

Manipulation Techniques – Problem 5

Foot-in-the-door (Freedman & Fraser, 1966)	Underlying processes and theories	Similarities and differences
<p>A small request, typically one that is minimally invasive so that the target is almost certain to respond affirmatively, is done. After securing compliance, either the initial requestor or an associate makes a larger, often related request.</p> <p>Once a person complies with the initial small request, they are more likely to also comply to a subsequent larger (target) request.</p>	<p>Mechanism of compliance Changing one's behavior due to request or direction of another person, greater external pressure leads to greater compliance. → Factors to increase compliance: conformity to social norms, familization with the requester and matter of principle (saying yes the first time makes it harder to say no the second time).</p> <p>Contrast Theory The initial request makes the larger request look like it needs less effort, in contrast to a direct large request.</p> <p>Impression management People want to maintain the good impression the requester has of them.</p> <p>Self-Perception Theory (Bem, 1972) People develop their attitudes by observing their own behavior and concluding what attitudes must have caused it. After agreeing to the initial request, targets ascribe traits to themselves reflecting their recent actions. This change in self-perception increases compliance in the direct future. Thus, after complying to the initial request people see themselves as helpful, caring or altruistic. In order to maintain this perception of themselves they are more likely to comply with the second request.</p>	<p>Similarities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All techniques rely on a certain extent of mindlessness to increase compliance 2. <i>LB</i>: Commitment <p>Differences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>LB</i>: only 1 request, FITD has 2 requests
<p>Freedman & Fraser (1966): (Experiment 1) People were asked on the phone which household products they used, and later were asked if experimenters could come into their house to see which product they used. → 50% of the experimental group complied with the request, compared to 25% of the control group. (Experiment 2) People were asked to put a small sign in their window, and later were asked to put a large billboard in their yard. → complying with the initial request increased the willingness to comply with the second request.</p> <p>Carcucci et al.: People were first asked to fill out a questionnaire about donation, and then asked if they wanted to become a donor. → the initial request increased the willingness to become a donor</p>		

Manipulation Techniques – Problem 5

<u>Door-in-the-face (Cialdini)</u>	Underlying processes and theories	Similarities and differences
<p>A persuader tries to convince the target to comply by making a large request that most likely will be rejected, followed by a second more reasonable request.</p> <p>The success of the of the strategy hinges on the target’s perception that the requester has made a legitimate concession (Cialdini & Trost, 1998)</p> <p>AND:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ Timing is important (Cann et. al, 1975) ➔ Only one person must do both request (Cann et. al, 1975) ➔ This technique is more effective with friends than strangers (Miller, 2010) 	<p>Reciprocal Concession Model When someone does us a favor, we need to return that favor. The target feels a normative obligation to reciprocate the influence sellers concession with a concession of his/her own. This is accomplished by moving from a position of non-compliance to compliance (Cialdini et al, 1975). Thus, the small request is perceived as a concession after the large request is rejected. This compels the person to reciprocate by accepting the second request.</p> <p>The power of Guilt The target feels guilty by rejecting the first request and tries to reduce this negative feeling by agreeing to the smaller second request. Thus, by manipulating the degree of guilty feelings, induced by rejection of the larger request and reduced by the acceptance of the smaller request, compliance is increased.</p> <p>Self-presentation theory People are concerned with their image. By rejecting the initial request people want to create a more positive image later on. Rejecting the initial request causes concerns about possible negative evaluations by the requester. Through compliance to the 2nd request a more positive image will be created.</p> <p>Mindlessness (cognitive depletion) A certain extent of mindlessness causes a lack of rational decision-making and increases compliance</p> <p>Availability hypothesis Concessions on the part of the requester is recorded a favorable by the working memory subsequently informing the target to comply with the 2nd request</p> <p>Perceptual contrast The large initial request makes the 2nd request smaller than when it would be perceived if they were presented alone</p> <p>Social responsibility People feel responsible to help</p>	<p>Similarities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All techniques rely on a certain extent of mindlessness to increase compliance 2. <i>FITD</i>: target request comes second in both techniques 3. <i>FITD</i> & <i>TNA</i>: effects can be explained by the norm of reciprocity in social interactions 4. <i>TNA</i>: both improve the initial request (anchor point) 5. <i>TNA</i>: Reciprocity <p>Differences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>FITD</i>: requests sizes are used in the other way 2. <i>FTR</i>, <i>TNA</i> & <i>CS</i>: 2 requests are made and only the 2nd is the actual target 3. <i>TNA</i>: in <i>TNA</i> is no time to respond to the initial responds, in <i>DITF</i> there is
<p>Gueguen, Jacob & Meineri: They hypothesized that more compliance is expected when an offer for tea/coffee is made directly after a customer rejects an offer for dessert, compared to when the tea/coffee offer is made a minute later.</p>		

Manipulation Techniques – Problem 5

Low-balling (Cialdini)	Underlying processes and theories	Similarities and differences
<p>An active preliminary decision to take action tends to persist even after the costs of performing the action have been increased. (small to large progression)</p> <p>For example, the car salesman sells you the car, but suddenly the price goes up, but since you already decided to buy it, you stick with the deal.</p> <p>IMPORTANT → it must feel like it really is your own choice when you commit to and accept the initial request.</p>	<p>Commitment to decision When someone decides to undertake a certain action (e.g. buy a car), it is always possible not to buy the car, BUT a certain feeling commitment accompanies the decision (you are committed to buy the car) = illusion of binding contract. If circumstances change and the behavior will become more costly, we often still pursue the action because of this feeling of commitment (you will still buy the car even when it becomes more expensive).</p> <p>People are motivated to act consistently with their commitments</p> <p>The principal of consistency → Cognitive Dissonance Theory (Festinger, 1957) Cognitive dissonance refers to a situation involving conflicting attitudes, beliefs or behavior. This produces a feeling of discomfort leading to altering the attitudes, beliefs or behavior to reduce the discomfort and restore the balance. THUS, when a person is already enjoying the prospect of an excellent deal and the future benefits of the item or idea (e.g. driving in a cool car), than backing out would create dissonance. This feeling of dissonance can be prevented by playing down the negative effect of the extra costs (e.g still buy the car).</p> <p>Self-Perception Theory (Bem, 1972) People develop their attitudes by observing their own behavior and concluding what attitudes must have caused it. After agreeing to the initial request, targets ascribe traits to themselves reflecting their recent actions. This change in self-perception increases compliance in the direct future. Thus, after complying to the initial request people see themselves as helpful, caring or altruistic. In order to maintain this perception of themselves they are more likely to comply with the second request.</p> <p>Investment When you already had costs you continue to invest and the higher price doesn't seem so bad.</p>	<p>Similarities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All techniques rely on a certain extent of mindlessness to increase compliance 2. <i>FTR</i>: elicit compliance by use, reduction and/or prevention of negative affect (also bit in techniques using norm of reciprocity) 3. <i>FITD</i>: Commitment <p>Differences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>FITD</i>: in LB you make a commitment and in FITD you're still in the persuading process. 2. <i>FITD</i>: in LB you always go back to the initial request which remains, in FITD the request can change 4. <i>LB</i>: this is the only technique that deliberately increases costs for the receiver 5. <i>FITD</i>: LB only 1 request, FITD 2 requests (changing the conditions of the initial request)
<p>Cialdini et al (1978): Students were asked to participate in an experiment. The control group was told the experiment started at 7, the experiment group was told the experiment started at 7 AFTER they had already agreed to take part in the experiment → 24% of student in the control group agreed to take part, compared to 95% of the 53% who agreed to take place in the experiment group.</p>		

Manipulation Techniques – Problem 5

That's not all (Burger, 1986, 1999)	Underlying processes and theories	Similarities and differences
<p>Compliance towards an offer is increased by adding a product or reducing the original price of the product (increasing the benefits), BEFORE the target has the chance to respond and a decision is made to buy the product.</p> <p>2 Forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ reducing costs ➔ adding value 	<p>Norm of Reciprocity in social interactions (Burger, 1989) When someone does us a favor, we need to return the favor. By either reducing the costs or adding value, people feel like the seller did us a favor (without asking) and we should return the favor by buying the product. THUS, the revised offer feels like a personal favor and creates pressure to reciprocate. The target returns a favor by complying.</p> <p>The use of an Anchor point (Burger, 1989,1999) The initial request modifies the anchor point individuals use when deciding how to respond to the more attractive request. Elevating the anchor point, increases the likelihood that the better deal will fall into a range of acceptance that is based on the higher anchor point. THUS, judgments are made in reference to an anchor point. This anchor point can be manipulated and changed and the initial price alters the anchor point that the target uses to decide to comply or not.</p> <p>Mindlessness (cognitive depletion) A certain extent of mindlessness causes a lack of rational decision-making and increases compliance</p> <p>BUT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ The more mindful the target is, the less likely he/she is to actually engage in buying if the technique is used (focus on peripheral route) ➔ The procedure can backfire when the original request is too costly or demanding 	<p>Similarities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All techniques rely on a certain extent of mindlessness to increase compliance 2. <i>DITF and FITD</i>: effects can be explained by the norm of reciprocity in social interactions 3. <i>DTR</i>: TNA technique can be seen as a special case of DTR in which the revision of the original request serves as the disruption, but the reframing is implicit rather than explicit (it's a bargain) 4. <i>DITF</i>: both improve the initial request (anchor point) <p>Differences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>FITD and DITF</i>: in TNA only 1 request is made 2. <i>DITF</i>: in TNA there is no time to respond, in <i>DITF</i> there is
<p>Burger: People were offered an additional package of cookies free of charge during a bake sale. 73% of the people in the TNA condition bought the cookies, compared to 40% in the non-TNA condition.</p>		

Manipulation Techniques – Problem 5

<u>Fear-Then-Relief</u> (Dolinski)	Underlying processes and theories	Similarities and differences
<p>Inducing anxiety of fear, but by not following it with the threat or by proposing a solution, the experienced fear makes place for relief which leads to compliance.</p> <p>The persuader deliberately places the target in a state of fear, only to quickly eliminate the threat and replace it with a mild request for compliance.</p> <p>Fear → Relief → Request (fear can be unrelated to the request)</p>	<p>Mindlessness The induced state (fear) by the technique creates a moment of mindlessness, a moment of vulnerability. When anxious people prepare to take action (fight or flight), which represents cognitive load and may cause cognitive exhaustion/cognitive deficit. When the action reaction is suddenly not needed any more, people are not ready to produce new adequate responses right away. This makes them susceptible to external request.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">→ State of disorientation</p> <p>People can feel disoriented because of the sudden change from negative stimuli (fear) to positive stimuli (relief) and cannot directly activate an appropriate reaction to maintain resistance. Therefore people react <i>mindlessly</i> with automatic preprogrammed reactions</p>	<p>Similarities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All techniques rely on a certain extent of mindlessness to increase compliance 2. <i>DTR</i>: confusion <p>Differences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>FITD & DITF</i>: only 1 request is made in FTR 2. <i>DTR</i>: in <i>DTR</i> there's no fear, in FTR there is
<p>Dollinsky & Nawrat (1997): People who parked their car in an unauthorized find a ticket under their windshields. In the FTR condition it looked like a parking ticket but it was just an advertisement, in the anxiety condition it was a parking ticketing → compliance to fill in an questionnaire was significantly higher in the FTR condition compared to the anxiety condition. THUS, compliance is caused by fear then relief and not just by fear</p>		

Manipulation Techniques – Problem 5

<u>Creating similarity</u>	Underlying processes and theories	Similarities and differences
<p>High similarity between yourself and another person increases the chance that the other person will comply to your request</p> <p>BUT: Only extern similarity is NOT enough within long exposure. Similarity can work in long-term exposure but you have to be really convincing in creating similarity (Lichtenhal, 2001)</p>	<p>Similarity reduces resistance</p> <p>Social Comparison Theory People evaluate themselves by comparing themselves to similar others (and their opinions). Higher similarity will increase liking and thus has positive influence on compliance rates (less critical thinking).</p> <p>Dual process model Similarity triggers more associative processing, thus less thinking. This increases compliance because individuals rely on cues that are not the actual message to make a decision.</p>	<p>Similarities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All techniques rely on a certain extent of mindlessness to increase compliance <p>Differences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>FITD & DITF</i>: only 1 request is made
<p>Lichtenhal (2001):</p>		

Manipulation Techniques – Problem 5

Disrupt-then-reframe (Davis & Knowles, 1999)	Underlying processes and theories	Similarities and differences
<p>This technique operates by disrupting an individual's understanding of and resistance to an influence attempt and reframing the persuasive message or request so that the individual is left more vulnerable to the proposition</p> <p>The technique is characterized by a small twist or confusing element in the request (the disruption), followed by a persuasive phrase (reframing), and is used to confuse a target to reduce resistance and increase compliance.</p>	<p>The thought-then-disruption theory (Petty & Wegener, 1999) Disruption functions as a distracter, reducing the ability of the target to produce counter arguments. The disruption in the DTR technique may foster lower levels of processing (peripheral route) and the 'reframe-part' could have an impact on compliance to the extent that it functions as a heuristic or peripheral cue. → Think of: Elaboration likelihood model (Petty & Copoccio, 1986)</p> <p>Mindlessness A certain extent of mindlessness causes a lack of rational decision-making and increases compliance</p> <p>Erikson confusion Eriskon (founder of modern clinical hypnoses) found that many people that came to him wanted to be hypnotized, but yet they were also resistant. In order to deal with this resistance he developed confusion techniques (non-sequiters, unconventional word order, handshake). This would engage and occupy the conscious mind while diverting it from maintaining the resistance to hypnosis.</p> <p>Action Identification Theory The theory proposes that people always have some conception of what they are doing available. These conceptions can be defined at different hierarchical levels. Lower level and higher level actions. Lower level characterizations pertain to specific details of the action, higher level qualifications include the purpose, goals and broader implications of the actions. The theory predicts that a disruption shifts the recipients focus from the higher level meanings to a more concrete lower level of focus. The attention to details brought on by shift would make the recipient more susceptible to influence by the reframe.</p>	<p>Similarities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All techniques rely on a certain extent of mindlessness to increase compliance 2. <i>FTR</i>: confusion <p>Differences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>TNA</i>: TNA technique can be seen as a special case of DTR, but the reframing is implicit in TNA and is explicit (it's a bargain) in DTR 2. <i>FTR</i>: DTR there is no fear, in FTR there is
<p>Davis & Knowles (1993): They found that disrupting a sales script for selling Christmas cards for charity (300 pennies) followed by reframing (that's a bargain) significantly enhanced purchases. → 65% in the DTR condition, compared to 35% in the control condition.</p>		