What is Regulatory Goal Compatibility?

- People experience an increase in motivational intensity when their manner of goal pursuit matches their self-regulatory orientation → regulatory fit

- When this happens…
  - more intense reactions are experienced
  - the goal pursuit activity “feels right”
  - people become more engaged

- This “feeling right” experience generates value and leads to greater persuasion

Self-Regulatory Orientation

- Self-regulatory orientation are goals that guide people’s behaviors to serve fundamental needs

|| Nurturance Needs | Security Needs |
|------------------|----------------|
| Promotion Goal   | Prevention Goal|

Self-Regulatory Goals

- **Promotion Focus (serves nurturance needs)**
  - Strive toward achievements and growth
  - Sensitive to positive outcomes (gains & nongains)
  - Focus on ideals, hopes and aspirations

- **Prevention Focus (serves security needs)**
  - Strive toward safety and security
  - Sensitive to negative outcomes (nonlosses & losses)
  - Focus on duties, obligations and responsibilities

Hierarchy of Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Regulatory Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption Goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hierarchy of Goals – Buying a Car

Promotion Goal
To Buy a Car

Prevention Goal
To Buy a Car

Hierarchy of Goals – Buying a Car

Promotion Focus
Sunroof
DVD Player
Turbo Charger

Prevention Focus
Air bags
ABS Brakes
Traction Control

Research Questions

- How is regulatory fit effected?
- What are the effects of regulatory fit on persuasion?
- What mechanism underlies this regulatory fit effect?
- What are the boundary conditions of this effect?
- Is Promotion-Prevention the same as Approach-Avoidance?
- What are the broader implications of regulatory fit?

Experiencing Regulatory Fit

Two ways to operationalize regulatory fit

- Process-based
- Outcome-based
**Experiencing Regulatory Fit**

- **Process-based**
  - Employing decision strategies that are consistent vs. inconsistent with their regulatory orientation
  - Example:
    - Participants asked to evaluate two brands of correction fluid based on affective vs. cognitive response (Avnet & Higgins 2006)

---

**Process-based Regulatory Fit**

Avnet & Higgins 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing Willingness to Pay](chart)

---

**Experiencing Regulatory Fit**

- **Outcome-based**
  - Leveraging the outcomes to which people with distinct regulatory goals are sensitive
  - Example:
    - Participants presented with gain vs. loss framed messages that address promotion or prevention concerns (Lee & Aaker 2004)

---

**Gain-framed Promotion Appeal**

Get Energized
~ Drink Welch's Grape Juice!

---

**Loss-framed Promotion Appeal**

Don't Miss Out on Getting Energized
~ Drink Welch's Grape Juice!

---

**Gain-framed Prevention Appeal**

Prevent Clogged Arteries
~ Drink Welch's Grape Juice!
Loss-framed Prevention Appeal

Don’t Miss Out on Preventing Clogged Arteries
~ Drink Welch’s Grape Juice!

Regulatory Focus x Frame

- Promotion focus
  - Get energized (gain)
  - Don’t miss out on getting energized (nongain)
- Prevention focus
  - Prevent clogged arteries (nonloss)
  - Don’t miss out on preventing clogged arteries (loss)

Attitude toward Welch’s Grape Juice

![Bar chart showing attitude toward Welch’s Grape Juice]

Lee & Aaker, 2004 JPS

Potential Matches for Regulatory Fit

**Promotion System**
- Growth needs
- Ideal Self-Standards
- Independent Self-Construal
- Cheerfulness/Dejection
- Gain/Non-Gain Incentives
- Eagerness strategies
- Abstract, Distant-Future
- Creativity
- Affect-based processing
- Change
- Locomotion mode
- Additive Counterfactuals

**Prevention System**
- Security needs
- Ought Self-Standards
- Interdependent Self-Construal
- Calm/Agitation
- Non-Loss/Loss Incentives
- Vigilance strategies
- Concrete, Near-Future
- Self Control
- Reason-based processing
- Stability
- Assessment mode
- Subtractive Counterfactuals

Self Construal x Regulatory Focus

Website Evaluation

![Graph showing website evaluation]

Lee & Aaker, 2003 JCR
**Regulatory Focus x Level of Construal**

Think about your hopes and aspirations

![The Ultimate Aerobic Machine For A Great Workout!](image)

Senna's new elliptical trainer gives you body contouring and conditioning while you achieve cardiovascular training. Senna has a stride and arm path that simulates running, walking, jumping, and climbing. The precise, patented geometry of the stride ensures that you get buff.

Think about your duties and obligations

![The Ultimate Aerobic Machine With the Right Features!](image)

Senna's new elliptical trainer is equipped with a patented non-impact stepper designed to cushion each step. Senna has a stride and arm path that simulates running, country walking, wading, bounding, and climbing. A multiple stride setting complements the precise, patented geometry of the stride.

Keller, Lee & Sternthal 2006
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Promotion Prevention

Regulatory Focus

Self Construal x Temporal Distance

"Please imagine that you have been assigned to work on a big project (as part of a team).

At an initial meeting, the allocation of task responsibility, collection of relevant data, and progress update were discussed. The date for the presentation of key findings and recommendations has also been scheduled, and you have two more weeks (days) before this deadline."

Lee & Lee, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Construal x Temporal Distance

DV: What did you think of the situation?

very bad – very good, unfavorable – favorable

Lee & Lee, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Construal x Temporal Distance

DV: How motivated would you be to take on the responsibilities assigned?

Not at all motivated – very motivated

Lee & Lee, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Construal x Temporal Distance

DV: How motivated would you be to take on the responsibilities assigned?

Not at all motivated – very motivated

Lee & Lee, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Construal x Temporal Distance

DV: How motivated would you be to take on the responsibilities assigned?

Not at all motivated – very motivated

Lee & Lee, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Construal x Temporal Distance

DV: How motivated would you be to take on the responsibilities assigned?

Not at all motivated – very motivated

Lee & Lee, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Construal x Temporal Distance

DV: How motivated would you be to take on the responsibilities assigned?

Not at all motivated – very motivated

Lee & Lee, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the mechanism underlying the regulatory fit effect on persuasion?

- Consistent vs. inconsistent information is conceptually more fluent
  - Fiske & Neuberg 1990
  - Macrae, Milne, & Bodenhausen 1994

- Processing fluency leads to more favorable attitudes
  - Lee 2001
  - Mandler, Nakamura, & Van Zandt 1987
  - Reber, Winkielman, & Schwarz 1998

→ Hypothesis: Goal-compatible messages are easier to process. Fluent processing leads to enhanced evaluation.

Mechanism underlying Regulatory Fit

Design:
- 2 Regulatory Focus (Promotion vs. Prevention)
- 2 Frame (Gain vs. Loss)

DV(1): Perceived ease of processing
1 = difficult to process, understand
7 = easy to process, understand

DV(2): Perceptual identification
(8 target words presented at 50msec interval)

Uncovering Mechanism Underlying Fit ~ Implications of Processing Fluency?

Design:
- 2 Regulatory Focus (Promotion vs. Prevention)
- 2 Frame (Gain vs. Loss)

DV: Attitude toward the brand
# Support Reasons
Effectiveness of the Ad
Effectiveness of the Ad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gain Frame</th>
<th>Loss Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lee & Aaker, 2004 JPSP

Underlying Mechanism

- # of Support reasons was NOT a mediator of the fit effect
- Persuasion effect was mediated by perceived effectiveness of the ad
- Processing fluency underlies the effect of regulatory fit on persuasion

Boundary Conditions of Fit Effects

- When do people not rely on fluency effects?
- When does regulatory fit/fluency lead to less favorable attitudes?

Boundary Condition of Fit Effects I

**Design:**
- 2 regulatory focus (promotion, prevention)
- 2 involvement (high, low)
- 2 feature types (promotion, prevention)

**DV:** Type of feature selected
- Involvement:
  - Select vs. huge sample
  - Product launch vs. preliminary testing
- Features:
  - Teeth whitening, breath freshening, enamel strengthening
  - Cavity prevention, plaque prevention, gingivitis prevention

Involvement x Fit on Information Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion Features</th>
<th>Prevention Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Involvement</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Involvement</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strong claim:** it freshens your breath with perilla seed extract, grapefruit seed extract, and natural essential oils of orange and mint

**Weak claim:** it freshens your breath

Wang & Lee, 2006 JMR

Involvement x Fit on Persuasion

**Design:**
- 2 regulatory focus (promotion, prevention)
- 2 involvement (high, low)
- 2 product (Brand A: strong promotion claims, Brand B: strong prevention claims)

**Strong claim:** it freshens your breath with perilla seed extract, grapefruit seed extract, and natural essential oils of orange and mint

**Weak claim:** it freshens your breath
Involvement x Fit on Persuasion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Focus</th>
<th>High Involvement</th>
<th>Low Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = strong promotion claims</td>
<td>B = strong prevention claims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wang & Lee, 2006 JMR

Boundary Condition of Fit Effects II

--fit intensifies reactions
  - Positive reactions become more positive
  - Negative reactions become more negative

Design:
- 2 Self Construal (Independent vs. Interdependent)
- x 2 Frame (Promotion vs. Prevention)
- x 2 Argument Strength (Strong vs. Weak)

DV: Attitude towards the Brand

Argument Strength on Fit Effects

Attitude toward the Brand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument Strength</th>
<th>Compatible</th>
<th>Incompatible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong arguments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak arguments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aaker & Lee, 2001 JCR

Intensified Reactions from Regulatory Fit

Design
- 2 (Dieting goal: Dieters vs. Non-dieters)
- x 2 (Prime: Promotion vs. Prevention)
- x 2 (Target: Nongain vs. Nonloss)

DV: Brand evaluation

Processing fluency

Evaluation by Non-dieters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation by Non-dieters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nongain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Koo, Labroo & Lee, 2006

Evaluation by Dieters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation by Dieters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nongain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Koo, Labroo & Lee, 2006
Imagine that you (you and your two friends) are a volunteer at the Summer Jobs for Youths Bureau. Every year the bureau makes telephone calls to local companies listed in the Yellow Pages to explain to management the mission of the bureau and to solicit their support by hiring summer interns. Every volunteer takes turns (All volunteers take turns) being the ‘ambassador on duty’ for a day to make these calls. Although you (the three of you) are committed to advancing the cause of the bureau, you (you three) have never made cold calls before. Some experienced callers have said that it is often difficult to get through to the right person and that some people can be very rude.

You (the three of you) have been assigned to be the ‘ambassador on duty’ in two days (three weeks). Now please imagine what it is like in two days (three weeks), when you (you and your friends) are about to make your first call.

**Self-Construal x Temporal Construal on An Unpleasant Task**

Imagine that you (you and your two friends) are a volunteer at the Summer Jobs for Youths Bureau. Every year the bureau makes telephone calls to local companies listed in the Yellow Pages to explain to management the mission of the bureau and to solicit their support by hiring summer interns. Every volunteer takes turns (All volunteers take turns) being the ‘ambassador on duty’ for a day to make these calls. Although you (the three of you) are committed to advancing the cause of the bureau, you (you three) have never made cold calls before. Some experienced callers have said that it is often difficult to get through to the right person and that some people can be very rude.

You (the three of you) have been assigned to be the ‘ambassador on duty’ in two days (three weeks). Now please imagine what it is like in two days (three weeks), when you (you and your friends) are about to make your first call.

**Self Construal x Temporal Distance**

DV: What did you think of the job of the ambassador?
Bad-good, negative-positive, very unrewarding-very rewarding

**Self Construal x Temporal Distance**

DV: How motivated would you be to make these calls?
Not at all motivated/eager – very motivated/eager

**Cognitive Structure of Goals in Memory**

Is the goal compatibility effect the result of...

- a match between the **hedonic goal** of approach and avoidance (i.e., positive vs. negative valence)?

- or compatibility between **regulatory goal** (i.e., promotion vs. prevention focus)?

**Hedonic vs. Regulatory Goal Predictions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Loss</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nongain</td>
<td>🙁</td>
<td>🙁</td>
<td>🙁</td>
<td>🙁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonloss</td>
<td>☺/</td>
<td>☺/</td>
<td>☺/</td>
<td>☺/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hedonic Goal Compatibility
Gain Prime: Nonloss > Nongain
Loss Prime: Nongain > Nonloss

Regulatory Goal Compatibility
Gain Prime: Nongain > Nonloss
Loss Prime: Nongain > Nonloss
Cognitive Structure of Goals in Memory

- **Design:**
  - 2 (prime: gain vs. loss)
  - x 2 (target: nongain vs. nonloss)

- **DV:**
  - Attitude toward the brand
  - Processing Fluency
  - Perceptual Identification

---

Priming Stimuli

**Gain Prime**
- Feeling Fresh...
- Feeling Confident...
- Have happy feet...

**Loss Prime**
- Feeling embarrassed...
- Have smelly feet...
- Foot deodorizer

---

Target Stimuli

**Nongain Target**
- Freedom from Embarrassment
- Say goodbye to stickiness

**Nonloss Target**
- Not feeling great?
- Lacking in hygiene and cleanliness

---

Brand evaluation reflects regulatory goals structure in memory

---

Processing fluency reflects regulatory goals structure in memory

---

Broader Implications of Regulatory Fit

- **When people experience regulatory fit…**
  - more intense reactions are experienced
  - the goal pursuit activity “feels right”
  - people become more engaged

  - Regulatory fit facilitates self-regulation
  - Regulatory nonfit impairs self-regulation
Fit vs. Nonfit on Self-Regulation

Manipulation of Regulatory Fit

- Tell us about one of your dreams/aspirations
  - What are some of the things you can do to make sure everything would go right with achieving this aspiration? Please list at least 3 of them.

- Tell us about one of your duties/obligations
  - What are some of the things you can do to avoid anything that could go wrong with fulfilling this obligation? Please list at least 3 of them.

Regulatory Fit Manipulation

- Tell us about your dream and aspiration
  - Things you can do to make sure everything goes right.
  - Things you can do to avoid anything that could go wrong.

Fit vs. Nonfit on Self-Regulation

- Design
  - 2 (regulatory fit: fit, nonfit) x 3 (handgrip task: time1, time2, time3)

- Procedure
  - Handgrip (time1: baseline measure)
  - Thought listing but do not think of “white bears”
  - Handgrip (time2)
  - Fit manipulation
  - Handgrip (time3)

Fit vs. Nonfit on Self-Regulation

- (Hand grip - physical endurance)

- (Anagram - cognitive persistence)

Hong & Lee 2008
Fit vs. Nonfit on Self-Regulation (Temptation - will power)

Choice of Snack

Prescriptive Implications
~ Do people voluntarily adopt fit strategies?

- Design
  2 (regulatory focus: promotion, prevention) x 2 (ad critique strategy: feelings, reasons) x 2 (assignment: assigned, self-select)

- DV
  - choice of strategy in the free choice condition
  - apple vs. chocolate bar

Choice of Strategy

How about getting tested for hepatitis?
**Fit Effect on Getting Tested for Hepatitis**

- **Design**
  - 2 regulatory focus
  - 2 strategy
  - 2 perceived risk (low vs. high frequency behavior)

- **Procedure**
  - Read message on getting tested for hepatitis
  - Fit manipulation
  - DV = Likelihood of getting tested

---

**Fit vs. Nonfit on Self-regulation**

Hepatitis is a liver disease caused by virus infections… Early detection of hepatitis is critical…

**You are at high risk if you…**

- Low frequency behaviors
  - received blood transfusions;
  - shared drug needles;
  - had organ transplants;
  - engaged in homosexual intercourse;
  - had multiple sex partners during the same time period;
  - were subject to the use of unsterilized equipment in your doctor’s office.

- High frequency behaviors
  - shared a toothbrush;
  - shared a razor;
  - had unprotected sex;
  - engaged in oral sex;
  - shared bottles of water or soda;
  - ate uncooked food (such as unpeeled fruits or vegetables).

---

**Implications of Regulatory Fit on Health and Subjective Well-being**

- **Subjective well-being**
  - Feeling right

- **Health-related issues**
  - Persuasion and will power
    - Compliance
    - Preventative actions
    - Self-control

---

**Get Fit and be Happy**

---

**Thank You**