experimenters explained to participants that the cupcakes and cookies could not be sold separately due to the fact that the experimenters had to keep track of how many packages were sold. These data were consistent with the TNA message being more effective than a control message. In the TNA condition, participants purchased significantly more products (73%) than in the control condition (40%), indicating that the “added product” version of the TNA increased compliance compared to the control condition.

In Experiment 2, the reduced price version of the TNA procedure was tested against the control condition. In this version only cupcakes were sold at the bake sale. In the TNA condition, the experimenter asked the participant to wait while the two experimenters conferred before returning to the participant to say, “But, because we are planning to close down pretty soon, we are going to start selling them for \$0.75.” In the control condition, the participants were simply told that the cupcakes sold for \$0.75 when they asked about the price of the cupcakes. Again, significantly more participants in the TNA condition (73%) purchased cupcakes than in the control condition (44%).

Experiment 3 was designed to test the reciprocal concessions explanation of the TNA procedure. In the experiment, Burger attempted to manipulate the extent to which the seller’s behavior appeared to be a personal negotiation. It was hypothesized that if the norm of reciprocity is an explanatory mechanism of the TNA procedure (the theoretical explanations proposed for the TNA procedure are detailed subsequently), then the technique would be most effective when the seller’s action is perceived as a personal concession rather than something he or she was forced to do. The experimental procedure was followed as in experiments 1 and 2. The reduced price version of the TNA procedure

was used. In both the negotiation and no-negotiation conditions, the cupcakes were announced to sell for \$1.00. As in the previous experiments, the second experimenter interrupted the first experimenter, who then asked the participant to “wait a second.” In the negotiation condition, the first experimenter returned to the participant after 2-3 seconds and said, “But I want to leave soon, so I’d be willing to sell them to you for \$0.75.” In the no-negotiation condition, the experimenter told the participant that they had just started selling cupcakes that day and had made a mistake regarding the price. The results indicated a significant statistical difference between the negotiation condition (85%) and the control condition (50%) at selling cupcakes. However, the no-negotiation condition (70%) did not differ from these conditions.

Regardless of the effectiveness of the negotiation condition in study 3, the examination has two primary problems that cloud the ability to interpret the data confidently (Burger, 1986). First, the base rate for compliance in the control condition was 50%, making it difficult to achieve statistically significant increases in compliance rates with the experimental conditions. Second, the personal negotiation condition was problematic. In the negotiation condition, the experimenter lowered the price of the cupcake, but it was at little personal loss. In this experimental condition, the experimenter told the participant that he wanted to go home, making it possible that the participants perceived that the seller was gaining from the transaction and hence, the perception of a personal negotiation was weakened. Experiment 4 attempted to address these dilemmas by selling candles door-to-door, which was presumed to lower the base rate of compliance and by emphasizing the negotiation by having the sellers sacrifice their own

profits. These flaws and the reciprocal concessions theory are expounded upon subsequently.

In Experiment 4, a male and a female experimenter went door-to-door selling candles to raise money for their school expenses. The male experimenter told the participants that the candles sold for \$3.00 each. Again, the second experimenter interrupted experimenter one at that point, delaying the response of the participant. In the negotiation condition, the female experimenter said out loud, “No, we decided to sell those for \$2.00 now.” The male experimenter turned back to the participant at that point and announced, “I’m sorry. We decided to try to sell more candles at a lower price. So now we’re selling them for only \$2.00.” In the no-negotiation condition, the female experimenter’s line was, “No, we sold all of those. These are the \$2.00 candles.” The male experimenter then turned to the participant and said, “I’m sorry. We sold those. I meant to say the price is \$2.00.” In the control condition, participants were told only that the price of the candles was \$2.00.

These data were consistent with the hypothesis that the negotiation condition would elicit the most compliance (57.1%), followed by no negotiation (37.1%) and the control condition (14.3%). Both the negotiation condition and the no-negotiation condition were significantly better at increasing compliance compared to the control group; however, the difference between the two negotiation conditions was “only marginally significant,”  $p < .10$  (Burger, 1986, p. 280).

Because both the negotiation and no-negotiation TNA messages were more effective than the control condition, Burger concluded that perceptions of personal negotiation might increase compliance, but the TNA procedure is still effective without

negotiative message elements, as evidenced by the first set of experiments. Hence, these data do not offer strong support for the reciprocal concessions explanation for the TNA effect. Thus, Burger tested a second theoretical explanation for the TNA effect: Perceptual contrast. According to this account, the initial request establishes an anchor point by which the improved request is judged. Since the second offer is better in contrast to the first offer, compliance rates are improved.

Experiment 5 was designed to test the possibility that the initial request influences the anchor point for making the purchasing decision. Participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire about a hypothetical psychology club bake sale. Half received a questionnaire indicating that cupcakes at the bake sale were being sold for \$0.75, and the other half were told the cupcakes sold for \$1.00. Participants were then asked to imagine that they came upon the bake sale and were considering purchasing a cupcake. Subsequently, participants were asked what the highest amount they would be willing to pay for a cupcake, the established price notwithstanding. Second, participants were asked what they believed was an honest amount to charge for the cupcake, again notwithstanding what the psychology club was charging.

Responses on the two questions were compared for the \$0.75 and \$1.00 groups. Although not statistically significant, participants in the \$1.00 condition ( $M = \$0.51$ ) indicated that they would pay more for the cupcake than participants in the \$0.75 ( $M = \$0.45$ ) condition. Additionally, participants in the \$1.00 condition reported a significantly higher honest price for the cupcake ( $M = \$0.66$ ) than did participants in the \$0.75 condition ( $M = \$0.51$ ). Burger concluded that the results were consistent with the perceptual contrast explanation.

These data led Burger to conclude that participants who complied with the TNA requests did so because they perceived that they were getting a bargain. For example, participants in one condition of Experiment 4 believed that they were being offered a candle for \$2.00 that is normally worth \$3.00. In order to examine this explanation, Burger conducted experiment 6, which featured a TNA condition, a bargain condition, and a control condition. The procedure involved a psychology club bake sale. Customers were randomly assigned to one of three conditions. In the TNA condition, participants were told that the price of a cupcake was \$1.25. Again, the second experimenter interrupted the communication and the participant was asked to “wait a second.” After the brief delay, the first experimenter explained, as in Experiment 2, that they were planning to close down the bake sale soon, so they were willing to sell the cupcakes for \$1.00. In the bargain condition, when asked about the price, the participants were told, “These are only a dollar now. We were selling them for \$1.25 earlier” (Burger, p. 280). Participants in the control condition were told only that the cupcakes were \$1.00. Sixty adults and teenagers who approached the booths set up around a university campus were used as participants in the study. The number of participants who purchased cupcakes was compared across conditions.

The data indicated that the participants who received the TNA message were more likely to purchase a cupcake (55%) than participants in the control condition (20%). Participants in the TNA condition were more likely (though the effect only neared statistical significance) to purchase a cupcake than those in the bargain condition (25%),  $\chi^2 (1, 40) = 3.75, p < .07$ . The participants in the bargain condition did not differ significantly from the control participants in compliance rates. Burger concluded that the

appearance of a bargain does not explain the TNA effect because both the bargain condition and the TNA condition offered a \$1.25 product for \$1.00, but only the TNA procedure significantly increased compliance compared to the control condition. As further evidence that the perception of a bargain is not an acceptable account for the TNA effect, Burger noted that Experiment 1 and the no-negotiation condition in Experiment 3 provided tests of the TNA procedure that do not confound the procedure with the perception of a bargain price.

In the final experiment, Burger tested the effectiveness of the TNA procedure against the DITF procedure. Sixty adults and teenagers who approached booths set up around a university campus were randomly assigned to control, TNA, or DITF conditions. The TNA and the control conditions were identical to that of Experiment 6. In the DITF condition, the first experimenter informed the participant that the cupcakes cost \$1.25. Unlike the TNA condition, the experimenter was not interrupted and the participant was allowed to respond. If the participant agreed to the \$1.25 price, then the cupcake was sold at that price (two participants purchased the cupcake at \$1.25). If the participant rejected the price, the same experimenter immediately replied, “Well, we were planning to close down pretty soon, so I’ll start selling them for \$1.00” (Burger, 1986, p. 282).

The two participants who agreed to buy the cupcakes at \$1.25 in the DITF condition were included in the purchase condition since it was assumed that if they purchased a cupcake for \$1.25, they would also have made the purchase had the price been \$1.00. Burger found that both the TNA procedure (50% compliance) and the DITF procedure (35%) increased cupcake purchases when compared to the control group

(20%). Only the difference in compliance rates between the TNA and the control group, however, was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(1, 40) = 3.96, p < .05$ . Burger concluded that the TNA procedure may be more effective than the DITF procedure at increasing compliance rates, but since the difference between the TNA and DITF condition was not statistically significant, the data do not indicate whether they produce distinct results. Burger's final conclusion was that further exploration into the difference between the TNA and DITF procedures was needed. Further exploration of the TNA effect would not be published for over a decade however.

The first researchers to respond to the call for further investigation of the TNA procedure were Pollock et al. (1998). Pollock et al. argued that although Burger's experiments had demonstrated the TNA effect repeatedly, "a reasonable explanation for this effect or even clear boundary conditions for its operation have been elusive" (1998, p. 1153). Pollock et al. believed that a reasonable explanation for the TNA was missing due to problematic experimental procedures used in Burger's series of experiments. They proposed that the empirical investigations of the reciprocal concessions and perceptual contrast explanations of the TNA procedure were flawed. Specifically, Pollock et al. argued that the experiments supporting the reciprocal concessions explanation for the TNA procedure failed to provide clear evidence that reciprocal concession was the mediating process behind the TNA effect. Pollock et al. pointed to the three experiments in Burger's (1986) study that distinguish between negotiation and no-negotiation TNA requests. The no-negotiation conditions emphasized the accidental nature or impersonal origin of the price reduction in those offers. For example, in experiment three of Burger's (1986) study, the experimenter in the no-negotiation condition explained that the price of



the cupcake was reduced because the experimenter was new at selling cupcakes and had made a mistake about the price. Pollock et al. point out that the impersonal offers did not produce sales that significantly improved upon the “negotiation” TNA offers. Therefore, the results are ambiguous about whether reciprocal concessions mediate the TNA effect.

Additionally, Pollock et al. found the experiments exploring the perceptual contrast explanation of the TNA effect equally problematic. According to the social judgment explanation, the initial price of the cupcake establishes an anchor point, which creates the appearance of a higher quality cupcake. The participants in the TNA condition were being offered a \$1.00 cupcake for \$0.75 although the control condition participants were offered a \$0.75 cupcake for \$0.75. Pollock et al. found the experiments where Burger successfully demonstrated the altering of anchor points, where participants were asked to image a \$1.00 or \$0.75 cupcake and then estimate an honest price for the cupcake, to be “extraordinarily full of demand” (1998, p. 1154).

In considering Burger’s (1986) experiments, Pollock et al. arrived at two conclusions. First, they believed that the appearance of a bargain in Burger’s experiments was not in the price of the cupcake itself (\$0.75) but in the “counterfactual created by the comparison of the revised offer to the initial offer” (1998, p. 1154), resulting from the fact that the participant could buy the cupcake for \$0.75 and the counterfact that the cupcakes were being offered for \$1.00 before. This implication of the counterfactual was that the participant was getting the product for a lower price than the default offer (Roese, 1997; Roese & Olson, 1997). Pollock et al. believed that this counterfactual bargain would disappear when thoughtfully and rationally considered. They believed such conditions would include being asked to estimate the value of a \$0.75 cupcake. When

carefully processed, both the TNA and control offers are identical in that the cupcake will cost \$0.75 either way.

Second, Pollock et al. (1998) contended that the participants in the field experiments underwent dramatically different message processing than participants in the laboratory experiments who were attempting to estimate the true value of a \$1.00/\$0.75 cupcake (e.g., Burger, 1986). Pollock et al. argued that the participants in the field experiments were focused on cupcakes rather than careful contemplation of the offer and since the offer was small and reasonable, there was no “rational, detailed, economic analysis” (1998, p. 1154)<sup>2</sup>.

Based upon the two problematic issues described above, Pollock et al. reasoned that the TNA effect might be the result of mindless acceptance of a perceived bargain. They cited Langer’s (1989) work about unimportant events in everyday life that engender mindless automatic behavior. Langer’s research deals with how our reliance on rigid categories inhibits mindful processing of information, which then engages mindless behavioral scripts. Her groundbreaking examination of mindlessness was a field study that looked at compliance to requests bolstered by either real or placebo excuses (Langer, Blank, & Chanowitz, 1978). In the study, experimenters requested to cut in front of someone in a line at a photocopy machine at a graduate center located in New York.

---

<sup>2</sup> Pollock et al. (1998)’s concern about the processing conditions conducive to the TNA effect is important; however, their claim regarding economic analyses is rather overstated. It is highly dubious that lab experiments encourage participants to perform “economic analyses.” Even given a lengthy period for contemplation, it is doubtful that many participants would perform an economic analysis, or even know what one is.

Experimenters made either a small request to copy five pages or a large request to copy 20 pages in one of three ways: (1) request to copy five or 20 pages without providing a reason (“May I use the Xerox machine?”); (2) request to copy while providing a placebo, tautological reason (“because I have to make copies”); or (3) request to copy pages while providing a real reason (“because I’m in a rush”). Langer et al. (1978) found that when asking to copy five pages, both the placebo reason (93%) and the real reason (94%) were equally effective in increasing compliance compared to providing no reason (60%). However, when the request was larger (to copy 20 pages), participants seemed to mindfully process the reasons provided because the placebo reason (24%) was equally as effective as providing no reason (24%), and both were significantly less effective than providing the real reason (42%).

Pollock et al. hypothesized that, similar to the mindless acceptance research by Langer et al. (1978), the TNA procedure would work best when targets responded to the offer in a mindless way. They assumed that the TNA message would create the appearance of a bargain, and under conditions of low-cost, this would serve as a peripheral cue (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), thereby creating an automatic response. Conversely, a higher cost item would cause more detailed, mindful processing of the message, and behavior would not be automatically triggered since attention would be focused on salient product factors. This mindful processing of factors such as the cost of the product, the desire to obtain the product, as well as the quality of the product would reduce the reliance on peripheral cues such as the appearance of a bargain indicated by a TNA message.

Pollock et al. tested the price-reduction form of the TNA procedure utilizing a 2 (small/large box of chocolate) X 2 (TNA/control influence condition) X 3 (no reason/placebic reason/real reason) independent groups design. In their study, participants encountered several large or small boxes of chocolate at a psychology club chocolate sale. After inquiring into the price of the boxes, participants were given either the control price (a small box for \$1 or a large box for \$5) or the TNA prices (\$1.25 reduced to \$1 for the small box or \$6.25 reduced to \$5 for the large box) and then were given one of three reasons for buying the chocolate: no reason, a placebo reason (“This candy is made of chocolate and sold in this box”), or a good reason (“These Sweet Shop chocolates are fudge hand-dipped in chocolate with pecans. Also, Sweet Shop has been in business over 20 years”). The higher priced chocolate was intended to stimulate more mindful processing of the message, and the reasons provided served as a test of processing. If the participants were impacted by the reasons in both conditions, then mindlessness could not explain the TNA effect. As expected, however, Pollock et al. found evidence that mindlessness moderates the TNA effect in that the TNA effect was present regardless of the reasons given for the small boxes of chocolate, but the TNA procedure was not effective at increasing compliance when selling the large box of chocolate. They concluded that their study provides support for the idea that the TNA creates the appearance of a bargain, a heuristic cue leading to peripheral processing and mindless compliance. The original goal of Burger et al.’s research was to extend the TNA procedure beyond sales situations. Burger et al.’s primary research question explored whether the TNA procedure would be effective at increasing compliance for altruistic purposes (although Burger et al. acknowledged that the sales situations from previous

experiments could be thought of as pro-social since the sales presumably benefited a psychology club or students' education). In the first two experiments of the study, though, Burger et al. failed to replicate the TNA effect and actually found that the TNA message created a boomerang effect, which they labeled the "reverse TNA effect." Experiments 3 and 4 explored this unexpected finding as a function of initial request size. The experiments are described in detail below.

First, the TNA procedure was tested with requests to volunteer time for a hearing-impaired elementary school carnival. Burger et al. predicted that participants who were presented with a request to volunteer for two days of work, which was lowered to one day of work, would comply more than those participants who were presented with a request to volunteer for one day of work only. Sixty undergraduates who lived in on-campus residence halls were used as participants in Experiment 1. Two student experimenters approached randomly selected dormitory rooms and delivered a TNA message or a control message, based on a prearranged random order. The first experimenter introduced both experimenters and provided an explanation about how they worked for an on-campus organization that was soliciting volunteers to work at a local hearing-impaired elementary school carnival. In the TNA condition, the first experimenter asked participants if they would be willing to volunteer their time to work at the carnival from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on both Saturday and Sunday of the upcoming weekend. As in previous TNA experiments, the second experimenter interrupted before the participant could respond. The second experimenter said, "Wait a minute. All of our volunteer spots are filled on Sunday. Are you interested in volunteering for Saturday only?" In the control condition, the second experimenter only

asked the participant if they would volunteer to work between 11:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. on Saturday. Burger et al. (1999) found that the TNA message (3%; 1 out of 30) was significantly worse at securing compliance than was the control condition (27%; 8 out of 30). This unexpected boomerang effect perplexed Burger et al. since Burger's (1986) previous work resulted in seven successful TNA experiments. They believed there were two possible explanations for the boomerang effect. First, perhaps the TNA procedure is ineffective with altruistic requests and only works with sales. Second, perhaps the size of the initial request was too big. Burger et al. argued that the success of the TNA procedure is predicated on the idea that the initial request, along with the inability to respond to the initial request, leave the participant in a state of indecision. Subsequently, when the offer is improved, the indecision is resolved in favor of complying with the request. If the request is too large, the participants might immediately reject the idea of compliance, and the subsequent improvement of the offer will not be processed. Burger et al. argued that the college students in their sample might have felt that giving up three hours of their time on both Saturday and Sunday was an extreme request and made up their mind not to comply. Burger et al. decided to attempt to replicate the boomerang effect produced in experiment one. Again, they used a prosocial request with a large initial request.

In Experiment 2, Burger et al. examined the effectiveness of the TNA procedure on requests to make a charitable donation. As in Experiment 1, 60 randomly selected undergraduates living in on-campus dormitories served as participants in the study. The experimenter contacted students on the telephone and delivered either the TNA message or the control message based on a prearranged random order. The experimenter explained that money was being collected for the student class fund used for social activities and a

class gift to the university. The experimenter asked participants in the TNA condition if they would donate \$5.00 to the class gift (which, based on a pre-test, was a large request). Before participants could respond, the experimenter pretended to be interrupted by another person. The experimenter then said, “Wait, hold on a second. OK. I just found out that we still have Santa Clara coffee mugs left to give away. If you donate \$5.00 you will get a mug, too” (Burger et al., 1999, p. 246). The results again indicated that the TNA message (23%) was significantly less effective at gaining compliance than the control message (63%). Burger et al. had replicated the boomerang effect from experiment one. Based on the prosocial nature of the previous TNA experiments (Burger, 1986), they doubted that altruistic or prosocial requests were the key moderating factor of the TNA effect. Burger et al. concluded that the key to the TNA effect was the size of the initial request. Experiment three was designed to test this reasoning.

Experiment 3 was designed to demonstrate both the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of the TNA procedure compared to the control message. Participants in one TNA condition received a TNA message with a large initial request and participants in a second TNA condition received a TNA message where the initial request was only slightly larger than the second request. It was hypothesized that the moderate initial request size TNA message would be effective but the large initial request size TNA message would boomerang when both are compared against the control message.

Two hundred and twenty undergraduate students living in on-campus dormitories were used as participants in the experiment. The experimental procedures were identical to experiment one except for the addition of a moderate initial request TNA message. The moderate initial request asked if they would volunteer to work from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00

p.m. on Saturday only. The percentages of participants who agreed to comply with the final request were compared across conditions. Burger et al. found that the overall experimental effect fell short of being statistically significant. However, Burger et al. believed specific comparisons provided support for the hypothesis that initial request size determines the effectiveness of the TNA effect. The moderate initial request TNA condition (23.3%) yielded larger compliance rates than the large initial request TNA condition (10.8%),  $p < .05$ . However, there was no significant difference between the moderate initial request condition (23.3%) and the control condition (13.7%),  $p < .14$ . Burger et al. believed that this lack of effectiveness compared to the control condition was due to the low overall compliance rates in comparison to experiment one. Burger et al. found this strange, since the same request was being made in both experiments 1 and 3. Experiment 4 was designed to test how the size of the initial request in the TNA procedure impacts effectiveness, but this time a control condition request was selected that was expected to yield a 50% compliance rate.

In Experiment 4, 210 undergraduates were called randomly and asked to make a charitable contribution, this time for a university scholarship fund. Students received a large initial request TNA condition, a moderate initial request TNA condition, (or a control message) based on a prearranged random assignment. In the large initial request condition, students were informed that they would receive a coffee mug bearing the name of their university for a \$10.00 donation. As in experiment two, the experimenter pretended to be interrupted by another person. The experimenter said, "Wait, hold on a second. OK. My supervisor just told me we have lowered the minimum donation for receiving the mug to \$3.00. Would you be willing to donate \$3.00 to the fund for the



coffee mug?” The moderate initial request size TNA message was identical except the first request was \$5.00 instead of \$10.00. Participants in the control condition were only presented with the last part of the request. Burger et al. (1999) found that the results provided support for the idea that the size of the initial request moderated the effectiveness of the TNA procedure. 24.3% of the participants in the \$10.00 condition complied compared with 58.6% in the \$5.00 condition and 41.4% in the control condition; and, the differences among these conditions are statistically significant. Additionally, and unlike experiment three, the moderate initial request size TNA condition yielded more compliance than the control condition.

Although experiment 4 provided a compelling demonstration of how the size of the initial request in the TNA message can produce either the TNA or reverse TNA effect, it did not provide any evidence for why the size of the initial request can change compliance rates so dramatically. Burger et al. (1999) proposed that the decrease in compliance associated with a large initial request might be due to negative reactions towards the requester, or that a large initial request falls within a receiver’s latitude of rejection. This lack of a clear explanation for the results of a TNA experiment is not novel.

## **HYPOTHESES**

Despite three separate studies totaling 12 experiments, a satisfactory explanation of why the TNA procedure does and does not work remains elusive. In explaining why the TNA procedure works, Burger (1986) initially proposed both reciprocal concessions and perceptual contrast as explanations for the TNA effect. However, Pollock et al. detail how the experimental testing of these explanations calls into question the validity of

Burger's (1986) conclusions. Moreover, Burger (1986) did not test the theoretical explanations against each other or specify the conditions for which one explanation would be favored over another. Another explanation was provided by Pollock et al. (1998), who concluded that the TNA procedure works because the improved offer message serves as a peripheral cue that signals a bargain. In contrast to the perceptual contrasts explanation, Burger et al. (1999) argued that large contrasts in a TNA message will actually decrease compliance, which they called the reverse TNA effect. They reasoned that large initial offers anger message receivers toward the requestor and request situation. Finally, compliance researchers have recently addressed the role that guilt plays in sequential request messages (O'Keefe & Figge, 1997, 1999). Since all of the TNA technique studies have been conducted for prosocial causes, the role of guilt in producing compliance cannot be accounted for. Hence, there are three separate theoretical accounts for the TNA effect<sup>3</sup>: perceptual contrasts, reciprocal concessions, and anticipated guilt. Additionally, anger has been posited to account for the reverse TNA effect.

The focus of this dissertation is to test four competing theoretical mechanisms of the TNA technique, examining the cognitive and affective moderators and mediators of the message tactic. Two studies were conducted, both involving sales situations where

---

<sup>3</sup> Davis and Knowles (1999) also posit an explanation for the TNA effect. They argue that the TNA technique is a specific instance of the "Disrupt-Then-Reframe" technique. However, this dissertation examines moderating and mediating factors of the TNA effect, which are not necessarily inconsistent with the disrupt-then-reframe technique. It is important to examine the factors that produce, enhance, or inhibit the TNA effect other than a "disruption" which could take a number of forms.

coffee cups bearing a university logo were sold. In order to examine the explanations for the TNA effect (or reverse TNA effect), it was necessary to manipulate three variables. Obviously, a TNA study requires TNA messages. However, in this dissertation, it was necessary to create moderate and large initial request TNA messages in order to test the reverse TNA effect against the perceptual contrast explanation. In order to examine the impact of anticipated guilt, the prosocialness of the organizations selling the coffee cups was also varied; the experiments used either a retailer of coffee products or a university group that used the profits of the coffee cup sales to provide books and tutors for underprivileged children. Finally, testing the reciprocal concessions account requires message variation in terms negotiative message elements. In the next section of the paper, each of the competing accounts, and the accompanying hypotheses, will be discussed in detail.

### **Perceptual Contrast Explanation**

One explanation for the effectiveness of the TNA technique, perceptual contrast, is derived from social judgment theory (Sherif & Hovland, 1961; Sherif & Sherif, 1967) and adaptation-level theory (Helson, 1964). According to social judgment theorists, humans make comparative judgments in reference to a pre-existing anchor point. For example, \$20.00 will be judged as an expensive concert ticket by a person who has never spent more than \$10.00 on a ticket; however, \$20.00 will be seen as inexpensive to someone who commonly spends \$40.00 on a concert ticket. This example illustrates an important element in the social judgment process, which is that the anchor point can be altered by various experiences. An example of how anchor points may change was demonstrated in a study by Kenrick and Gutierrez (1980) in which males, who had just

watched an episode of “Charlie’s Angels,” a television show featuring very attractive women, rated a woman as less physically attractive than those who did not watch the show. The explanation for this is that by watching a television show featuring beautiful women, participants’ anchor points were altered enough to negatively affect the attractiveness ratings of women in general.

Applied to the TNA technique, a customer’s anchor point, used to determine compliance with the request, can be altered by the initial price of the product. Hence, after the experimenters offered a \$1.00 (anchor point) in the cupcake experiment (Burger, 1986), \$0.75 seemed like a better deal than if the original anchor point was \$0.75. Burger further supported this in experiment 5 of his study when experimenters told customers that the cupcakes were selling for either \$1.00 or for \$0.75. Those participants that were told the price of the cupcakes was \$1.00 estimated that the actual value of the cupcakes was higher than those who were told the price was \$0.75. It is important to note that perceptual contrast was not specifically measured but was instead inferred by the experiment.

If the perceptual contrast explanation accounts for the TNA effect, then manipulating the size of the initial offers will produce different levels of compliance and different perceptions regarding the offers. According to perceptual contrasts, a larger difference between the two offers will create a larger perceptual contrast. Hence, more compliance is expected when the difference between the offers is largest.

H1: If perceptual contrast (vs. reciprocal concessions, guilt, and negative affect) is the underlying theoretical mechanism of the TNA effect, then compliance should be highest in the large TNA conditions (regardless of negotiative message

element or prosocialness of the organization) compared to all other conditions. That is, there will be a main effect for size of the TNA condition on compliance. Therefore,  $1/4 (\mu_{15} + \mu_{16} + \mu_{25} + \mu_{26}) - 1/8 (\mu_{11} + \mu_{12} + \mu_{13} + \mu_{14} + \mu_{21} + \mu_{22} + \mu_{23} + \mu_{24}) > 0$  (see Figure 2.1 for cell indicators).

The perceptual contrast explanation is predicated on the idea that the large initial alters the anchor point by which the final offer is judged. Therefore, a larger initial offer should create a greater perceptual contrast, which would make the improved offer seem smaller. By measuring the perceived costliness of the final offer, this potential mediating process can be tested. Thus,

H1a: If perceptual contrast explanation (vs. reciprocal concessions, negative affect, and guilt) is the underlying theoretical mechanism of the TNA effect, then perceived costliness should be lowest in the large TNA conditions (regardless of negotiative message element or prosocialness of the organization) compared to all other conditions. That is, there will be a main effect for size of the TNA condition on perceived costliness. Therefore,  $1/4 (\mu_{15} + \mu_{16} + \mu_{25} + \mu_{26}) - 1/8 (\mu_{11} + \mu_{12} + \mu_{13} + \mu_{14} + \mu_{21} + \mu_{22} + \mu_{23} + \mu_{24}) > 0$ .

Similar to the idea that perceptual contrast makes the final TNA offer appear less costly, Pollock et al. argue that the TNA procedure acts as a peripheral cue that indicates a bargain. This is not inconsistent with the perceptual contrast explanation. In order to test this, perceptions of a bargain must be measured. Thus,

H1b: If perceptual contrast explanation (vs. reciprocal concessions, negative affect, and guilt) is the underlying theoretical mechanism of the TNA effect, then participants' perceptions of a bargain should be highest in the large TNA

conditions (regardless of negotiative message element or prosocialness of the organization) compared to all other conditions. That is, there will be a main effect for size of the TNA condition on perceived bargain. Therefore,  $1/4 (\mu_{15} + \mu_{16} + \mu_{25} + \mu_{26}) - 1/8 (\mu_{11} + \mu_{12} + \mu_{13} + \mu_{14} + \mu_{21} + \mu_{22} + \mu_{23} + \mu_{24}) > 0$ .

Figure 2.1: Cell Identification

	Control		Moderate TNA		Large TNA	
Negotiation Message	Prosocial 11	Not 12	Prosocial 13	Not 14	Prosocial 15	Not 16
No Negotiation message	21	22	23	24	25	26

### Reciprocal Concessions Explanation

Another theoretical mechanism provided to explain the TNA effect is the reciprocal concessions explanation (Burger, 1986). Termed the “norm of reciprocity”, Gouldner (1960) succinctly summarized the norm as, “You should give benefits to those who give you benefits” (p. 170). Such norms are presumed to benefit societies by encouraging individuals to share resources since, under the norm of reciprocity; those resources will be returned in some manner. The norm of reciprocity has been demonstrated in experimental research (e.g., Brehm & Cole, 1966; Regan, 1971) where participants who received a favor were more likely to return a favor, although not necessarily a favor of identical nature. Cialdini et al. (1975) argued that reciprocity extends beyond benefits and services to other types of social exchanges. Cialdini et al.

reasoned that a norm of reciprocal concessions benefits members of a society by encouraging compromise through mutual concessions.

The negotiation literature has provided several examples of reciprocal concessions. Chertkoff and Conley (1967) performed a negotiation experiment and found that the number of concessions by one participant in the study was positively related to concessions of the opponent. In another study of negotiation behavior, Komorita and Brenner (1968) had one group of participants in a negotiation situation initially propose an equitable price and refuse to deviate from that price throughout the negotiation; in the other conditions, the participants asked a very high price and gradually lowered the price throughout the negotiation. Komorita and Brenner concluded that failing to make concessions in a negotiation, even if the initial starting price is fair, is an ineffective strategy for reaching an agreement.

Cialdini et al. (1975) specifically tested the reciprocal concessions hypothesis with the DITF technique. In order to separate the reciprocal concessions from the perceptual contrast explanation, the researchers varied the conditions to parcel out the differences between the explanations. In the reciprocal concessions conditions, participants were asked to perform a large favor. When the request was rejected, a smaller request was made. In the perceptual contrast condition, the targets had the larger offer mentioned to them (but not actually made to them) before the smaller request was made. That is, participants were made aware of a larger offer before the smaller request was made. In the control condition, only the smaller request was made. The data were consistent with the reciprocal concessions explanation. It is noteworthy, however, that the

reciprocal concessions account was only supported when participants rejected the initial offer.

If the reciprocal concessions explanation is underlying process of the TNA effect, then manipulating the degree of negotiation present in the TNA tactic should produce noticeable effects in compliance and related perceptions (Burger, 1986). Burger attempted to manipulate negotiation in of the experiments in his initial study of the TNA procedure. Burger claimed that the TNA procedure “is effective because the requester is seen as negotiating on the purchase price” (1986, p. 282) but he has never tested this perception. Another perception crucial to the reciprocal concessions explanation is obligation to reciprocate the concession through compliance. Cialdini (2001) argued that in negotiation circumstances, participants feel “an obligation to make a concession to some who has made a concession to us” (p. 37). In the case of the TNA technique, reciprocation of the concession takes the form of compliance with the offer.

There are two problems with the TNA studies that have examined the reciprocal concessions explanation: the lack of statistically significant effects and the absence of perceptual dependent measures. First, Burger (1986) tested the reciprocal concessions account by creating negotiation TNA message and no negotiation TNA message conditions. In the negotiation TNA message condition, the confederate sellers told the participants that they were willing to reduce the price of the cupcakes because they wished to leave the sales booth for the day. In the no-negotiation TNA message condition, the participants were told that the initial cupcake price they were given was mistaken, at which point the price was reduced. Burger’s data indicated that the negotiation/no negotiation manipulation did not produce statistically different rates of



compliance for either TNA message. Hence, he concluded that the results were inconclusive. Second, Burger did not measure perceptions of the negotiation (i.e. an induction check) nor did Burger measure if participants perceived an obligation to comply with the request. The absence of these perceptual variables leaves Burger's study wanting.

Additionally, if the reciprocal concessions explanation is the theoretical mechanism behind the TNA effect, then the prosocialness of the organization using the TNA message should not impact compliance. In the negotiation literature, the reciprocal concessions account was supported even though the requests were not prosocial (Chertkoff & Conley, 1967; Komorita & Brenner, 1968). Further, Cialdini (2001) argued that the reciprocal concessions explanation is powerful because it works when attitudes toward the requesting organization are not positive. For example, Hari Krishnas had success in soliciting donations by handing out flowers to passersby, using the norm of reciprocity. Moreover, Hale and Laliker (1999) argued that the reciprocal concessions explanation works well with prosocial requests. Hence, if research testing the reciprocal concessions explanation has found support for the theory in both for-profit and prosocial applications, it stands to reason that prosocialness is an irrelevant factor for the reciprocal concessions explanation. Moreover, Gouldner (1960) does not present the norm of reciprocity as a conditional principle. Thus, it is predicted that the reciprocal concessions explanation will be effective in both prosocial and for-profit conditions of the TNA technique.

Finally, if the reciprocal concessions explanation is the mechanism underlying the TNA effect, then more compliance should be observed with larger concessions. Hale and

Laliker (1999) argued for the reciprocal concessions mechanism to be triggered, a concession must be large enough to reach participants' threshold of concession. Given that different participants will have varying thresholds of concession, larger concessions should increase the number of participants whose concession thresholds have been met (O'Keefe, 1999). Taken together:

H2: If the reciprocal concessions explanation (vs. perceptual contrast, guilt, and negative affect) is the underlying theoretical mechanism of the TNA effect, then compliance should be highest in the large TNA / negotiative message elements (regardless of the prosocialness of the organization) compared to all other conditions. That is, there will be a two way interaction between size of the TNA message and negotiative message elements on compliance. Therefore,  $1/2 (\mu_{15} + \mu_{16}) - 1/10 (\mu_{11} + \mu_{12} + \mu_{13} + \mu_{14} + \mu_{21} + \mu_{22} + \mu_{23} + \mu_{24} + \mu_{25} + \mu_{26}) > 0$ .

The mediating variable of interest regarding the reciprocal concessions explanations is feelings of obligation to comply by the target of the message. If the reciprocal concessions explanation is accurate, then the increased compliance described in H2 will be accompanied by increased feelings of obligation to comply with the request. Thus,

H2a: If reciprocal concessions explanation (vs. perceptual contrast, negative affect, and guilt) is the underlying theoretical mechanism of the TNA effect, then perceived obligation should be highest in the large TNA conditions that feature negotiative message elements (regardless of the prosocialness of the organization) compared to all other conditions. That is, there will be a two way interaction between size of the TNA message and negotiative message elements on perceived

obligation. Therefore,  $1/2 (\mu_{15} + \mu_{16}) - 1/10 (\mu_{11} + \mu_{12} + \mu_{13} + \mu_{14} + \mu_{21} + \mu_{22} + \mu_{23} + \mu_{24} + \mu_{25} + \mu_{26}) > 0$ .

### **Negative Affect and the Reverse TNA Effect**

In 1999, Burger et al. conducted a series of experiments intended to test some of the limiting conditions of the TNA effect. In order for the TNA technique to be successfully utilized by practitioners, it is important to understand what factors reduce its effectiveness. Pollock et al. (1998) suggested that the TNA effect is limited by mindful processing of the message, but Burger et al. found an additional limiting factor. Their data indicated that when TNA messages used a large initial offer, there was a decrease in compliance compared to the control offers, leading Burger et al. to conclude that when TNA messages have a large initial request, a “reverse TNA effect” is created. Burger et al. suggested that a large initial request might invoke “suspicion, anger, annoyance, and dislike” (p. 248) which would lead to lower rates of compliance compared to a more moderate initial request TNA. Importantly, the negative affect account proposed by Burger et al. to explain the reverse TNA effect is inconsistent with the perceptual contrast explanation originally offered by Burger (1986) to explain the TNA effect. According to this account, the negative affect felt toward the requestor or sales situation overcomes the perceptual contrast that occurs when a large offer is improved. Thus,

H3: If the negative affect explanation (vs. perceptual contrast, reciprocal concessions, and guilt) is the underlying theoretical mechanism of the TNA and reverse TNA effects, then compliance should be highest in the moderate TNA conditions (regardless of negotiative message element or prosocialness of the organization) compared to all other conditions. That is, there will be a curvilinear

impact of the size of the TNA message on compliance. Therefore,  $1/4 (\mu_{13} + \mu_{14} + \mu_{23} + \mu_{24}) - 1/8 (\mu_{11} + \mu_{12} + \mu_{21} + \mu_{22} + \mu_{15} + \mu_{16} + \mu_{25} + \mu_{26}) > 0$ .

Yet, affect has not been measured in any of the previous TNA studies. Central to explaining the reverse TNA effect is to isolate the conditions that produce negative feelings in the message target. Burger et al.'s (1999) negative affect account identifies large initial request TNA messages as the cause of negative affect and hence, lower compliance rates. Thus,

H3a: If the negative affect explanation (vs. perceptual contrast, reciprocal concessions, and guilt) is the underlying theoretical mechanism of the TNA and reverse TNA effects, then anger should be highest in the large TNA conditions (regardless of negotiative message element or prosocialness of the organization) compared to all other conditions. That is, there will be a main effect for size of the TNA message on anger. Therefore,  $1/4 (\mu_{15} + \mu_{16} + \mu_{25} + \mu_{26}) - 1/8 (\mu_{11} + \mu_{12} + \mu_{13} + \mu_{14} + \mu_{21} + \mu_{22} + \mu_{23} + \mu_{24}) > 0$ .

### **Anticipated Guilt Explanation**

Anticipated guilt has been a recent theoretical explanation in the sequential request literature (O'Keefe & Figge, 1997, 1999). Although it has not been forwarded to directly explain the TNA effect, there are two reasons to study it in this dissertation. First, the message similarities of the reduced price version of the TNA message and the DITF technique have been clearly articulated. Second, all of the studies testing the TNA procedure have been conducted for prosocial causes/organizations. It is possible, as that the TNA effect is limited to prosocial messages (Burger et al., 1999), which would include anticipated guilt as, at the very least, a moderating variable.

People experience guilt when they behave in a manner that is incongruent with their perceptions of appropriate conduct (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994). Researchers that have induced participants to feel guilty have found that participants report a greater likelihood of performing helpful acts (Darlington & Macker, 1966; Wallace & Sadalla, 1966). Given that guilt drives behavior change, it might be that persons perceive that they will feel guilt in the future if they refuse to comply. Termed “anticipated guilt,” O’Keefe and Figge (1997, 1999) argued that participants will comply with requests in order to avoid the guilt that they expect to feel if they reject a request. O’Keefe and Figge (1999) demonstrated that participants feel more guilt after rejecting an offer that would benefit a prosocial cause than after rejecting an offer that would benefit a for-profit organization. Their data indicated that participants are motivated to comply with the target (second) request in DITF messages because they expect that compliance will reduce guilt.

Related to the TNA procedure, since all of the previous studies have been conducted in prosocial contexts, it is possible that compliance is a function of anticipated guilt. Until the TNA procedure is tested in a for-profit context, and anticipated guilt is measured, the role of guilt in the TNA effect will remain elusive. Furthermore, it is unknown how additional message factors tested with the TNA, such as initial request size and negotiation might impact feelings of anticipated guilt.

It is possible that both initial request size and negotiative message elements also play a role in increasing guilt, and hence, increasing compliance, with the TNA technique. If Gouldner (1960) is correct, then the norm of reciprocity is an accepted societal norm. Given that guilt is caused by failure to act in accordance with norms, it

follows that anticipating a failure to follow established norm will cause guilt. Additionally, a large price reduction (with a prosocial request) should increase the anticipated guilt associated with rejecting the offer because the source is offering the message target a dramatically improved deal to enable them to comply with the prosocial request. Thus,

H4: If the anticipated guilt explanation (vs. perceptual contrast, reciprocal concessions, and negative affect) is the underlying theoretical mechanism of the TNA effect, then compliance should be highest in the large TNA condition with negotiative message elements for the prosocial organization compared to all other conditions. That is, there will be a three way interaction between size of the TNA request, negotiative message element, and prosocialness of the organization on compliance. Therefore,  $1/2 (\mu_{15}) - 1/20 (\mu_{11} + \mu_{12} + \mu_{13} + \mu_{14} + \mu_{16} + \mu_{21} + \mu_{22} + \mu_{23} + \mu_{24} + \mu_{25} + \mu_{26}) > 0$ .

If the three-way interaction does produce the most compliance, the guilt explanation would be supported by finding the most guilt in that cell. Thus,

H4a: If the guilt explanation (vs. perceptual contrast, reciprocal concessions, and negative affect) is the underlying theoretical mechanism of the TNA effect, then anticipated guilt should be highest in the large TNA condition with negotiative message elements for the prosocial organization compared to all other conditions. That is, there will be a three way interaction between size of the TNA request, negotiative message element, and prosocialness of the organization on anticipated guilt. Therefore,  $1/2 (\mu_{15}) - 1/22 (\mu_{11} + \mu_{12} + \mu_{13} + \mu_{14} + \mu_{16} + \mu_{21} + \mu_{22} + \mu_{23} + \mu_{24} + \mu_{25} + \mu_{26}) > 0$ .

## **Chapter 3:**

### **Testing the Hypotheses**

Chapter 3 contains the results of two separate experiments conducted to test the hypotheses. Study 1 and Study 2 will be presented in order. First, the method is detailed. Second, the results are presented. Third, the implications for scholars and practitioners are discussed. Fourth, the limitations are noted. Finally, future directions for research are offered.

#### **METHOD OF STUDY 1: TELEMARKETING EXPERIMENT**

##### **Overview**

The purpose of Study 1 was to replicate a portion of Burger et al.'s (1999) TNA experiment while examining potential moderators and mediators of the TNA effect. To that end, participants were called on telephone and given one of twelve different sales messages featuring varying message elements pertaining to the independent variables: TNA request size, negotiation, and prosocialness of the sales organization. After the "sale" concluded, the participants were asked about their impressions of the message, thereby testing the hypotheses concerning mediators of the TNA effect.

##### **Participants**

A total of 296 participants completed the study. Participants were students enrolled at a large East Coast University. A random list of 8,000 students was provided to the author by the University registrar, and the author divided one fourth of the list of participants among the seven original research assistants. Additional lists were provided to the other research assistants in packets of 200. In total, 2,978 participants were called

from that list to take part in the study. Research participants were instructed to attempt to reach each participant, calling a total of five times if necessary. If the participant could not be reached after five attempts, that number was labeled “unreachable” and no further attempt to contact that particular participant was made. Of the 2,978 participants called, 807 (27.10%) were reached. Of those contacted, 63.33% either hung up before the sales message was finished, said no and hung up, or responded and then refused to answer questions. Those participants were not included in the analysis. The mean age of the participants at the time of the study was approximately 20 years of age ( $SD = 4.07$ ), ranging from 18 to 61 years of age. Regarding the gender of the sample, slightly less than half were male (47%).

### **Design**

A 3 (request type: large initial request TNA, moderate initial request TNA, control) X 2 (negotiation vs. no negotiation) X 2 (prosocial vs. commercial beneficiary) independent groups design was utilized in Study 1.

### **Procedure**

After reviewing the experiment training manual (see Appendix A) and completing practice script readings to the satisfaction of the author, research assistants were given several hundred names provided from a random sample of the University population provided to the author by the University Registrar. The 12 research assistants<sup>4</sup> all females

---

<sup>4</sup> Five additional research assistants were recruited approximately two weeks into the data collection period. The slow pace of data collection required additional research assistants in order to complete the Study before the end of the semester.



approximately 21 years of age, were instructed to call the potential participants and attempt to deliver one of twelve sales messages (see Appendix B for a complete listing of all of the messages). In order to ensure randomization and equal numbers of the messages (to ensure equality in cell sizes) the messages were contained on the questionnaires, randomized and counterbalanced. This randomized stack of questionnaires was split between the callers. Callers were instructed to deliver whatever message was on the questionnaire.

The messages contained different combinations of independent variable manipulations. After delivering the sales message and noting whether the participant agreed to buy the coffee cups, the research assistants asked the participant to answer a few questions about their perceptions of the sales message (see the items assessing the dependent variables below). This was done in order to check the manipulations as well as to test potential mediators of compliance. Only participants who completed the questions following the experimental message were included in the final analysis for Study 1.

### **Instrumentation**

Prior to conducting the experiment, two pretests were conducted. The first pretest was conducted to determine the price of the product as well as the organization selling the product in the experimental conditions, and the second pretest was used to examine the unidimensionality of the measures as well as the feasibility of the procedure.

***Pretest 1.*** In Pretest 1, participants were asked to imagine that they were called on the phone and asked to buy a coffee cup with some version of the University logo. Participants read a list of coffee cup prices rated each for how expensive they felt each price was as well as their willingness to purchase a cup at each price. Next, participants

were asked to imagine that one of a variety of organizations was selling the coffee cups. They read a list of organizations and rated each organization in terms of prosocialness (vs. profit-orientation). All ratings were made on 7-point, Likert-type indices, where higher numbers correspond to higher levels of the variables.

A total of 42 participants completed Pretest 1. The average age of the participants at the time of the pretest was approximately 19 years of age ( $SD = 1.06$ ), ranging from 18 to 22 years of age. There were approximately an equal number of males and females in the sample, with 45% being men. The results of Pretest 1 indicated that participants perceived \$15 as a highly priced cup ( $M = 5.77$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ), \$7 as a moderately priced cup ( $M = 3.74$ ,  $SD = 1.20$ ), and \$3 as an inexpensive price ( $M = 1.95$ ,  $SD = 1.21$ ) for a coffee cup bearing a University logo. Consistent with the price results, participants reported that they were most willing to purchase the \$3 coffee cup ( $M = 5.67$ ,  $SD = 1.28$ ), followed by the \$7 coffee cup ( $M = 3.79$ ,  $SD = 1.90$ ), and the \$15 coffee cup ( $M = 2.21$ ,  $SD = 1.28$ ). Finally, participants rated several organizations in terms of their prosocialness, which was measured by an index comprised of questions about: (1) how prosocial vs. profit-oriented each organization was; (2) how helpful vs. not helpful to society each organizations was; and (3) whether the profits from sales would be used to benefit others vs. benefit management. Those three questions were combined to create a prosocialness index for each organization. Results indicated that “Terps for Underprivileged Kids” was perceived as most prosocial ( $M = 6.00$ ,  $SD = 1.53$ ), and the “CoffeeMax Corporation” was perceived as least prosocial ( $M = 1.60$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ).

**Pretest 2.** A second pretest was conducted with 33 participants, of which 31% were male. The average age of the participants at the time of the pretest was 20 years of

age (SD = 1.21), ranging from 19 to 22 years of age. The purpose of Pretest 2 was to examine the reliability and validity of the questionnaire, as well as to test the experimental design for collecting data. During Pretest 2, interviews with participants indicated that they were unwilling to answer a large amount questions over the phone after receiving a sales message. Mock experimental procedures determined that participants were opposed to answering any questionnaire that would take longer than 2-3 minutes. Given that the experimental message induction took approximately 20 seconds, it was determined that one item per variable would be used in order to conduct the study with the student sample available. Because one-item measures were used, further interviews were conducted with students to determine which items had the most face validity for the constructs being measured. These interviews were consistent with the survey data collected in Pretest 2 (see dependent variable section below for specific questions used to measure variables).

Moreover, due to concern over the inability to examine reliability or internal consistency with one-item scales, confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted on each dependent variable using Equations (EQS; Bentler, 1995) in order to have confidence that the measures were unidimensional. The correlation matrix for each index was analyzed using maximum likelihood procedure. The model chi-square test was used as the primary indicator of model fit, as a matter of convention. However, given that the chi-square test is overly sensitive, especially with large samples; two alternative fit criteria were used when the chi-square was statistically significant: Bentler's comparative fit index (CFI) and the standardized root mean-square residual (SRMR), as recommended by Hu and Benter (1999). They argued that utilizing joint criteria,  $CFI \geq .96$  and SRMR

$\leq .10$ , helps to minimize the dual threats of rejecting the correct model and retaining the wrong one.

Two indices were used to assess manipulations of the independent variables. The chi square test on the four items used to assess the prosocialness of the organization indicated that the items formed a single solution,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 33) = 4.36, p = .35$ . The chi square test for the measure of perception of negotiation was statistically significant,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 33) = 44.21, p < .01$ . However, the measure of negotiation exceeded Hu and Bentler's (1999) alternative criteria for model fit, CFI = .97 and SRMR = .05.

CFAs were also performed on the five indices were used to measure the main independent variables. The four items developed by O'Keefe and Figge (1997) to assess anticipated guilt formed a single solution,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 33) = 1.20, p = .55$ . The chi square test on the four items used to assess perceived negative affect was significant,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 33) = 11.17, p < .05$ . However, the measure of negative affect exceed Hu and Bentler's (1999) alternative criteria for model fit, CFI = .98 and SRMR = .03. Similarly, the chi square test on the measure of perceived obligation was significant,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 33) = 30.7, p < .01$ , but the four items exceeded the alternative fit criteria, CFI = .97 and SRMR = .03. Additionally, the chi square test on perceptions of a bargain was significant,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 33) = 19.48, p < .01$ , but the measure surpassed the alternative fit criteria, CFI = .99 and SRMR = .02. Finally, chi square for the five items used to assess the perceived costliness was significant,  $\chi^2 (5, N = 33) = 72.28, p < .01$ . The CFI and SRMR did not exceed the alternative fit criteria. The item "that was a cheap price for a coffee cup" was dropped from the index, which improved the fit. The chi square test on the four-item measure was still significant,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 33) = 11.79, p < .01$ , but the revised measure exceed the

alternative fit criteria, CFI = .97 and SRMR = .04. Hence, the measures were judged to be unidimensional, and one item was selected from each measure to be used in Study 1. Altogether, the items selected to be used in the final experiment were deemed to have face validity.

### **Experimental Inductions**

Based on the pre-test data, the final messages were developed and are as follows:

***Request conditions.*** In the large initial request TNA condition, the speaker said, “These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$15.” In the moderate initial request TNA condition, the speaker said, “These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$7.” In the control condition, the speaker said, “These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$3.” The control price was also delivered in the TNA conditions after the initial price was offered, but the transition between initial request and control request was buffered by a message from the negotiation condition.

***Negotiation conditions.*** The negotiation message was delivered after the initial request (in the TNA conditions) but before the target request was made. In the negotiation condition, the speaker said, “But wait - for this special promotion, only for University of Maryland students, we’re selling the cups for...” At that point, the target message was delivered. In the no negotiation condition, the speaker said, “wait a second [then the experimenter paused, as if talking to a supervisor]...my supervisor says that these cups are on sale for...” At that point, the target message was delivered.

***Prosocial/Commercial conditions.*** In the prosocial condition, the source explained that all proceeds from the coffee cup sales will benefit “Terps for Underprivileged Kids,” which is “a University organization that provides books and

tutors for kids who don't have the financial resources to reach their education potential.” In the commercial condition, the source explained that the organization benefiting from the coffee cup sales was “the CoffeeMax Corporation,” which is “a retailer of coffee products.”

### **DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

In order to minimize the intrusiveness of the questionnaire, one-items measures were used to assess the dependent variables. Excluding compliance, all one item measures were seven-point, Likert-type scales bounded by “not at all” and “very much so.” Lower scores indicate lower agreement with the concept.

***Compliance.*** A one-item dichotomous question measured compliance with the offer (“would you be interested in purchasing a cup?”). Additionally, if the participant agreed to buy the coffee cups, they were asked what style and color they would like to keep up the appearance of an actual sales transaction.

***Anger.*** In order to explain the reverse TNA effect, Burger et al. (1999) suggested that large TNA requests create anger toward the requestor. In order to test this explanation, the question, “did the sales message make you angry?” was posed to the participants ( $M = 1.86, SD = 1.48$ ).

***Perceived Guilt.*** One item from O’Keefe and Figge’s (1999) expected guilt scale was used to examine if the participants believed that they would have felt guilty if they chosen not to comply. Participants were told to “imagine that you haven’t decided whether or not to purchase the coffee cup. Think about how you would *expect* to feel if you rejected the offer” ( $M = 2.95, SD = 1.97$ ).

**Perceived Request Size.** Burger's (1986) perceptual contrast explanation for the TNA effect assumes that the initial price creates an anchor point that makes a subsequent offer appear better than it might be perceived alone. To test this, the question, "did you think the price of the coffee cup was expensive?" was asked of the participants ( $M = 2.20$ ,  $SD = 1.47$ ).

**Perceived Obligation.** The reciprocal concessions explanation of the TNA effect predicts that the perceived concession made by the requestor creates a sense of obligation to reciprocate and comply with the request. Perceived obligation was measured using the item, "did you feel obligated to buy the coffee cup?" ( $M = 2.26$ ,  $SD = 1.68$ ).

**Perceived Bargain.** In order to test whether the TNA messages create a perception of a bargain compared to the control condition, the participants were asked, "did you feel like the offer was a bargain?" ( $M = 4.11$ ,  $SD = 1.95$ ).

### **Data Analysis**

Logistical regression analysis was used to test the compliance hypotheses, and ANOVA was used to test the mediating hypotheses<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> Whenever ANOVA is used in multiple tests, the issue of family-wise error adjustment inevitably arises. In this dissertation, no family-wise error adjustments were made and ANOVA was used over MANOVA. This was done for four primary reasons. First, convention dictates that planned comparisons, as opposed to post hoc comparisons, are exempt from adjustment practices (Keppel & Zedeck, 1989). Second, correcting substantially reduces power. Given that Type II errors are more common than Type I errors, this is equivalent to a cure being worse than the disease. Third, the null is almost never false. In a two-tailed test, the null is almost literally never true. Fourth, MANOVA was not used because it would increase the number of tests used and the

## **RESULTS**

### **Data Screening**

As recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), the data were screened prior to the analyses. In order to detect any out of range values, univariate descriptive statistics were examined for all of the variables in the study. Additionally, random surveys were rechecked to ensure valid data entry. Data screening revealed no problems.

### **Testing ANOVA Assumptions**

To analyze these data, ANOVAs were utilized to examine the data for any potential main or interaction effects, as predicted. ANOVA rests on three major assumptions: independence of observation, homogeneity of variance, and that the dependent variable(s) is normally distributed for each of the experimental cells. To control for independence of observation, an independent groups factorial design was utilized. To test the assumption of homogeneity of variance,  $F_{\max}$  tests were calculated for all continuous dependent variables (the two manipulation check variables and five main dependent variables).  $F_{\max}$  compares the variance between the cell with the largest variance and the cell with the smallest variance and computes a ratio. If the sample has relatively equal cell sizes, an  $F_{\max}$  of 10 or less is acceptable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). For this sample, the  $F_{\max}$  for the dependent variable of perceived organization prosocialness was 5.65, perceived anger was 5.47, anticipated guilt was 2.18, perceived costliness was 5.63, perceived obligation was 3.63, perceived negotiation was 6.36, and

---

dependent variables are not hypothesized to be related to one another. Each dependent variable is related to a specific explanation.



perceived bargain was 1.56. Because this sample had relatively equal cell sizes and the calculated values were all under 10, the homogeneity of variance assumption was not violated. Finally, to test the normality of the distribution for each dependent variable across each cell, skewness and kurtosis were calculated. For perceived organization prosocialness, skewness was .48 and kurtosis was -1.24. For perceived anger, skewness was 1.70 and kurtosis was 1.75. For perceived anticipated guilt, skewness was .54 and kurtosis was -1.05. For perceived costliness, skewness was 1.14 and kurtosis was .49. For perceived obligation, skewness was 1.19 and kurtosis was .35. For perceived negotiation, skewness was .99 and kurtosis was -.20. Finally, for perceived bargain, skewness was -.1 and kurtosis was -1.1. Green and Salkind (2003) state that for cell sizes with over 15 participants, non-normality of distribution will still yield accurate  $p$  values. In this study, there were approximately 25 participants in each group. Therefore, the  $p$  values reported in the results section should be accurate even though the normality of distribution assumption was violated. Thus, data analysis proceeded with the univariate tests.

### **Manipulation Checks**

Manipulation checks were conducted to assess the effectiveness of the negotiation and prosocial organization manipulations. One-way ANOVAs were conducted for each of the two independent variables described above and their respective manipulation measures. Results of the ANOVA revealed that the negotiation message element condition was perceived as more negotiative ( $M = 2.66$ ,  $SD = 1.81$ ) than the no negotiation condition ( $M = 2.13$ ,  $SD = 1.81$ ),  $F [1, 294] = 7.02$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .02$ . Likewise, the organization prosocialness manipulations were successful. Participants rated “Terps for Underprivileged Kids” as significantly more prosocial ( $M = 6.09$ ,  $SD =$

1.40) than the “CoffeeMax” ( $M = 3.56$ ,  $SD = 2.07$ ),  $F [1, 295] = 149.945$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .34$ . Although the perception of negotiation is small, the inductions were deemed effective.

### **Testing Hypotheses**

***Perceptual Contrast and Compliance.*** H1 predicts that there will be a linear trend for compliance as a function of the size of the TNA message, meaning that the large TNA conditions should yield greater compliance than the moderate TNA conditions, which should yield greater compliance than the control condition. H1 was tested with planned comparisons in logistic regression. The predicted contrasts were not consistent with the data,  $\chi^2 = 0.44$ , *n.s.* The control conditions (30.61%) were not significantly different than the moderate TNA (34.04%) or the large TNA (34.62%) conditions. Hence, H1 was not supported (see Table 3.1 for a summary of the dependent variable scores for each experimental condition).

***Perceptual Contrast and Perceived Costliness.*** H1a predicts that there will be a linear trend for perceived costliness as a function of the size of the TNA message, meaning that participants in the large TNA conditions should perceive the cups to be less costly than the participants in the moderate TNA conditions, which should perceive the cups to be less costly than those in the control condition. H1a was tested with planned comparisons in ANOVA. The data were not consistent with the planned contrasts predicted by H1a. In fact, the results were nearly significant in the opposite direction as participants in the control conditions ( $M = 1.98$ ,  $SD = 1.35$ ) found the cups less expensive than those in the moderate TNA conditions ( $M = 2.24$ ,  $SD = 1.37$ ) or those in the large

TNA conditions ( $M = 2.37$ ,  $SD = 1.64$ ),  $F [1, 292] = 3.51$ ,  $p = .06$ . Hence, H1a was not supported.

***Perceptual Contrast and Perceived Bargain.*** H1b predicts that there will be a linear trend for perceived bargain as a function of the size of the TNA message, meaning that participants in the large TNA conditions should perceive the cups to be a better bargain than the participants in the moderate TNA conditions, which should perceive that they were receiving more of a bargain than those in the control condition. H1 was tested with planned comparisons in ANOVA. Although the means were in the predicted direction, as participants in the control conditions ( $M = 3.94$ ,  $SD = 2.08$ ) perceived less of a bargain than those in the moderate TNA conditions ( $M = 4.05$ ,  $SD = 1.78$ ) and large TNA conditions ( $M = 4.33$ ,  $SD = 1.96$ ), the contrasts were not statistically significant,  $F [1, 294] = 2.00$ , *n.s.* Hence, H1b was not supported. In sum, the data did not lend strong support to the perceptual contrasts explanation. The mediating processes failed, but the scores for perceived bargain trended in the predicted pattern. The main problem with the perceptual contrast explanation is the lack of a statistically significant TNA effect. It should be noted that the trend for compliance rates were slightly larger in TNA conditions than in the control conditions, but again, not at statistically significant levels. To the extent that the non-significant trends for perceived bargain and compliance are acknowledged, there is at least partial support for the perceptual contrast explanation.

***Reciprocal Concessions and Compliance.*** H2 predicts that there will be a two-way interaction between TNA size and negotiative message element, in that compliance will be highest when negotiation is present and the large TNA message is

Table 3.1: Means and Standard Deviations for Key Variables across All Experimental Conditions in Study 1.

		Prosocial						Commercial					
		Control		Moderate TNA		Large TNA		Control		Moderate TNA		Large TNA	
		NGTN	NO NGTN	NGTN	NO NGTN	NGTN	NO NGTN	NGTN	NO NGTN	NGTN	NO NGTN	NGTN	NO NGTN
Compliance		37.50%	28.00%	31.82%	44.44%	52.17%	27.27%	31.82%	25.93%	28.57%	29.17%	29.03%	32.14%
Obligation	<i>M</i>	2.25	2.48	2.82	2.96	2.13	2.91	2.05	1.92	2.00	1.67	2.35	1.68
	<i>SD</i>	1.57	2.00	1.84	1.93	1.49	1.60	1.68	1.63	1.64	1.27	1.89	1.06
Costliness	<i>M</i>	2.00	2.00	1.64	2.74	2.17	2.55	1.86	2.04	2.05	2.42	2.42	2.32
	<i>SD</i>	1.32	1.63	0.80	1.61	1.87	1.84	1.08	1.34	1.16	1.47	1.48	1.52
Negative Affect	<i>M</i>	1.33	1.36	1.50	1.85	1.43	1.68	1.68	1.70	2.38	2.13	2.42	2.57
	<i>SD</i>	0.87	0.99	0.86	1.59	1.04	1.25	1.04	1.46	2.04	1.60	1.65	2.06
Negotiation	<i>M</i>	2.04	1.68	2.73	2.59	3.04	2.50	2.59	1.44	2.14	1.83	3.19	2.71
	<i>SD</i>	1.63	1.07	1.72	1.47	2.06	1.90	1.82	0.85	1.71	1.40	1.78	2.14
Bargain	<i>M</i>	4.54	3.64	4.50	4.44	4.48	4.09	3.95	3.67	4.05	3.17	4.32	4.39
	<i>SD</i>	1.84	2.34	1.68	1.87	2.27	1.93	2.15	1.98	1.75	1.59	1.89	1.89
Guilt	<i>M</i>	3.67	3.52	3.41	4.22	3.39	3.95	2.77	2.26	1.95	2.04	2.42	2.00
	<i>SD</i>	2.20	1.87	1.94	1.97	2.08	1.96	1.85	1.79	1.77	1.23	1.82	1.49
Prosocialness	<i>M</i>	6.42	5.92	6.27	5.52	6.43	6.09	4.14	4.04	3.62	3.04	3.45	3.14
	<i>SD</i>	1.28	1.61	0.98	1.83	1.04	1.23	2.34	2.05	2.09	1.68	2.20	1.99

*Note.* NGTN = Negotiation condition, NO NGTN = No Negotiation condition. All indices are seven-point Likert-type scales, where higher numbers indicate greater amounts of that variable.

used. The contrast test did not support this,  $\chi^2 = 1.16$ , *n.s.* The results were inconsistent with the reciprocal concessions hypothesis (H2).

***Reciprocal Concessions and Perceived Obligation.*** H2a predicts that there will be a two-way interaction between size of the TNA request and negotiative message element, increasing perceived obligation to comply when negotiation and large TNA are used together. The data were not consistent with the planned contrasts,  $F [1, 295] = 0.27$ , *n.s.* Therefore, H2a was not supported. In sum, the data provided no support for the reciprocal concessions explanation. The compliance data were not in the predicted directions and the perceptions of obligation were also not in the direction predicted. Perceived obligation was not higher with large initial offer TNA messages are coupled with negotiation messages. The reciprocal concessions explanation clearly did not receive support in Study 1.

***Reverse TNA and Compliance.*** H3 predicts that there will be a curvilinear relationship between TNA request size and compliance. The highest compliance was expected in the moderate TNA condition. The contrasts revealed no curvilinear effect for compliance,  $\chi^2 = 0.04$ , *n.s.*, as the moderate TNA conditions (34.04%) did not produce higher compliance rates than the large TNA conditions (34.62%). Therefore, the results were inconsistent with H3.

***Reverse TNA and Anger.*** H3a predicts that anger will be highest in the large TNA request condition. H3a was tested with planned contrasts, which revealed no significant difference between the control requests ( $M = 1.52$ ,  $SD = 1.12$ ) moderate TNA requests ( $M = 1.96$ ,  $SD = 1.57$ ) and large TNA requests ( $M = 2.08$ ,  $SD = 1.63$ ) in terms of anger,  $F [1, 294] = 0.71$ , *n.s.* Hence, H3a was not supported. In sum, the data in Study 1

provided no support for the reverse TNA effect or the predicted increase in negative affect as the size of the initial offer increases. The reverse TNA explanation failed in Study 1.

***Anticipated Guilt and Compliance.*** H4 predicts that there will be a three-way interaction between negotiation, TNA request size and prosocialness of the organization selling coffee cups in that compliance is highest in those conditions. H4 was tested with planned comparisons, which revealed significantly more compliance in the large TNA, negotiation, and prosocialness condition compared to the others,  $\chi^2 = 4.00, p < .05$ . Indeed, compliance was highest in the large TNA, negotiation, prosocial organization condition (52.17%), which is almost 10% more than the next highest (44.44%) in the moderate TNA, no negotiation, prosocial condition, and approximately 20% higher than any other condition. Hence, H4 was supported. From these results, it appears that compliance rates are highest when large initial request TNA messages are used in conjunction with negotiative message elements for prosocial organizations.

***Perceived Anticipated Guilt.*** H4a predicts that perceptions of anticipated guilt will be highest when TNA request size, negotiation, and prosocialness interact, resulting in higher guilt in the large TNA, negotiation, prosocial condition. Planned comparisons were used to test this hypothesis. The contrasts for the three-way interaction were not significant,  $F(1, 294) = 1.34, n.s.$  However, guilt was highest in the moderate ( $M = 3.86, SD = 1.98$ ) and large ( $M = 3.66, SD = 2.02$ ) TNA conditions for the prosocial organization, which is a two-way interaction,  $F(1, 294) = 7.56, p < .01, \eta^2 = .02$ . Hence, H4a was partially supported. In sum, the anticipated guilt explanation matched the data better than the other explanations. Compliance was highest in the large initial request

TNA condition, with negotiation message and for a prosocial organization. Furthermore, participants in the moderate and large initial TNA conditions and prosocial conditions reported the most anticipated guilt.

## **DISCUSSION OF STUDY 1**

Dating back to the first TNA study published in 1986, researchers have proposed a number of explanations for the effectiveness of the TNA procedure and, in the most recent case, the limiting conditions of the TNA (i.e. the “reverse TNA”). Regardless of the efforts scholars have put into labeling the theoretical underpinnings of the TNA, conflicting findings and a general failure to directly test the proposed explanations have left questions of theoretical and practical import unresolved. The purpose of Study 1; therefore, was to test the possible moderators and mediators (that is, pitting the extant theories against each other) explaining the TNA in a direct replication of Burger et al (1999). To test these explanations, three independent variables were manipulated: size of initial TNA request, presence of negotiative message element, and prosocialness of the organization making the request. Four theoretical explanations were tested against one another: the perceptual contrast explanation, the reciprocal concessions explanation, the reverse TNA and anger explanation, and the perceived guilt explanation. Each of the four theoretical mechanisms makes specific predictions about the conditions that should lead to the greatest compliance. Additionally, each of the four explanations assumes that a specific cognitive or affective variable mediates the relationship between the message and compliance. In the following sections, the results of Study 1 will be discussed, implications of those findings for scholars and practitioners will be detailed, limitations of Study 1 noted, and directions for future research will be offered.

## **DISCUSSION OF THE MAIN FINDINGS**

*No TNA effect.* The most striking result of Study 1 was the lack of a statistically significant TNA effect. The moderate initial TNA conditions and large initial TNA conditions both yielded compliance rates averaging 34%, whereas the control conditions yielded approximately 30% compliance. Although compliance was higher in the TNA conditions, it was not statistically significant,  $p = .35$ . Clearly, the lack of a statistically significant TNA effect is problematic for most of the hypotheses; however, there are several important findings to note from Study 1, encompassing both the supported and unsupported hypotheses. Primarily, there was not an overall TNA effect, but the TNA technique did work for prosocial organizations.

*Perceptual Contrast vs. Reverse TNA Effect.* The theoretical explanations purported to account for the TNA research results are not necessarily incompatible; however, the perceptual contrast and reverse TNA explanations are two such discordant hypotheses. Specifically, these explanations make contradictory predictions about the outcomes of large initial request TNA messages. The perceptual contrast explanation maintains that the TNA effect is caused by comparing the smaller target offer to the larger initial offer, meaning that a larger difference between the initial offer and the target offer should lead to more compliance. However, if the data are consistent with a reverse TNA effect then a large initial offer will be offensive to message receivers, resulting in lower compliance in the large initial TNA request conditions. Although the results of Study 1 failed to conclusively support either theoretical explanation, the data are more consistent with the perceptual contrast account.



There was a non-statistically significant trend for compliance rates such that the TNA conditions had slightly more compliance than the control conditions. The price contrast was the only difference between the TNA conditions and the control conditions, leading to the conclusion that the price contrast played a role in this trend. However, the lack of a statistically significant TNA effect seriously undermines the perceptual contrast explanation in Study 1.

There is an additional problem with the perceptual contrast explanation, at least as it has been conceived by Burger (1986), because Burger contended that a larger initial offer shifts the anchor point about the value of the product. Accordingly, the perceptual contrast account predicts that a larger initial offer will shift the anchor point regarding the value of the cup, making the improved offer seem less costly by comparison. These data do not support this contention. First, the differences between the mean scores of perceived costliness were not different at a statistically significant level. Second, the means for perceived costliness were in the opposite direction of the perceptual contrast predictions. Clearly, the participants in Study 1 did not perceive the coffee cup to be less costly as the initial request size increased.

A second mediating relationship examined with the perceptual contrast account was the perceived bargain explanation. Pollock et al. (1998) reasoned that the TNA technique signals a bargain to message receivers. Consistent with the rationale behind the perceptual contrast account, it was predicted that larger contrasts would create a greater perceptions of a bargain. The data from study 1 failed to support this hypothesis also. The means were in the predicted direction, as participants in the large TNA conditions ( $M = 4.33$ ,  $SD = 1.97$ ) perceived a better bargain than those in the moderate TNA conditions

( $M = 4.05$ ,  $SD = 1.78$ ), which perceived a slightly better bargain than the control conditions ( $M = 3.94$ ,  $SD = 2.08$ ), but the difference was not statistically significant,  $p = .15$ . In general, the participants in all of the conditions perceived the offers to be above the midpoint in terms of a perceived bargain

Unlike the perceptual contrast explanation, the data unequivocally failed to support Burger et al.'s account for the reverse TNA effect. Since the large initial TNA conditions did not decrease compliance compared to the control conditions, the results of Study 1 failed to find any evidence of the reverse TNA effect. This finding directly contradicts Burger et al.'s coffee cup compliance experiments, which were also conducted over the telephone. Whereas Burger et al. found that large initial requests decreased compliance compared to the control requests, the present study found no decrease whatsoever. Burger et al. suggested that a large initial request angered the participants, thereby decreasing compliance. Unlike the Burger et al. experiments, the present study measured anger. Although anger increased from the control conditions to the TNA conditions, the contrast specifying the most anger in the large initial TNA request conditions was not supported. Perceived anger was not significantly different from the moderate to large initial request conditions. So it does not appear to be the case that the large TNA requests created more anger in the participants of Study 1. Perhaps the participants in the Burger et al. experiments were easily offended by large initial prices, or are particularly sensitive to large initial offers.

***Reciprocal Concessions.*** The reciprocal concessions explanation, along with perceptual contrast, reflects Burger's (1986) original thinking about the theoretical underpinnings of the TNA procedure. Unlike the perceptual contrast explanation, though,

there were no trends in the Study 1 data consistent with the reciprocal concessions explanation. Despite the assumption of the reciprocal concessions explanation that the appearance of a negotiation increases a sense of obligation to comply with the request, the results of Study 1 indicate that this assumption is erroneous in explaining the TNA effect. The manipulation check confirmed that the negotiation conditions were perceived as more negotiative than the non-negotiation conditions; however, this had no distinguishable impact on compliance or on feelings of obligation to comply with the request.

Perhaps this is not surprising when one considers the nature of the TNA technique compared to the DITF procedure, another compliance gaining tactic in which reciprocal concessions is thought to be the underlying explanatory mechanism. Unlike the DITF message sequence, the TNA procedure does not require the message recipient to respond to the message before the offer is improved. Hence, it is not particularly analogous to a negotiation. The DITF procedure, on the other hand, involves an offer-rejection-counteroffer message style that is more reminiscent of a true negotiation.

*Anticipated Guilt.* The theoretical explanation with the most empirical support in Study 1 was the anticipated guilt explanation. The predicted three-way interaction, in which the negotiative, large TNA message for the prosocial organization was contrasted against all other conditions, was statistically significant. All of the independent variables combined to produce a “magic cell” (large TNA, negotiation, prosocial organization) where compliance was greater than the other cells. Additionally, participants were fairly cognizant of their motivation to comply, as a two-way interaction for perceived guilt was found regarding the mediator for this explanation. Perceived guilt was highest in the

moderate and large TNA conditions for the prosocial organization. This tends to support the anticipated guilt explanation because compliance was second highest in the moderate TNA, prosocial organization condition. The data indicate that improvements in the initial offer make it even more difficult to not help the underprivileged children. Hence, the data from Study 1 support the theory that guilt enhances the TNA effect. Furthermore, the results from Study 1 indicate that TNA message might not be successful unless used for prosocial causes. This is interesting given that all previous studies of the TNA technique have used prosocial organizations with the TNA messages.

Prosocialness figured prominently in the results of Study 1. The amount of prosocialness attributed to the organizations was significantly related to perceived obligation to comply ( $r = .27$ ), the perceived costliness of the coffee cups ( $r = -.12$ ), the perceptions of the offer being a bargain ( $r = .22$ ), perceived anger ( $r = -.30$ ), and anticipated guilt ( $r = .42$ ; see Table 3.2 for correlations among dependent variables in Study 1). As participants perceived the organization as prosocial, they experienced guilt. Guilt was strongly associated with perceived obligation to comply ( $r = .56$ ). The TNA conditions created the strongest sense of anticipated guilt when used with the prosocial organization, and those conditions (moderate and large TNA, prosocial organization) had the largest compliance rates.

### **Implications for Scholars and Practitioners**

The results of Study 1 indicate a number of implication for scholars and practitioners of the TNA procedure. First, the inconsistency between the results of Study 1 and the findings of Burger et al. (1999) regarding the impact of large initial TNA

Table 3. 2: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations for Key Measures Included in Study 1.

Variable	<i>MD</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Obligation	2.26	1.68							
2. Costliness	2.20	1.47	-.09						
3. Negative Affect	1.86	1.48	-.07	.35*					
4. Negotiation	2.39	1.72	.09	.17*	.16*				
5. Bargain	4.11	1.95	.20*	-.30*	-.18*	.07			
6. Guilt	2.95	1.97	.56*	-.07	-.20*	.16*	.18*		
7. Prosocialness	4.78	2.18	.27*	-.12*	-.30*	-.05	.22*	.42*	

\*  $p < .05$

requests indicates that the nature of the reverse TNA effect remains elusive. Despite an initial price of \$15 for a coffee cup, which is three times as much as Burger et al. used in their study, there was no decrease in compliance or increase in anger. There are two conclusions that can be drawn from this data. First, the price (although very expensive) was not expensive enough to create negative affect with the participants. Second, the reverse TNA effect is not related to initial request size. Scholars should attempt to replicate the reverse TNA effect and explore the mechanisms that produce it. Second, some of original theoretical mechanisms believed to underlie the TNA effect need to be rethought, in terms of finding new explanatory mechanisms or better methods to test them. Of the original proposed explanations for the TNA effect, the reciprocal concessions explanation had the poorest fit with the data from Study 1. Neither

negotiative message elements nor larger “concessions” in the price of the coffee cups increased perceptions of obligation or compliance. The other original TNA explanation, the perceptual contrasts account, fared better than reciprocal concessions, but larger contrasts failed to produce statistically significant increases in compliance. Research that identifies the conditions where certain explanations are viable would make a significant theoretical contribution to the scholarship of the TNA effect. Specific directions for future research regarding the TNA technique will be offered later in the dissertation.

For practitioners, the results of Study 1 suggest three key points. First, the TNA technique may not be well suited for telemarketing research. Unlike previous TNA studies (Burger, 1986; Burger et al., 1999, Pollock et al., 1998), Study 1 failed to detect a statistically significant TNA effect, even with moderate initial offer TNA messages. Perhaps the nature of telemarketing does not favor the TNA technique. Unlike the DITF tactic, the TNA technique does not involve “give and take” between message source and target. If the retailing slogan, “the sale starts at ‘no,’” has any merit, then the TNA tactic will be inferior to the DITF procedure because the TNA message has nowhere to go after the message is rejected. It must be noted, however, that Burger et al. (1999) were able to demonstrate the TNA effect using telemarketing-style experimental methods. Second, the results of Study 1 suggest that the problems associated with large initial offer TNA messages (i.e., lower compliance rates compared to control messages) may be overstated. Study 1 provided no evidence for the reverse TNA effect; instead, large initial offers produced compliance rates equal to moderate initial offers. Third, practitioners should note that the TNA effect is enhanced when used by prosocial organizations. The results of Study 1 indicated that participants felt more anticipated guilt when prosocial

organizations used the TNA procedure, and hence, participants complied more with requests in those conditions.

### **Limitations of Study 1**

Study 1 has two limitations that merit further discussion, concerning the sample and the dependent measures. First, there are two issues regarding the sample that may undermine Study 1's ecological validity. The first issue deals with how the design and procedure created a puzzling self-selection bias. Telephone solicitation is, by its nature, a disagreeable enterprise. The research assistants did not enjoy making the calls, and the students did not seem too pleased about receiving the calls. Indeed, the research assistants attempted to contact 2,978 participants, but they were only able to complete their experimental task with 292. Furthermore, only the participants who agreed to answer the follow-up questionnaire were included in Study 1 because the researchers believed that most of the participants who did not answer the questionnaire also did not attend to the message. Indeed, many potential participants hung up on the research assistants before they finished their message, and several more said no before they finished the offer. Those participants who were truly angered by the message probably hung up or refused to participate, undermining the negative affect mediator of compliance. Conversely, the participants included in Study 1 were those polite enough to wait through the message and patient (or sympathetic) enough to answer questions about the sales message. This might represent a particular sub-class of college student, perhaps one that is less irritated by telephone solicitations or has more free time.

The other sample-related issue concerns the nature of the sample in Study 1. All of the participants in Study 1 were students at a large East Coast University. This fact,

coupled with the self-selection issue discussed above, may reduce the generalizability of the results to populations other than East Coast college students. There are two important factors to note regarding this issue. First, the sample was chosen because Study 1 was a replication of Burger et al.'s (1999) telephone TNA study with college students. Second, the author was able to obtain names and phone numbers of 8,000 randomly selected students from the University Registrar. Although this does not solve the threat to ecological validity, it does attempt to make the results more generalizable to the students of the University as a whole.

A second limitation of Study 1 involves the dependent measures. First, all of the dependent variables were measured with only one item. This was deemed necessary as it was determined during pretesting that students were unwilling to answer a questionnaire over the phone that took longer than two minutes. However, one-item measures are far from ideal for scientific investigations. As Kerlinger and Lee (2000) note, change error cannot be computed nor corrected for with one-item measures. Multiple-item measures allow for the balancing of error, which is a luxury that Study 1 did not have. Second, the nature of the telephone interview required participants to inform the research assistants of their answers, which the research assistants then recorded. It is plausible that this may have created a social desirability bias that may have inhibited open and honest answers to the dependent variable items.

### **Directions for Future Research**

Study 1 illuminates two key issues for scholars to explore in future research endeavors related to the TNA procedure. First, scholars should explore the message processing conditions that inhibit or enhance the TNA effect. The data from Study 1 does



not reveal anything about the participants' message processing. It is possible that participants were more suspicious of the request, and processed it more extensively. Conversely, it is possible that the telephone calls were fielded while the participants were multi-tasking. How the message processing conditions impacted the results of Study 1 is unclear because there has only been one study that attempted to examine how mindfulness impacts the TNA technique (Pollock et al., 1998). Future research is needed to address this important issue.

Second, communication researchers need to examine the TNA technique in more varied contexts. Most of the TNA studies have been conducted using a bake-sale booth situation (Burger, 1986; Pollock et al., 1998), and until Study 1, TNA messages have only been tested in conjunction with prosocial organizations, typically a social psychology club. Scholars need to examine how different contexts (telephone, face-to-face, or mediated) impact the TNA effect. Further, scholars need to test the TNA effect with samples other than college students in order to make broader claims about the generalizability of the TNA effect. One step in this direction was taken in Study 2, where the TNA technique was examined with television commercials.

## **METHOD OF STUDY 2: TELEVISION COMMERCIAL EXPERIMENT**

### **Overview**

Study 2 sought to replicate the design of Study 1 using televised commercials to experimentally manipulate variations of the TNA technique. Participants were instructed that they were watching prototypes of commercials for coffee cups. The purpose of Study 2 was to replicate Study 1 and test the TNA technique in a commercial context,

something that has been discussed in all previous TNA studies but never before accomplished.

### **Participants**

A total of 324 participants completed the study. The mean age of participants at the time of the study was approximately 20 years of age ( $SD = 1.67$ ), ranging from 18 to 31 years of age. Only 38% of the participants were male. All of the participants were students enrolled in Communication courses at the University and were recruited as part of the Communication department participant pool. Participants received extra credit for their participation.

### **Design**

A 3 (request type: large initial request TNA, moderate initial request TNA, control) X 2 (negotiation vs. no negotiation) X 2 (prosocial vs. commercial beneficiary) independent groups design was employed.

### **Procedure**

As Study 2 was designed to replicate Study 1 in a commercial context (rather than a telephone solicitation context), the procedure was designed to be as similar as possible between the two studies. Obviously, the largest difference is the method in which the message was delivered. In addition to that difference, the negotiative message element was slightly different in Study 1 and 2 due to the method of message delivery. That is, it did not seem plausible for a commercial actor to stop in the middle of the commercial and carry on a conversation with a superior off screen, and then return to the commercial and finish the message. The specifics of the Study 2 procedure are described below.

A research assistant greeted participants upon their arrival at the lab. The assistant informed the participant that the Communication department has been contracted by an outside organization to conduct research on students' thoughts and feelings about a new commercial being developed. Participants were asked to watch a brief, rough version of a commercial and then fill out a questionnaire about the commercial. The research assistant told the participants that this was an actual commercial under development, so they could actually take part in the offer made in the commercial. After watching the video, participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire containing the induction checks and dependent variable measures.

### **Experimental Inductions**

***Request conditions.*** The TNA request conditions were identical to those in Experiment 1. Recall that in the large initial request TNA condition, the speaker said, "These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$15." In the moderate initial request TNA condition, the speaker said, "These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$7." In the control condition, the speaker said, "These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$3." The control price was also delivered in the TNA conditions after the initial price was offered, but the transition between initial request and control request was buffered by a message from the negotiation condition.

***Negotiation conditions.*** Due to the innate differences between delivering a message over the phone versus via a television commercial, the negotiation condition was slightly different in the commercial experiment. Again, the negotiation message was delivered before the target request was made. As before, in the negotiation condition, the speaker said, "But wait - for this special promotion, only for University of Maryland

students, we're selling the cups for..." At that point, the target message was delivered. However, in the no negotiation condition, the speaker said, "These high-quality coffee cups were mistakenly priced at [price determined by TNA condition] but we're offering the cups for their original price of..." At that point, the target request was delivered.

***Prosocial/Commercial conditions.*** The prosocial/commercial conditions were identical to the message conditions used in experiment 1. Recall that in the prosocial condition, the source explained that all proceeds from the coffee cup sales will benefit "Terps for Underprivileged Kids," which is "a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don't have the financial resources to reach their education potential." In the commercial condition, the source explained that the organization benefiting from the coffee cup sales was "the CoffeeMax Corporation," which is "a retailer of coffee products."

### **Dependent Variables**

***Negative Affect.*** Three items were utilized to assess negative affect as a result from the compliance-gaining message. Participants were asked to assess to which degree they felt angry, irritated, annoyed, and pleased (reverse coded) they felt by the message presented to them.

***Compliance.*** A one-item dichotomous question measured compliance with the offer, specifically, "would you be interested in purchasing a cup?" Additionally, if the participant agreed to buy the coffee cup, they were asked what color and design they preferred. This was done to preserve the appearance of an actual sales situation.

***Perceived Costliness.*** Five items formed the perceived costliness index. Participants were asked to indicate their impressions of the \$3 coffee cup offer by

answering their level of agreement/disagreement with the items: that request asked a lot of me, that was a large request, that is an expensive coffee cup, that was a small request (reverse coded), and that was a cheap price for a coffee cup.

***Perceived Obligation.*** Four items measured participants' perceived obligation to comply with the request. The questions included: I felt obligated to comply with this request at the time it was made, I felt that I had to comply with this request, I did not feel any pressure to comply with this request (reverse coded), and I felt that I was supposed to go along with the request.

***Perceived Negotiation Cognitions.*** Four items measured the degree to which participants perceived the request to be similar to a negotiation. The questions were: I felt this person was negotiating with me, I felt I was in a negotiation situation, I felt like the requestor was trying to bargain with me, and I did not feel like the requestor was bargaining (reverse coded).

***Perceived Bargain.*** In order to measure the participants' perceptions of the offer being a bargain, four items were utilized. Participants were asked to indicate their agreement/disagreement with: I felt like this was a good deal, I felt like I was receiving a bargain, I felt like the offer was a rip off (reverse coded), and I felt like there was good value in the offer.

## **Data Analysis**

Logistical regression analysis was used to test the compliance hypotheses, and ANOVA was used to test the mediating hypotheses. ANOVAs were also used to check the manipulations of two of the three independent variables. Confirmatory factor analyses were used to test the unidimensionality of the indexes of the dependent variables.

## RESULTS

### Data Screening

As recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), the data were screened prior to the analyses. In order to detect any out of range values, univariate descriptive statistics were examined for all of the variables in the study. Additionally, random surveys were rechecked to ensure valid data entry. Data screening revealed no problems.

### Testing Unidimensionality

Next, Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFAs) were conducted for each of the dependent variables using Equations (EQS; Bentler, 1995). CFAs were performed on all manipulation checks and dependent variable indices.

Two indices were used to assess manipulations of the independent variables. The chi square test for the measure of prosocialness of the organization was significant,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 324) = 14.49, p < .01$ . However, the measure of prosocialness exceeded Hu and Bentler's (1999) alternative model fit criteria, CFI = .97 and SRMR = .04. A mean was calculated for these four items ( $M = 4.77, SD = 1.19, \alpha = .81$ ). Likewise, the chi square test for the measure of negotiation of the organization was significant,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 324) = 48.00, p < .01$ . Again, the measure of negotiation exceeded Hu and Bentler's (1999) alternative model fit criteria, CFI = .97 and SRMR = .04. A mean was calculated for these four items ( $M = 2.84, SD = 1.28, \alpha = .88$ ).

CFAs were also performed on the five indices that were used to measure the main dependent variables. The four items developed by O'Keefe and Figge (1997) to assess anticipated guilt formed a single solution,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 324) = 6.91, p = .07$ . A mean was calculated for these four items ( $M = 2.72, SD = 1.32, \alpha = .87$ ). The chi square test on the

four items used to assess perceived negative affect was significant,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 324) = 11.17, p < .05$ . However, the measure of negative affect exceed Hu and Bentler's (1999) alternative criteria for model fit, CFI = .99 and SRMR = .02. A mean was calculated for these four items ( $M = 2.13, SD = 1.34, \alpha = .81$ ). The four items that assessed perceived obligation formed a single solution,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 324) = .58, p = .57$ . A mean was calculated for these four items ( $M = 2.84, SD = 1.28, \alpha = .83$ ). Additionally, the chi square test on perceptions of a bargain was significant,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 324) = 15.83, p < .01$ , but the measure surpassed the alternative fit criteria, CFI = .99 and SRMR = .01. A mean was calculated for these four items ( $M = 5.12, SD = 1.21, \alpha = .89$ ). Finally, chi square for the five items used to assess the perceived costliness was significant,  $\chi^2 (5, N = 324) = 86.70, p < .01$ . The CFI and SRMR did not exceed the alternative fit criteria. The troublesome item, "that was a cheap price for a coffee cup," was dropped from the index, which improved the fit. The chi square test on the four-item measure was still significant,  $\chi^2 (2, N = 324) = 11.79, p < .01$ , but the revised measure exceed the alternative fit criteria, CFI = .98 and SRMR = .05. A mean was calculated for these four items ( $M = 2.41, SD = 1.02, \alpha = .81$ ). Hence, the measures are unidimensional.

### **Testing ANOVA Assumptions**

To analyze these data, ANOVA was used to examine the data for any potential main or interaction effects, as predicted. ANOVA rests on three major assumptions: independence of observation, homogeneity of variance, and that the dependent variable(s) is normally distributed for each of the experimental cells. To control for independence of observation, an independent groups factorial design was utilized. To test the assumption of homogeneity of variance,  $F_{\max}$  tests were calculated for all continuous dependent

variables, including the manipulation check variables.  $F_{\max}$  compares the variance between the cell with the largest variance and the cell with the smallest variance and computes a ratio. If the sample has relatively equal cell sizes, an  $F_{\max}$  of 10 or less is acceptable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). For this sample, the  $F_{\max}$  for the dependent variable of organization prosocialness was 4.23, perceived anger was 2.45, perceived anticipated guilt was 1.51, perceived costliness was 2.41, perceived obligation was 1.85, and perceived negotiation was 2.03. Because this sample had relatively equal cell sizes and the calculated values were all under 10, the homogeneity of variance assumption was not violated. Finally, to test the normality of the distribution for each dependent variable across each cell, skewness and kurtosis were calculated. For perceived organization prosocialness, skewness was .48 and kurtosis was -1.24. For perceived anger, skewness was 1.70 and kurtosis was 1.75. For perceived anticipated guilt, skewness was .54 and kurtosis was -1.05. For perceived costliness, skewness was 1.14 and kurtosis was .49. For perceived obligation, skewness was 1.19 and kurtosis was .35. For perceived negotiation, skewness was .99 and kurtosis was -.20. Finally, for perceived bargain, skewness was -.1 and kurtosis was -1.1. Green and Salkind (2003) state that for cell sizes with over 15 participants, non-normality of distribution will still yield accurate  $p$  values. In this study, there were approximately 30 participants in each group. Therefore, the  $p$  values reported in the results section should be accurate even if the normality of distribution assumption was violated. Thus, the data analysis continued with the univariate tests.

### **Manipulation Checks**

Manipulation checks were conducted to assess the effectiveness of the negotiation and prosocial organization manipulations. One-way ANOVAs were conducted for each



of the two independent variables described above and their respective manipulation measures. Results of the ANOVA revealed that the negotiation message element manipulation was not successful in that the negotiation condition ( $M = 2.91$ ,  $SD = 1.41$ ) was not rated as more of a perceived negotiation than the no negotiation condition ( $M = 2.77$ ,  $SD = 1.14$ ;  $F [1, 323] = .98$ , *n.s.*). Perhaps a mediated interaction precludes the experience of a negotiation. Regardless, there was a substantial difference between the two messages, and although not perceived differently in the manipulation check, participants received different messages. O’Keefe (2003) argued that manipulation checks are unnecessary when message features are conceptualized in terms of intrinsic features. The negotiation message manipulation occurred whether participants recognized it or not, and the impact of that message is what is of theoretical interest.

In contrast, the organization prosocialness manipulation was successful. Participants rated “Terps for Underprivileged Kids” as significantly more prosocial ( $M = 5.33$ ,  $SD = 1.01$ ) than the “CoffeeMax Corporation” ( $M = 4.04$ ,  $SD = 1.01$ ),  $F (1, 321) = 133.97$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $\eta^2 = .29$ .

### **Testing Hypotheses**

*Perceptual Contrast and Compliance.* H1 predicts that there will be a linear trend for compliance as a function of the size of the TNA message, meaning that the large TNA conditions should yield greater compliance than the moderate TNA conditions, which should yield greater compliance than the control condition. H1 was tested with planned comparisons in logistic regression. The results of the planned comparison revealed that the data fit the predicted pattern, with compliance highest in the large TNA conditions

(46.30%) followed by the moderate TNA conditions (37.77%) and the control conditions (30.77%),  $\chi^2 = 5.70, p < .02$ . Hence, H1 was supported.

***Perceptual Contrast and Perceived Costliness.*** H1a predicts that there will be a linear trend for perceived costliness as a function of the size of the TNA message, meaning that participants in the large TNA conditions should perceive the cups to be less costly than the participants in the moderate TNA conditions, which should perceive the cups to be less costly than those in the control condition. H1a was tested with planned comparisons in ANOVA. The results of the planned contrasts revealed no significant linear trend for perceptions of costliness, as the perceptions of costliness in the control conditions ( $M = 2.91, SD = 0.61$ ) were not different than the moderate TNA conditions ( $M = 3.18, SD = 0.77$ ), or large TNA conditions ( $M = 2.95, SD = 0.74$ ),  $F [1, 324] = 0.08, n.s.$  Hence, H1a was not supported (see Table 3.3 for means and standard deviations for the dependent variables in all experimental conditions).

***Perceptual Contrast and Perceived Bargain.*** H1b predicts that there will be a linear trend for perceived bargain as a function of the size of the TNA message, meaning that participants in the large TNA conditions should perceive the cups to be a better bargain than the participants in the moderate TNA conditions, which should perceive that they were receiving more of a bargain than those in the control condition. H1 was tested with planned comparisons in ANOVA. The predicted contrast was not significant, as perceptions of a bargain were similar for the control conditions ( $M = 5.07, SD = 0.61$ ), the moderate TNA conditions ( $M = 5.02, SD = 0.77$ ), and the large TNA conditions ( $M = 5.27, SD = 0.74$ ),  $F [1, 324] = 1.45, n.s.$  Hence, H1b was not supported. In sum, the perceptual contrast explanation was generally supported by the data. The patterns of

compliance perfectly matched the predictions; however, the data regarding the mediators again failed to reach statistical significance or represent the predicted patterns.

***Reciprocal Concessions and Compliance.*** H2 predicts that there will be a two-way interaction between TNA size and negotiative message element, in that compliance will be highest when negotiation is present and the large TNA message is used. The results of the planned comparisons were inconsistent with the reciprocal concessions hypothesis;  $\chi^2 = 0.60$ , *n.s.* Table 3.3 clearly shows how negotiation did not increase compliance in the large TNA request conditions. Therefore, H2 was not supported.

***Reciprocal Concessions and Perceived Obligation.*** H2a predicts that there will be a two-way interaction between size of the TNA request and negotiative message element, increasing perceived obligation to comply when negotiation and large TNA are used together. The results of the planned contrasts were not consistent with this hypothesis,  $F [1, 324] = 2.06$ , *n.s.* Hence, H2a was not supported. In sum, the data did not lend any support to the reciprocal concessions explanation. The compliance and perceptions of obligation both were not higher when negotiation message elements were used with the large initial request TNA message.

***Reverse TNA and Compliance.*** H3 predicts that there will be a curvilinear relationship between TNA request size and compliance. The highest compliance is expected in the moderate TNA condition. The planned comparisons test did not support this hypothesis, as compliance rates were highest with large TNA requests (46.30%), followed by moderate TNA requests (37.27%), and control requests (30.77%),  $\chi^2 = 0.01$ , *n.s.* Hence, H3 was not supported.

Table 3.3: Means and Standard Deviations for Key Variables across All Experimental Conditions in Study 2.

		Prosocial						Commercial					
		Control		Moderate TNA		Large TNA		Control		Moderate TNA		Large TNA	
		NGTN	NO NGTN	NGTN	NO NGTN	NGTN	NO NGTN	NGTN	NO NGTN	NGTN	NO NGTN	NGTN	NO NGTN
Compliance		32.14%	44.00%	44.00%	36.00%	50.00%	60.00%	26.92%	20.00%	40.00%	30.00%	35.71%	41.38%
Obligation	<i>M</i>	3.07	2.82	3.28	3.15	3.37	3.01	2.44	2.78	2.60	2.28	2.79	2.70
	<i>SD</i>	1.35	1.15	1.37	1.05	1.08	1.24	1.42	1.29	1.57	1.04	1.46	0.99
Costliness	<i>M</i>	2.79	2.86	2.94	3.03	3.13	2.72	2.96	3.04	3.31	3.34	2.83	3.09
	<i>SD</i>	0.63	0.59	0.46	0.72	0.83	0.42	0.66	0.55	0.88	0.84	0.72	0.85
Negative Affect	<i>M</i>	2.20	2.39	2.53	2.20	2.38	2.76	2.74	2.59	2.62	2.67	2.84	2.67
	<i>SD</i>	0.77	0.73	0.81	0.56	0.78	0.98	0.93	0.97	0.95	1.07	1.23	1.02
Negotiation	<i>M</i>	2.55	2.04	3.73	3.16	3.33	3.48	3.56	2.48	4.19	3.45	3.28	3.16
	<i>SD</i>	1.37	0.98	1.66	1.65	1.60	1.44	1.81	1.22	1.62	1.48	1.34	1.52
Bargain	<i>M</i>	5.10	5.06	5.27	5.24	5.10	5.59	5.13	4.97	4.90	4.77	5.28	5.13
	<i>SD</i>	1.07	1.15	1.13	0.94	1.15	1.07	1.12	1.03	1.50	1.03	1.40	1.60
Guilt	<i>M</i>	2.96	2.94	2.93	3.10	3.11	3.30	2.15	2.55	2.31	2.35	2.41	2.72
	<i>SD</i>	1.35	1.28	1.24	1.33	1.15	1.34	1.14	1.14	1.40	1.24	1.34	1.39
Prosocialness	<i>M</i>	5.23	5.56	5.21	5.21	5.16	5.65	3.82	4.04	3.83	4.18	4.00	4.37
	<i>SD</i>	1.08	1.02	0.99	0.88	0.93	1.12	1.01	0.58	1.05	0.84	1.13	1.22

*Note.* NGTN = Negotiation condition. NO NGTN = No Negotiation condition. All indices are seven-point Likert-type scales

were larger numbers indicate greater amounts of each variable.

**Reverse TNA and Negative Affect.** H3a predicts that anger will be highest in the large TNA request condition. The planned comparisons did not support this prediction, as perceived anger was virtually identical with control requests ( $M = 2.97$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ), moderate TNA requests ( $M = 3.04$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ), and large TNA requests ( $M = 2.98$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ),  $F [1, 324] = 0.25$ , *n.s.* Hence, H3a was not supported. In sum, the data from Study 2 did not reveal a reverse TNA effect. Similarly, larger initial TNA offers did not increase perceived negative affect in the sample. The reverse TNA account failed in Study 2.

**Anticipated Guilt and Compliance.** H4 predicts that there will be a three-way interaction between negotiation, TNA request size and prosocialness of the organization selling coffee cups in that compliance is highest in the “magic cell” of large TNA requests, negotiative message elements, for the prosocial organization. Planned comparisons failed to support the three-way interaction,  $\chi^2 = 1.74$ , *n.s.* The predicted anticipated guilt cell had the second largest compliance (50%) compared to the large TNA request, no negotiation message, for the prosocial organization (60%). However, without factoring in negotiation, a two-way interaction was supported, where compliance is highest when large TNA messages are used for prosocial organizations,  $\chi^2 = 7.18$ ,  $p < .01$ . Hence, H4 was partially supported.

**Perceived Anticipated Guilt.** H4a predicted that perceptions of anticipated guilt would be highest when negotiation, TNA request size, and prosocialness interacted, resulting in higher guilt in the large request/negotiation/prosocialness condition. The planned contrasts did not support this prediction,  $F (1, 324) = 2.37$ , *n.s.* Guilt was not the highest in that cell, nor was it substantially different than the other TNA conditions with

the prosocial organization. However, with negotiation removed from the contrasts, the two-way interaction contrast was significant,  $F(1, 324) = 8.24, p < .01, \eta^2 = .02$ . Anticipated guilt was highest when moderate TNA requests ( $M = 3.02, SD = 1.27$ ) and large TNA requests ( $M = 3.20, SD = 1.23$ ) were used for prosocial organizations. Hence, H4a was partially supported. In sum, the anticipated guilt explanation was partially supported by the data in Study 2. Large TNA messages for prosocial organizations produced more compliance and anticipated guilt when compared to other conditions.

## **DISCUSSION OF STUDY 2**

Study 2 offers several advantages. First, it was argued previously that study 1 may be limited in its generalizability due to its telemarketing nature. Therefore, study 2, although using the same manipulations was conducted with television commercials. Moreover, this study provides another study to assess whether the results of study 1 are able to be replicated. One of the best defenses against type I error is replication.

Moreover, the application of the TNA technique in television commercials has been consistently noted by scholars (Burger, 1986; Burger et al., 1999; Pollock et al., 1998). Ironically, however, investigations of the TNA technique have been limited to face-to-face or telephone encounters, leaving the question of the utility of the TNA procedure in commercial settings unanswered. It is important for scholars, and practitioners alike, to understand how the TNA procedure might work differently when delivered in divergent situations. Hence, Study 2 sought to address these issues while replicating the design of Study 1 in a television commercial context.

## DISCUSSION OF THE MAIN FINDINGS

*Perceptual Contrast vs. Reverse TNA Effect.* As noted previously, the perceptual contrast and the reverse TNA effect hypotheses make competing predictions about the consequences of large initial offer TNA messages. According to the perceptual contrast explanation, a large initial TNA offer should increase compliance compared to a baseline offer or even a moderate initial TNA offer. Burger et al. (1999) contend that a large initial TNA offer will cause a decrease in compliance, called the reverse TNA effect, because a large initial offer angers the message recipients.

In Study 2, the pattern of compliance clearly supports the perceptual contrast explanation over than the reverse TNA effect account. Compliance was highest in the large initial request TNA conditions (46.3%), followed by the moderate initial request TNA conditions (37.3%), which had higher compliance than the baseline conditions (30.8%). The contrast predicted by the perceptual contrast explanation was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(1, N = 323) = 5.70, p < .02$ . And, the study 2 data failed to demonstrate the reverse TNA effect. There was an increased compliance in the large initial request TNA conditions instead of the hypothesized decrease.

Although the pattern of compliance rates was identical to the pattern expected by the perceptual contrasts account, the predicted mediating relationships consistent with perceptual contrasts were not supported by the data. First, Burger (1986) believed that the initial price adjusts the anchor point for the price of the product, which is then contrasted with the improved offer. This contrast presumably makes the improved offer appear better than it would otherwise, thereby increasing compliance rates. However, the mean ratings for perceived costliness of the coffee cups were practically identical across TNA

conditions and the minute differences were not in the predicted direction. It is possible that the participants were not conscious of why they were impacted by the offers. If Pollock et al. (1998) are correct then participants mindlessly comply with the request because they are reacting to heuristics about what is a good deal.

Pollock et al. (1998) argued that the TNA effect is caused by the message signaling a bargain to the participants. This was tested by assessing the degree to which participants felt like the various offers were a bargain. The means were generally in the predicted direction, as participants in the large TNA conditions ( $M = 5.27$ ,  $SD = 1.33$ ) perceived a better bargain than those in the moderate TNA conditions ( $M = 5.02$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ) or control conditions ( $M = 5.07$ ,  $SD = 1.80$ ), but the difference is clearly too small to be statistically significant,  $p = .29$ . All of the messages were generally perceived to be a bargain as they were all rated higher than the midpoint of the scale. Hence, even participants in the control conditions thought the offer was a bargain, only those in the TNA conditions actually agreed to take advantage of the bargain. Again, the data generally demonstrate a lack of awareness about the mediating processes of compliance.

***Reciprocal Concessions.*** The reciprocal concessions account predicted that compliance and feelings of obligation to comply would be highest when negotiative message elements were present and a large TNA message was used. As in Study 1, the rates of compliance were not consistent with the reciprocal concession explanation. Additionally, neither the large initial offer TNA messages nor the negotiative message elements increased feelings of obligation to comply with the request. Further, the participants did not perceive the negotiation messages as more negotiative than the non-negotiation messages. Perhaps perceptions of negotiation, and hence, the reciprocal



concessions account, require an interpersonal interaction. It seems plausible that participants may not perceive a commercial to be similar to a negotiation or personal concession, regardless of the message delivered. Conversely, it may be the case that the reciprocal concessions explanation is not a causal mechanism with the TNA effect. The reciprocal concessions account, as an explanatory mechanism, was borrowed from the DITF technique and although it has not been supported by empirical tests of the TNA technique (see Burger, 1986), it has not been discarded. The data from Study 2 indicate that the reciprocal concessions explanation should indeed be abandoned.

*Anticipated Guilt.* Based on the anticipated guilt account, a three-way interaction in which large TNA message with negotiative message elements for the prosocial organization was predicted to create the most anticipated guilt and the most compliance. However, unlike Study 1, the results of Study 2 failed to support the predicted three-way interaction contrast. However, compliance was highest when large TNA messages were used for the prosocial organization. Additionally, participants reported anticipating the most guilt in those conditions. Taken together, anticipated guilt appears to enhance the TNA effect. Perceived guilt was significantly correlated with prosocialness ( $r = .32$ ), perceived costliness ( $r = -.12$ ) and perceptions of a bargain ( $r = .24$ ). Perhaps participants felt guiltier about rejecting what appeared to be a good deal, especially when it is for a good cause (see Table 3.4 for correlations among all dependent variables for Study 2).

Table 3.4: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations for Key Measures Included in Study 2.

Variable	<i>MD</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Obligation	2.88	1.32							
2. Costliness	3.01	0.72	-.05						
3. Negative Affect	2.55	0.93	.13*	.16*					
4. Negotiation	2.84	1.28	.96*	-.06	.13*				
5. Bargain	5.12	1.21	.26*	-.43*	-.14*	.23*			
6. Guilt	2.72	1.32	.50*	-.12*	.10	.49*	.24*		
7. Prosocialness	4.67	1.19	.22*	-.32*	-.29*	.19*	.34*	.32*	

\*  $p < .05$

The two-way contrast partially supported the anticipated guilt hypotheses. Of interest is the reason for the lack of a three-way contrast. Perhaps the failure of the negotiation message element was to blame in this instance, as participants did not perceive the negotiation messages are more negotiative than the non-negotiation messages. Another line of reasoning concerns the rationale for the anticipated guilt hypotheses. Perhaps negotiative message elements do not make a strong contribution to perceptions of guilt, especially when presented via a television commercial. Finally, perhaps prosocialness and guilt overwhelmed the effect for negotiation.

*Implications for scholars and practitioners.* The results of Study 2 have distinct implications for both scholars and practitioners interested in the TNA compliance-gaining procedure. First, the findings regarding the failure of the reverse TNA effect should caution scholars against assuming that large initial offers will alienate message receivers. Instead of decreasing compliance, the large initial offer TNA messages increased compliance more than the moderate TNA messages. The results of Study 2 call into question the robustness of the reverse TNA effect. The large initial offer was three times the size of Burger et al.'s (1999) large initial offer TNA request, and yet the opposite result happened. Perhaps when a large request is delivered interpersonally, a more negative emotional response is triggered because participants feel like they are personally being mistreated and have a living human being to blame. In a commercial situation, such reactions might not occur. Conversely, it may be that the reverse TNA effect found by Burger et al. (1999) was a statistical aberration. After all, the prices used in this dissertation were dramatically higher than those used by Burger et al., and there was no indication whatsoever of a reverse TNA effect. More research is needed to answer this

question, and scholars should turn their attention to uncovering the mechanisms responsible for the elusive reverse TNA effect. Second, the results of Study 2 indicate that testing the mediating processes of compliance might not be the most fruitful line of research. The perceptual contrasts explanation correctly predicted the compliance patterns in the data; however, the data regarding the two hypothesized mediating processes failed to work. If the TNA effect is mindless, then testing the perceptual mediators may be requiring participants to recall information that is beyond their conscious awareness.

For practitioners, the results of Study 2 suggest three recommendations for utilizing the TNA procedure successfully. First, practitioners should feel encouraged to use the TNA technique in commercial messages. This is not a novel suggestion, as Burger (1986) specifically mentioned the prevalence of the TNA procedure in television commercials in the original TNA experiments. However, Study 2 is the first scientific examination of the TNA effect in a television commercial context, and the results were quite successful. Second, practitioners should note that large initial offer TNA messages were the most successful at gaining compliance in Study 2. Unlike Burger et al.'s (1999) results, large initial offers did not produce a reverse TNA effect. Practitioners, at least with television commercials, should feel encouraged to use larger initial offer TNA messages without fearing that they will decrease compliance rates. Finally, the findings regarding anticipated guilt and the TNA effect should be heeded by practitioners. The results of Study 2 (as with Study 1) are consistent with the idea that anticipated guilt enhances the TNA effect. Practitioners can still be successful using the TNA technique

with non-prosocial organizations; however, prosocial organizations will fare better when using TNA messages.

### **Limitations of Study 2**

There are two noteworthy limitations to the results of Study 2 that deserve further consideration. First, as noted previously, the negotiation manipulation was not seen as significantly negotiative by the participants in Study 2. The two conditions contained distinctly different message elements, where the price reduction was attributed a pricing mistake in the non-negotiation condition and to a special deal for [name of university's] students in the negotiation condition. Although this was consistent with how Burger (1986) conducted his test of reciprocal concessions, it clearly failed to impress upon the participants that a personal concession/negotiation was attempted. Because the negotiation manipulation was unsuccessful, the hypotheses based on negotiation (reciprocal concessions and anticipated guilt) were disadvantaged.

A second limitation of Study 2 concerns the nature of the sample. Similar to Study 1, the participants in Study 2 were University students. However, Study 2 did not have a random list of students from the Registrar. Participants in Study 2 were recruited from the Communication Department participant pool. All of the participants in Study 2 were enrolled in Communication courses. This subsection of students further reduces the generalizability of the results to other populations. However, given that this dissertation was designed to replicate previous TNA research conducted with college students, the sample was deemed appropriate for the present research purposes.

## **Directions for Future Research**

Based on the results of Study 2, there are two crucial issues that should further be explored by researchers of the TNA effect. First, more research is needed to investigate the reasons why the results of Study 2 were different than Study 1. Both studies had identical designs and similar procedures; however, the compliance rates were dramatically disparate. Study 1 did not find statistically significant support for the perceptual contrast explanation but the results were generally consistent with the anticipated guilt explanation. Differently, Study 2 provided strong support for the perceptual contrast explanation (in terms of compliance rates) and partial support for the anticipated guilt explanation. Perhaps the messages were processed differently in the studies, or perhaps the method of message delivery accounts for the discrepancies, or perhaps some combination of the two accounts for the different results. Only future research will be able to answer these questions with certainty.

Second, future research should explore if participants can perceive that a commercial message contains personal concessions, or negotiation. Study 2 failed to successfully manipulate perceptions of negotiation, which undermined the reciprocal concessions hypothesis. Future research is needed to determine whether the nature of the message induction was inadequate or whether the context of a television commercial was responsible for the failure of the negotiation manipulation.

## **Conclusion**

The TNA technique is a compliance-gaining tactic that has not received much research attention since being initially documented by Burger in 1986. Consequently, the theoretical mechanism behind the TNA effect is unclear, and little is understood about the

conditions that enhance or limit the effect. Therefore, this chapter detailed two experiments designed to testing competing explanations of the TNA effect while examining the mediators and moderators of the compliance technique. The perceptual contrast and anticipated guilt explanations received the most support in the dissertation. The reciprocal concessions and reverse TNA effect were not supported by the data from the two experiments.

### **Chapter Summary**

Chapter 3 reports the results of two experiments testing the mediators and moderators of the TNA effect. The hypotheses for each experiment were first explained. The method, results, and discussion of Study 1 were then detailed. Finally, the method, results, and discussion of Study 2 were presented.

## **Chapter 4:**

### **Conclusion**

Chapter 4 consists of the conclusion to the dissertation. The main findings of Study 1 and Study 2 will be reviewed. Additionally, the overall implications of this dissertation for scholars and practitioners will be discussed, and an agenda for future research concerning the TNA procedure will be detailed. Chapter 4 will conclude with a brief review of this section of the dissertation.

### **DISCUSSION OF MAIN FINDINGS**

The TNA procedure is a compliance-gaining technique in which a message source improves an initial offer before the message target has an opportunity to respond. First empirically documented by Burger (1986), the TNA effect has failed to receive copious research attention and hence, there are several important theoretical and practical questions that remain. Namely, there are at least four competing accounts that could explain the TNA effect, namely the perceptual contrasts explanation, the reciprocal concessions explanation, the reverse TNA effect explanation, and the anticipated guilt explanation. Furthermore, little is known about what factors limit or moderate the TNA effect. Accordingly, the purpose of this dissertation was to examine the cognitive and affective moderators and mediators of the TNA effect, thereby revealing the true theoretical mechanisms behind it. To that end, two separate TNA experiments, featuring coffee cup sales, were conducted; Study 1 involved telephone solicitation, and Study 2 involved commercial advertisement. In both studies, the prosocialness of the organization



making the request, the size of the initial TNA request, and the presence of negotiative message elements were independent variables.

***The Reverse TNA Effect.*** In 1999, Burger et al. found that large initial request TNA offers produced lower compliance than control requests, a result they dubbed the reverse TNA effect. They reasoned that large initial requests make message targets upset, and subsequently they are not inclined to comply with the improved offer. Their rationale was based on series of experiments where moderate initial request TNA offers produced higher compliance rates than control offers and large initial request TNA offers produced lower compliance rates than control requests. Across two studies in the present dissertation, the data failed to provide any support for the idea that large initial request TNA offers decrease compliance. Studies 1 and 2 concluded that compliance rates in the large initial request TNA conditions were not lower than the control conditions; conversely, the large TNA conditions in Study 2 produced significantly higher compliance rates than both the control conditions and the moderate TNA conditions. Furthermore, there was no evidence for the predicted increase in anger for the large TNA conditions.

***The Reciprocal Concessions Explanation.*** Another explanation that failed to predict the patterns in the data was the reciprocal concessions account. In the original TNA study, Burger proposed that message receivers interpret the improved offer as a concession by the requestor, and due to the norm of reciprocity, they feel obligated to reciprocate by complying with the request. In both Study 1 and 2, it was predicted that large initial request TNA messages with negotiative message elements would create the most obligation to comply and have the highest compliance rates. The results of both

studies failed to support those predictions. This failure occurred despite successful negotiation manipulations in the phone experiment.

***The Perceptual Contrast Explanation.*** The results from this dissertation were much more favorable to the perceptual contrast explanation. Although the compliance rates in Study 1 were not higher at statistically significant levels, the data provided at least partial support for the perceptual contrast account. However, the compliance rate patterns in Study 2 were exactly as expected by the perceptual contrasts explanation. The only problem with the perceptual contrast explanation concerns the predicted mediating processes. In both studies, perceived costliness and perceived bargain failed to mediate the relationship between the TNA messages and compliance. It was argued that perceptual contrast may not be a conscious process, but that perceptual contrast is still a viable explanation for the TNA effect.

***The Anticipated Guilt Explanation.*** The most successful theoretical explanation in the present study was the anticipated guilt explanation. In this dissertation, it was predicted that prosocialness, TNA message, and negotiative message element would all contribute to feelings of anticipated guilt, and hence, increase compliance. The compliance data in Study 1 were consistent with this three-way interaction contrast, but the compliance data in Study 2 were only consistent with an interaction between TNA message and prosocialness. This two-way contrast was also statistically significant for perceptions of anticipated guilt in both studies. In sum, it appears that anticipated guilt cannot alone account for compliance in this dissertation, but it does enhance the TNA effect. Furthermore, and unlike the perceptual contrast account, the data suggest that

participants are aware of anticipating feeling more guilt if they do not comply with large initial request TNA messages from a prosocial organization.

### **Implications for Scholars and Practitioners**

Overall, this dissertation represents important developments in the empirical investigation of the TNA technique. In this section, the implications for scholars and practitioners from this dissertation are discussed.

First, the findings regarding the mediators in this dissertation suggest to scholars that the TNA effect may be “mindless.” Pollock et al. (1998) argued that the TNA effect is mindless, and if that is the case, then participants should be unaware of why they comply with the request. The results of this dissertation generally support that argument, as the tests of mediating relationships generally failed, even when the compliance rates were in the expected direction. A “mindless” TNA effect would make the study of mediators a pointless effort since participants are unable to identify the reasons why they complied with the request.

Second, unless scholars have new ideas about how the reciprocal concessions explanation manifests itself or can be tested with the TNA procedure, it should be rejected as an explanation for the TNA effect. In both studies, the reciprocal concessions explanation failed to correctly predict both compliance and perceptions of obligation to comply. Furthermore, the reciprocal concessions explanation does not seem to be consistent with the nature of the TNA procedure or with its typical method of application. It seems odd that participants would perceive a negotiative situation in an encounter where they are not made a counteroffer after they reject the initial offer. Furthermore, commercial messages, which all scholars of the TNA technique discuss as the primary

source of TNA messages, may not create a perception of personal concession with message recipients. Without new methodology or theoretical development, the reciprocal concessions explanation should be rejected as an explanatory mechanism of the TNA effect.

Third, scholars need to systematically investigate the reverse TNA effect. This dissertation failed to replicate the reverse TNA effect despite similar methodology and considerably large initial price inductions than used by Burger et al. (1999). The statistically significant decrease in compliance with a large initial offer TNA message is of crucial importance to both scholars and practitioners of the TNA procedure. Researchers should investigate the circumstances that produce the reverse TNA effect and the associated cognitive and affective variables that contribute to it.

### **Future Research Directions**

Although the TNA procedure has not received the voluminous research attention afforded to other compliance-gaining messages, such as the DITF or FITD, the past decade has seen two significant research developments in the TNA procedure. This dissertation attempted to build upon those studies to examine the cognitive and affect processes that underlie and moderate the TNA effect. Building upon the results of this dissertation, there are several issues that future scholars might address.

First, given that the results of this dissertation support the notion that the TNA effect is mindless, scholars need to directly test this assumption. Pollock et al. (1998) argued that more expensive purchases increase the mindfulness of the compliance behaviors, but their induction of mindfulness only encompassed the purchase price. This research could integrate a variety of more sophisticated measures, including: distraction,

increased involvement, time constraints, and increased cognitive load. In summary, scholars need to conduct more programmatic studies before concluding that the TNA effect is mindless.

Second, this dissertation only explored one type of TNA procedure, the reduced-price message type. The other version of the TNA message, the additional offer, needs further research examination. The conclusions of this dissertation do not necessarily apply to the other type of TNA message. For example, the perceptual contrast explanation tested here does not have an analog with the additional offer type of TNA message. Future research is needed to explore if the explanatory mechanisms are similar for both versions of the TNA message. Additionally, the two versions of the message could be tested in one message to see if there is a cumulative increase in compliance.

Third, scholars should further investigate the role of anticipated guilt in enhancing the TNA effect. Anticipated guilt was examined in this dissertation because none of the previous TNA studies had tested TNA messages in a non-prosocial context. In fact, Burger et al. (1999) noted this quandary, but decided to test the tactic in “altruistic” contexts instead of testing the TNA message in a for-profit context. As O’Keefe and Figge (1993; 1997) argued, without parceling out the prosocial element from the compliance-gaining message, the effects of the message are confounded with the organization benefiting from the compliance. This dissertation found that anticipated guilt enhanced the TNA effect, but that the TNA effect can exist in a purely commercial context as well. Scholars should attempt to integrate the explanatory mechanisms in order to offer a more comprehensive account for the TNA effect.

## **Summary**

In this chapter, the main findings of Studies 1 and 2 were discussed. Additionally, the overall implications of the dissertation were detailed. Finally, the directions for future research examining the cognitive and affective factors related to the TNA effect were considered.

## APPENDIX A: PILOT TEST 1 QUESTIONNAIRE

**Instructions:** Imagine that you are sitting in your dorm room or apartment and the phone rings. When you answer it, you find out you are being called by an organization selling coffee cups to University students. They coffee cups come in the colors red, black, or white, and they feature the words “University of Maryland.” You have the choice of also having the school logo, Testudo, or “Fear the Turtle,” printed on the cup. With this situation in mind, please indicate your perceptions about the potential prices charged for the cup.

Imagine that the price of this cup was **\$15**. How would you rate the price of the coffee cup? Circle your answer.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Inexpensive			Average			Very Expensive

How likely would you be to purchase this **\$15** cup?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Unlikely			Neutral			Very Likely

Imagine that the price of this cup was **\$10**. How would you rate the price of the coffee cup? Circle your answer.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Inexpensive			Average			Very Expensive

How likely would you be to purchase this **\$10** cup?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Unlikely				Neutral		Very Likely

Imagine that the price of this cup was **\$7**. How would you rate the price of the coffee cup? Circle your answer.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---





**Instructions:** Now we would like you to give us your opinions about different organizations that might be selling these coffee cups. Please read the name of each organization and then circle the choice that best fits your opinion.

Imagine that the organization selling the coffee cups described above is called the **Undergraduate Communication Association**. What do you think about this organization?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Prosocial			Neutral			Very Profit-Oriented
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helpful to Society			Neutral			Not Helpful to Society

How do feel the profits of the sales will be used?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Benefit Others			Neutral			Benefit Management

Imagine that the organization selling the coffee cups described above is called the **United Way**. What do you think about this organization?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Prosocial			Neutral			Very Profit-Oriented
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helpful to Society			Neutral			Not Helpful to Society

How do feel the profits of the sales will be used?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Benefit Others			Neutral			Benefit Management

Imagine that the organization selling the coffee cups described above is called the **CoffeeMax Coffee Cup Inc.** What do you think about this organization?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Prosocial			Neutral			Very Profit-Oriented

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helpful to Society			Neutral			Not Helpful to Society

How do feel the profits of the sales will be used?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Benefit Others			Neutral			Benefit Management

Imagine that the organization selling the coffee cups described above is called **Terps for Underprivileged Kids.** What do you think about this organization?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Prosocial			Neutral			Very Profit-Oriented

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helpful to Society			Neutral			Not Helpful to Society

How do feel the profits of the sales will be used?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Benefit Others			Neutral			Benefit Management

Imagine that the organization selling the coffee cups described above is called **Terps for Young Readers**. What do you think about this organization?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very			Neutral			Very
Prosocial						Profit-Oriented

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helpful to			Neutral			Not Helpful
Society						to Society

How do feel the profits of the sales will be used?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Benefit			Neutral			Benefit
Others						Management

Imagine that the organization selling the coffee cups described above is called **University Marketing Company**. What do you think about this organization?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very			Neutral			Very
Prosocial						Profit-Oriented

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helpful to			Neutral			Not Helpful
Society						to Society

How do feel the profits of the sales will be used?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Benefit			Neutral			Benefit
Others						Management

Imagine that the organization selling the coffee cups described above is called **Corningware Tableware**. What do you think about this organization?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very			Neutral			Very
Prosocial						Profit-Oriented

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helpful to Society			Neutral			Not Helpful to Society

How do feel the profits of the sales will be used?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Benefit Others			Neutral			Benefit Management

Imagine that the organization selling the coffee cups described above is called **SmithCo Cup Manufacturing**. What do you think about this organization?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Prosocial			Neutral			Very Profit-Oriented

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helpful to Society			Neutral			Not Helpful to Society

How do feel the profits of the sales will be used?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Benefit Others			Neutral			Benefit Management

Please tell us a little about yourself

Male \_\_\_ Female \_\_\_

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B: PHONE EXPERIMENT RESEARCH MATERIALS

Welcome research team! I want to thank you in advance for helping with the data collection for my dissertation. You rock and I owe you one. Now, let's get down to business. This research manual will take you step by step through the details of the study. You will review this and we'll practice delivery during the next meeting.

### *Overview*

The purpose of this study is to examine how different message features impact compliance with message requests. Your involvement with the study is to call students on the phone (the names and numbers will be provided for you) and: (1) deliver one of 12 different sales messages, noting their response; and (2) attempt to administer a post-experiment survey over the phone. If all goes well, you will then (3) debrief the participant. In this packet, you will be provided with everything you will need to succeed as a research assistant on this project. The packet includes: a brief description of the study design, the scripts for each of the 12 sales messages, copies of the surveys that you will administer to the participants, a debriefing script, answers to frequently-asked questions, and some tips for the job. I hope that this packet gives you everything you need, but if you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me at [contact information removed].

### *Design*

This experiment utilizes a 3 (request type: large initial request TNA, moderate initial request TNA, control) X 2 (negotiation vs. no negotiation) X 2 (prosocial vs. commercial beneficiary) independent groups design. That means there will be a total of 12 different messages in the study. The messages are all similar, but they vary according to their particular combination of independent variables. The first variable is request type. This study examines a compliance-gaining technique known as the "that's-not-all" technique. This is when you make an offer to someone, but before they can respond, you improve the offer. The offer is typically improved by lowering the initial price or adding an additional product. The second variable is negotiation. This refers to the degree to which the requester makes the sales pitch sound like a negotiation. The final variable is

the source of the message. In this study, you will be calling on behalf of a charitable organization or regular business.

*Sales Scripts*

*Message 1: Large initial request TNA, Negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I’m [your name] and I’m calling on behalf of Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their educational potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$15 but wait – for this special promotion, only for University of Maryland students, we’re offering the cup for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?”

*Message 2: Moderate initial request TNA, Negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I’m [your name] and I’m calling on behalf of Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their educational potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$7 but wait – for this special promotion, only for University of Maryland students, we’re offering the cup for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?”

*Message 3: Control request, Negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I’m [your name] and I’m calling on behalf of Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their education potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. For this special promotion, only for University of Maryland students, we’re offering these high-quality cups for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?”

*Message 4: Large initial request TNA, No negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I’m [your name] and I’m calling on behalf of Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their education potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$15...wait a second [pause as if talking to supervisor]...my supervisor says that these cups are on sale for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?”

*Message 5: Moderate initial request TNA, No negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I’m [your name] and I’m calling on behalf of Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their education potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$7...wait a second [pause as if talking to supervisor]...my supervisor says that these cups are on sale for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?”

*Message 6: Control request, No negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I’m [your name] and I’m calling on behalf of Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their education potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. These high quality cups sell for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?”

*Message 7: Large initial request TNA, Negotiation, Commercial*

“Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I’m [your name] and I’m calling on behalf of the CoffeeMax Corporation. We’re a retailer of coffee products, and right now we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$15 but wait – for this special promotion,



only for University of Maryland students, we're offering the cup for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?"

*Message 8: Moderate initial request TNA, Negotiation, Commercial*

"Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I'm [your name] and I'm calling on behalf of the CoffeeMax Corporation. We're a retailer of coffee products, and right now we're selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$7 but wait – for this special promotion, only for University of Maryland students, we're offering the cup for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?"

*Message 9: Control request, Negotiation, Commercial*

"Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I'm [your name] and I'm calling on behalf of the CoffeeMax Corporation. We're a retailer of coffee products, and right now we're selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. For this special promotion, only for University of Maryland students, we're offering these high-quality cups for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?"

*Message 10: Large initial request TNA, No negotiation, Commercial*

"Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I'm [your name] and I'm calling on behalf of the CoffeeMax Corporation. We're a retailer of coffee cups, and right now we're selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$15...wait a second [pause as if talking to supervisor]...my supervisor says that these cups are on sale for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?"

*Message 11: Moderate initial request TNA, No negotiation, Commercial*

"Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I'm [your name] and I'm calling on behalf of the CoffeeMax Corporation. We're a retailer of coffee products, and right now

we're selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$7...wait a second [pause as if talking to supervisor]...my supervisor says that these cups are on sale for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?"

*Message 12: Control request, No negotiation, Commercial*

"Hi, is [subject name] there? Hi [subject name], I'm [your name] and I'm calling on behalf of the CoffeeMax Corporation. We're a retailer of coffee products, and right now we're selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in a variety of colors and styles. These high quality cups sell for \$3. Would you be interested in purchasing a cup?"

*Conducting the Research*

You will be provided with a list of names and numbers (see phone number sheet in folder). Depending on your schedule, set aside some time during normal business hours to call the potential subjects. Try to accomplish your calls during that time regularly. Obviously, if you find that your subject will be home at another time, call them back then. Since this is an experiment, make sure that you use the same tone and vocal mannerisms in all of the calls. Additionally, I know that 12 different messages seem like a lot to remember, but the basic messages are the same, so it really isn't that much. The main difference, of course, is the organization that you are calling from. It's important that you practice the messages until you have a good command of them before you start the calls. Of course, have the script ready when you call in case you forget a line.

After you deliver the experimental message and note their response (i.e., did they agree to buy a cup or not?), you will ask them if they would answer a few questions about the sales message, "Also, I'm in training and we're assessing these kinds of sales messages. Do you mind if I ask you a few questions? It should only take a minute or two." You'll ask them the questions while including the endpoints of the index. For example, "what was your impression of our organization on a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 is very prosocial and 7 is very profit-oriented?"

As soon as they answer the last question of the survey, debrief them (see debriefing form). They may be really interested or they may be a little annoyed, but make sure that they understand the gist of what happened – it was a communication study and they are not getting a cup. Try to give them the numbers to call in case they have additional questions and ask them if it is okay to use their data. If they are upset and say “no” (which is a rare occurrence in my experience), write it on their survey form.

Surviving the sale is the hard part, after that be very nice and throw in a “please” or two in order to get them to answer the questions. Remind them that there is no additional sales pitch.

### *FAQs*

1. *What happens if they hang up?* This will definitely happen, so be ready for it. If they hang up before you get a chance to finish your sales message, note it on your phone list sheet and move on to the next number. This does not count as a “no” however since you didn’t get to finish the message.
2. *What if they interrupt me?* Also quite likely. The sales messages are short, so hopefully that minimizes this problem. But they might want to know about the organization or something – tell them you’ll be happy to answer additional questions later and finish the message.
3. *What if they don’t want to answer the survey?* Obviously, emphasize that it is very brief, but if they really won’t go for it, debrief them immediately. But try your best because it is crucial that we get the surveys completed.
4. *What if they want to know more about the cups?* Tell them they come in either black, red, or white. They also have the choice of having the Maryland logo on the side or “Fear the Turtle.” They are standard size.
5. *What if they want to join Terps for Kids or know more about it?* Tell them that you’d be happy to tell them more later. Finish the message and survey, then debrief them.
6. *What if they ask how we got the number?* Tell them you don’t know, you were just given a list by your manager.
7. *What if I don’t have a phone (I only have a cell phone)?* Let me know and we’ll work something out (maybe call from my office). Perhaps you have a friend with a land line.

8. *What if they want to know how to pay?* Try to put them off until you're done with the sales message. Tell them they can pay with credit card or check number if they persist.

## APPENDIX C: COMMERCIAL MESSAGES

### *Message 1: Large initial request TNA, Negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, I’m Steve Rains from Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their educational potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo or “Fear the Turtle” written on the side. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$15 but wait – in this special promotion only for University of Maryland students, we’re offering the cups for \$3.”

### *Message 2: Moderate initial request TNA, Negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, I’m Steve Rains from Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their educational potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo or “Fear the Turtle” written on the side. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$7 but wait – in this special promotion only for University of Maryland students, we’re offering the cups for \$3.”

### *Message 3: Control request, Negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, I’m Steve Rains from Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their educational potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo or “Fear the Turtle” written on the side. In this special promotion only for University of Maryland students, we’re offering the cups for \$3.”

### *Message 4: Large initial request TNA, No negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, I’m Steve Rains from Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their educational potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo or “Fear the Turtle” written on the side. These high-quality coffee cups were mistakenly priced at \$15 but we’re offering the cups for their original price of \$3.”

*Message 5: Moderate initial request TNA, No negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, I’m Steve Rains from Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their educational potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo or “Fear the Turtle” written on the side. These high-quality coffee cups were mistakenly priced at \$7 but we’re offering the cups for their original price of \$3.”

*Message 6: Control request, No negotiation, Prosocial*

“Hi, I’m Steve Rains from Terps for Underprivileged Kids. We’re a University organization that provides books and tutors for kids who don’t have the financial resources to reach their educational potential. In order to raise money, we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo, Testudo, or “Fear the Turtle” written on the side. These high-quality coffee cups are being sold for \$3.”

*Message 7: Large initial request TNA, Negotiation, Commercial*

“Hi, I’m Steve Rains from the CoffeeMax Corporation. We’re a retailer of coffee products, and right now we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo or “Fear the Turtle” written on the side. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$15 but wait – in this

special promotion only for University of Maryland students, we're offering the cups for \$3."

*Message 8: Moderate initial request TNA, Negotiation, Commercial*

"Hi, I'm Steve Rains from the CoffeeMax Corporation. We're a retailer of coffee products, and right now we're selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo or "Fear the Turtle" written on the side. These high-quality coffee cups sell for \$7 but wait – in this special promotion only for University of Maryland students, we're offering the cups for \$3."

*Message 9: Control request, Negotiation, Commercial*

"Hi, I'm Steve Rains from the CoffeeMax Corporation. We're a retailer of coffee products, and right now we're selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo or "Fear the Turtle" written on the side. In this special promotion only for University of Maryland students, we're offering the cups for \$3."

*Message 10: Large initial request TNA, No negotiation, Commercial*

"Hi, I'm Steve Rains from the CoffeeMax Corporation. We're a retailer of coffee products, and right now we're selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo or "Fear the Turtle" written on the side. These high-quality coffee cups were mistakenly priced at \$15 but we're offering the cups for their original price of \$3."

*Message 11: Moderate initial request TNA, No negotiation, Commercial*

"Hi, I'm Steve Rains from the CoffeeMax Corporation. We're a retailer of coffee products, and right now we're selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo or "Fear the Turtle" written on the side. These high-quality coffee cups were mistakenly priced at \$7 but we're offering the cups for their original price of \$3."

*Message 12: Control request, No negotiation, Commercial*

“Hi, I’m Steve Rains from the CoffeeMax Corporation. We’re a retailer of coffee products, and right now we’re selling University of Maryland coffee cups. They come in black, red, and white, and you can have your choice of the UMD logo or “Fear the Turtle” written on the side. These high-quality coffee cups are being sold for \$3.”



## Bibliography

- Asch, S. E. (1955). Opinion and social pressure. *Scientific American*, 193, 31-35.
- Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. A minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs*, 70, (Whole No. 416).
- Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994). Guilt: An interpersonal approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 243-267.
- Bem, D. J. (1965). An experimental analysis of self-persuasion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 199-218.
- Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-perception theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 1-62). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Bentler, P. M. (1995). *EQS structural equations program manual*. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.
- Boster, F. J. (1995). Commentary on compliance-gaining message behavior research. In C. Berger & M. Burgoon (Eds.), *Communication and social influence processes* (pp. 91-113). East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Boster, F. J., & Cruz, M. G. (2002). Persuading in the small group context. In J. P. Dillard & M. Pfau (Eds.), *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice* (pp. 477-494). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Brehm, J. W., & Cole, A. H. (1966). Effect of a favor which reduced freedom. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 420-426.
- Burger, J. M. (1986). Increasing compliance by improving the deal: The that's-not-all technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 277-283.
- Burger, J. M., Reed, M., DeCesare, K., Rauner, S., & Rozolis, J. (1999). The effects of initial request size on compliance: More about the that's-not-all technique. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 243-250.
- Chertkoff, J. M., & Conley, M. (1967). Opening offer and frequency of concession as bargaining strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7, 185-193.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *Influence: Science and Practice* (5th Ed). New York: Harper Collins.

- Cialdini, R. B. (1980). Full-cycle social psychology. *Applied Social Psychology Annual*, 1, 21-45.
- Cialdini, R. B., Cacioppo, J. T., Bassett, R., & Miller, J. A. (1978). Low-ball procedure for producing compliance: Commitment then cost. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 463-476.
- Cialdini, R. B., Vincent, J. E., Lewis, S. K., Catalan, J., Wheeler, D., & Darby, B. (1975). Reciprocal concessions procedure for inducing compliance: The door-in-the-face technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 206-215.
- Darlington, R., & Macker, C. (1966). Displacement of guilt-produced altruistic behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 442-443.
- Davis, B. P., & Knowles, E. S. (1999). A disrupt-then-reframe technique of social influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 192-199.
- Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgment. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 51, 629-636.
- Festinger, L. (1953). An analysis of compliant behavior. In M. Sherif & M. O. Wilson (Eds.), *Group relations at the crossroads* (pp. 232-256). New York: Harper.
- Festinger, L., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 58, 203-210.
- Freedman, J. L., & Fraser, S. C. (1966). Compliance without pressure: The foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 195-202.
- Gass, R. H., & Seiter, J. S. (1999). *Persuasion, social influence and compliance gaining*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Green, & Salkind (2003). *Using SPSS: Analyzing and understanding data* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Helson, H. (1964). *Adaptation-level theory*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hale, J. L., & Laliker, M. (1999). Explaining the door-in-the-face: Is it really time to abandon reciprocal concessions? *Communication Studies*, 50, 203-211.

- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6, 1-55.
- Kelman, H. C. (1961). Processes of opinion change. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 25, 57-78.
- Kellerman, K., & Cole, T. (1994). Classifying the compliance gaining message: Taxomic disorder and strategic confusion. *Communication Theory*, 4, 3-60.
- Kenrick, D. T., & Gutierrez, S. E. (1980). Contrast effects and judgments of physical attractiveness: When beauty becomes a social problem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 131-140.
- Keppel, G., & Zedeck, S. (1989). *Data analysis for research designs: Analysis of variance and multiple regression/correlation approaches*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Komorita, S. S., & Brenner, A. R. (1968). Bargaining and concession making under bilateral monopoly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9, 15-20.
- Langer, E. J. (1989). *Mindfulness*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Langer, E., Blank, A., & Chanowitz, B. (1978). The mindlessness of ostensibly thoughtful action: The role of 'placebic' information in interpersonal interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 635-642.
- Marwell, G., & Schmitt, D. R. (1967). Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. *Sociometry*, 30, 350-364.
- Miller, G. R., & Burgoon, M. (1978). Persuasion research: Review and commentary. In B. Rubin (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 2* (pp. 29-47). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Miller, G. R., Seligman, C., Clark, N. T., & Bush, M. (1976). Perceptual contrast versus reciprocal concession as mediators of induced compliance. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 8, 401-409.
- O'Keefe, D. J. (1999). Three reasons for doubting the adequacy of the reciprocal-concessions explanation of door-in-the-face effects. *Communication Studies*, 50, 211-221.
- O'Keefe, D. J., & Figge, M. (1997). A guilt-based explanation of the door-in-the-face influence strategy. *Human Communication Research*, 24, 64-81.

- O'Keefe, D. J., & Figge, M. (1999). Guilt and expected guilt in the door-in-the-face technique. *Communication Monographs*, *66*, 312-324.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 123-205). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Pollock, C. L., Smith, S. D., Knowles, E. S., & Bruce, H. J. (1998). Mindfulness limits compliance with the that's-not-all technique. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *24*, 1153-1157.
- Regan, D. T. (1971). Effects of a favor and liking on compliance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *7*, 627-639.
- Roese, N. J. (1997). Counterfactual thinking. *Psychological Bulletin*, *121*, 133-148.
- Roese, N. J., & Olson, J. M. (1997). Counterfactual thinking: The intersection of affect and function. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 29, pp. 1-59). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Sherif, M., & Hovland, C. I. (1961). *Social judgment: Assimilation and contrast effects in communication and attitude change*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1967). Attitude as the individual's own categories: The social judgment-involvement approach to attitude and attitude change. In C. W. Sherif & M. Sherif (Eds.), *Attitude, ego-involvement, and change* (pp. 105-139). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Wallace, J., & Sadalla, E. (1966). Behavioral consequences of transgression: I. The effects of the social recognition. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*, *1*, 187-194.
- Wiseman, R. L., & Schenk-Hamlin, W. (1981). A multidimensional scaling validation of an inductively derived set of compliance gaining strategies. *Communication Monographs*, *48*, 251-270.

## Vita

John Andrew Banas was born on March 18, 1976 in Ann Arbor, Michigan to Theresa and John Banas Sr. He earned a B.A. in Communication from Michigan State University in 1998 and a M.A. in Speech from the University of Hawaii at Manoa in 2001. For the past seven years, he has taught courses in Communication as a Graduate Teaching Assistant, an Assistant Instructor, and a Lecturer. He has published works in *Communication Monographs* and the *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*.

Permanent address: 4224 North Ridge Ct.

Pinckney, MI 48169

This dissertation was typed by the author.