The key behind sequential request techniques, priming or depletion:

An experimental study

Fleur Betlem

S0072184

Research Report

Master Communication Studies

University of Twente

Instructor: dr. B.M. Fennis

Submitted: February 2005

Abstract

After decades of academic research on sequential request techniques the effectiveness of those techniques has still not been unraveled. The study contributes to this academic field by suggesting that the psychological process of depletion can potentially explain the effectiveness of the techniques. All sequential request techniques consist of two parts, an initial and a target request. We hypothesize that depletion is generated by the initial request resulting in compliance with the second request. The first study in this paper examines the occurrence of depletion by request techniques. This study indicates that the opposite occurs. Instead of depletion indicate the results a priming process in which the target person is primed by the initial request. A marginally significant main effect of the sequential request technique on compliance has been found. The second study examines the issue further. In this study it is hypothesized that the psychological process generated, depletion or priming, will lead to a specific state of mind. Depletion is supposed to generate a mindless state, whereby priming will lead to a mindful state. The state of mindlessness will result in use of heuristics. The second study measures preference for consistency. We assume that when a participant is depleted, he will use consistency to make a decision about the target request. The findings of the second study indicate the process of priming as well. This study shows a mindful state of the participants exposed to the influence technique. No main effect of the technique on compliance has been found. We concluded that in both studies indications have been found that the technique generates the psychological process of priming. We can suggest that the technique leads to a mindful state as well.

The key behind sequential request techniques, priming or depletion:

An experimental study

Making people act the way you want them to act is the essence of selling propositions. To reach the root of this matter, influence techniques used by salespersons are analyzed. How do these techniques work and how can these effects be accounted for? The key objective of this article is to demonstrate that the psychological process of depletion or priming plays a major part in the effectiveness of sequential request techniques.

The essence of sequential request techniques is saying yes by the target person to the request at the end of the technique. Saying yes is complying with the intentions of the person who executes the technique. Cialdini and Goldstein (2004) describe compliance as a 'particular kind of response to a particular kind of communication, whereby the target recognizes that he is being urged to respond in a desired way'. In order to generate compliance with the target request, we have to understand the behavior of the target person when he is exposed to the influence technique. Why does the target person comply with a request? What 'tricks' him in doing so? People sometimes find themselves going along with a request without much thought and without knowing why. This research seeks to examine potentially important factors of complying with the request. Could this be because the person in question is 'depleted' and therefore mindless? Or is the target person perhaps in a state of mindfulness because he has been 'primed' with the subject? This study enunciates these two psychological processes, which potentially can explain the effectiveness of the sequential request techniques. Before we discuss both processes we first explain the starting point of this study, sequential request techniques.

In the following section, we briefly give a review of sequential request techniques. Next, we discuss how the two psychological processes potentially can relate to these techniques. Finally, we report two studies to test the processes of the sequential request

techniques constructs and the implications for understanding the effectiveness of the techniques.

Review of sequential request techniques

The focus of this study is tactics that require more than one step, usually two to be effective (Cialdini & Guadagno, 2004). The essence of these tactics is to generate compliance with the last request. This can be generated through an initial request like first asking a small request followed by a larger request, or requesting a large favor followed by a smaller favor. The collective noun of these tactics is sequential request techniques. One of the most used techniques is Foot-In-The-Door (FITD). We explain this technique in the following section.

The FITD is a well-known sequential request technique. This technique has been used several times in different studies (Burger & Guadagno, 2003; Cann, Sherman & Elkes, 1975; Dolinski, 2000; Snyder & Cunningham, 1975). The technique consists of a small request followed by a large request. Many studies have shown that after agreeing to a small initial request, participants are more likely to agree to a large target request (Cialdini, Trost & Newson, 1995; DeJong, 1979; Dolinksi, 2000). Complying with the first request is a minor commitment from the participant, what leads to a major commitment into saying yes to the target request (Cialdini & Guadagno, 2004). Why do people comply easier when they hear an initial request beforehand? It has been argued that FITD demonstrations show that people try to act consistently with the way they have behaved in the past. It has to be taken in account that consistent behavior can spring from internal sources, but is also influenced by external sources (Bargh, Chen & Burrows, 1996). A possible external source is pressure by the requester when he uses an influence technique. Hence, through thoughts about former behavior combined with external pressure, the initial request makes sure that a person inclines to compliance.

The FITD technique has been used in several ways in different studies. At first, the technique was used in the traditional way by exposing the target person to a small request followed by a larger one. Secondly a variation of the FITD has been used, called the Continued Question Procedure (CQP) (Burger, 1999). This tactic consists of several questions followed by a target request. In this case the initial request is replaced by several questions. We assume that this tactic is effective because the target request is a logical continuation of the questions.

In addition, an important objective of the present research is to examine why the techniques are effective. A common explanation is the use of heuristics by the target person. This subject will be enunciated later in this study. First we are zooming in on other psychological processes that are possible explanations for the success of request techniques.

Two psychological processes

One process that potentially occurs when a person is exposed to several requests is self-control. Complying or not complying with a request can be seen as a result of self-control. We define self-control as the capacity of the self to alter its own states and responses (Baumeister, 2002). We can assume that a person fails at self-control when he is not capable of altering his own response. The strength model (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000) predicts that after a self-control attempt, subsequent attempts are less likely to succeed. Subsequent attempts are less likely to succeed, regardless of the success or failure of the first self-control attempt. When the translation is made to the sequential request techniques, for example a Continued Question Procedure, it can be stated that people who made an attempt at self-control during answering a few questions, will probably fail at self-control during the following target request. Baumeister (2002) stated in a review that there is extensive evidence to suggest that once a person fails at an act of self-control, he will perform even worse at the following act of self-control. The effectiveness of the influence techniques

potentially depends on the amount of self-control of a person immediately after the request. In other words, it depends on the amount of self-control demanded by the initial request.

Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven and Tice (1998) speak of different models of self-control. One version predicts that self-control is a limited resource. When this source depletes, the person is less capable of performing an act of self-control (Muraven, Tice and Baumeister, 1998). This exhaustion of the source is called ego depletion. The strength model of Muraven and Baumeister (2000) can be explained by ego depletion. According to this view the same source is used for different kind of activities. Decrements in self control performance as a function of prior exertion can be interpreted as prove of this model (Schmeichel, Baumeister & Vohs, 2003). Ego depletion can be translated into influence techniques. Exposing a person to a sequential request technique can result in exertion of self control and will result in a state of ego depletion. Depletion could be a reason to comply with the final request. In other words, for example by the continued question procedure, the questions will cause depletion of the resource. Because of the diminished resource, the person is less capable of resisting the target request.

Notwithstanding the hypothesis of depletion, another explanation is possible. The psychological process of priming can potentially be an alternative account of the success of sequential request phenomenon. Muraven and Baumeister (2000) state that priming is an essential psychological process. We define priming as an activation of mental representations by a context or movement, which results in a tendency to actually act in accordance with the context or make the movement (Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998). When people undergo an activity that leads to a request about the same topic, this activity can potentially prime their thoughts and self-control. This prediction could lead to a re-active state of self-control, which could lead to a conscious choice to comply with the request. When the target person is primed by the technique, we assume that the initial

attempt on self-control does not have a great impact on the second attempt of self-control. Priming is as nonconscious activation with the environmental context (Chartrand & Bargh, 1996). We propose that the initial request activates the mental representation of the target person, wherefore the target person is activated with the subject of the influence technique and focused on the target request.

Like the theory of depletion, priming can be another explanation for the FITD phenomenon. The implications for the amount of self-control are different for the depletion hypothesis and the priming hypothesis. The hypothesis of depletion states that the influence technique will deplete the target person, wherefore in accordance with the strength model, the exertion impairs self-control. The exertion is generated by the initial request. When this initial request does not deplete the target person but instead primes, then we assume that self-control is consolidated.

Both psychological processes cannot entirely explain the sequential request phenomenon. Another step has to be taken. What happens when the resource of a person has been depleted? Does he comply just simple because his resource has been diminished? Or does depletion makes sure that the person is in a specific state of mind? Muraven et al. (1998) state that one central prediction of the strength model is that exertion will be followed by a period of diminished capacity. In other words, when the initial request causes prior exertion of self-control, the target person could have a diminished capacity when he is exposed to the target request. Several studies indicate that complying with a target request as consequence of a sequential request technique usually occurs in relatively mindlessness circumstances (Langer, 1992 in Fennis, Das & Pruyn, in press). We propose that the diminished capacity of the target person is a result of the initial request. A diminished capacity indicates a state of mindlessness (Langer, 1989).

Next to the hypothesis of depletion, we have proposed priming as a psychological process that potentially explains the FITD phenomenon. We state that the target person is activated by the environmental context, in this case the initial request. Like depletion, priming itself cannot completely explain the FITD mystery. Once again, we propose that the psychological process leads to a specific state of mind. We assume that when a target person is primed by the initial request, he will turn in a state of mindfulness. Langer (1989) defines mindfulness as being aware of context. In conclusion we propose that in case of priming the target person is aware of the context, the initial request, and therefore is in a state of mindfulness.

In this study we seek to investigate if the psychological processes of depletion and priming result in a specific state of mind. Does depletion generate mindlessness, wherefore the target person responds to the target request in a state of mindlessness? Or does priming generate mindfulness, wherefore the target person responds to the target request in a state of mindfulness? In the next paragraph we will examine the impact of depletion and priming on the state of mind.

The state of mind

Mindfulness and mindlessness are not ways of responding but states of mind (Langer, 1989). Mindlessness has been described as minimal information processing, but Langer (1989) argues that this is too narrow. Mindlessness and mindfulness differ in the amount of processing and in quality of processing. They are different because once information has been processed mindlessly, it is no longer available for active use. Hence, a mindful decision can be small but well considered. In general we can say that mindlessness is expressed in minimal information processing and mindfulness is expressed in active information processing. When a person is in a state of mindfulness he will define his own categories and

distinctions, whereby a person in a state of mindlessness relies on categories that already have been formed and distinctions that have already been made (Langer, 1989).

The concepts can be defined as a state of alertness and lively awareness for mindfulness, and a state of reduced attention for mindlessness (Langer, 1989). Both notions can be important for the processing of sequential request techniques. We propose that depletion diminishes the capacity of a person and this will generate mindlessness. This means that when a target person is exposed to an influence technique, he is not capable of extensive information processing. In this scenario it can be stated that influence techniques are capacity consuming and the resource of self-control is lessened by the technique.

On the other hand, when we state that a sequential request enriches the capacity through priming, than the target person who is influenced will be in a re-active state of information processing. This scenario speaks of capacity increasing through request techniques. A point of consideration is the statement of Langer (1989) that risk taking always happens in a state of mindfulness. Hence, when the target request contains a risk for a person, his state will turn mindful. This implicates that the final request must not contain a risk, when the explanation for the phenomenon lies within depletion.

When we hypothesize that sequential request techniques result in depletion of resources, the next assumption is that depletion will result in a specific state of mind; mindlessness. When this is the case, the resource is not enough to engage in an active state of cognitive effort. Perhaps people in a mindlessness state are not motivated to engage in systematic processing and are likely to resort to heuristic processing. When a person in a mindlessness state is presented with information without motivation to question it, he may form a premature cognitive commitment (Langer, 1989). In other words the person accepts the information unquestioningly. Hence, when a person processes an initial request and becomes mindlessness, he probably will make a premature cognitive commitment. This

enhances the likelihood to comply with the final request. The key hypothesis in this study is that a sequential request technique generates a psychological process. When the process that is aroused by the influence technique is depletion, a person will turn in a state of mindlessness. The opposite is proposed to happen when the person is primed by the request technique. In this case, we expect the person to turn into a state of mindfulness.

We hypothesize that both psychological processes can probably be facilitated by a request technique and lead to a specific state of mind. Why is the state of mind important for the effectiveness of the techniques? Psychologists have suggested that a person in a state of mindlessness will use heuristics (Langer, 1989). Hence, when a person is in a mindless state because of depletion, he will use a heuristic to make a decision. The use of heuristics is mainly effective when the cognitive capacity is reduced (Fennis, Das & Pruyn, in press). We assume that when a person is in a mindless state generated by depletion, he will probably use heuristics to make a decision about the target request, but will abstain to do so when a person is in a mindful state. In the next paragraph the use of heuristics will be enunciated.

The use of heuristics

Different authors have brought up heuristics that potentially can explain the FITD or other sequential request techniques. Heuristics like mood (Dolinksi & Nawrat, 1998), authority, obedience (Scharzwald & Koslowsky, 1992), social norm (Cialdini & Guadagno 2004), reciprocity (Cialdini, Vincent, Lewis & Catalan, 1975), consistency (Cialdini et al., 1995) and commitment (Cialdini & Guadagno, 2004) are mentioned in the literature. The heuristic consistency could be a valid explanation for the FITD effect. When a person applies the psychological rule of consistency, it has two separate consequences for request techniques. First of all, a participant can consider himself as a consistent person. This implicates that when he complies with the first request, he will probably comply with the second request as well. Another aspect can be that the participant will comply with the

second request when this request is consistent with the first. In other words both requests have to concern the same topic. This last issue has not adequately been researched. Only two experiments examined this prediction directly (Freedman & Fraser, 1966, experiment 2 and Seligman & Miller et al., 1976 in Burger, 1999).

The results of request techniques vary in their outcomes. Some techniques are supposed to work because of preference for consistency (PFC). Cialdini et al. (1995) assume that preference for consistency explains why studies frequently fail at detecting and replicating experimental phenomena like the FITD. When they developed the preference for consistency scale, they discovered that a surprisingly large percentage of the participants showed no strong preference. The assumption is made that results of a FITD experiment will be influenced by the preference for consistency of participants. The technique will probably succeed when most of the respondents score high on the scale, as opposed to when the participant's score indicates a low preference. Cialdini et al. (1995) state:

> *'That a dispositional preference for or against consistent responding importantly moderates the extent to which individuals will behave in accord with consistency theory predictions'.*

The difference between the preferences for consistency of respondents can create error variance that will influence the results of the data. This can be a cause for not succeeding in duplicating a FITD-effect. Guadagno, Asher, Demaine and Cialdini (2001) quote several studies which demonstrate the moderation of preference for consistency on behavior. Individuals have a drive to be consistent with their previous behaviors and commitments (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). Previous work has demonstrated that a strong preference for consistency among participants can enhance the FITD effect (Guadagno et al., 2001).The results of the study of Cialdini et al. (1995) indicates that only people that score high on the

PFC-scale are affected by the FITD-effect. When people with a high score on the scale agree to a small request, it makes them more likely to agree to the target request.

Before we explore the previous hypotheses, we first review the alternative explanation for the success of sequential request techniques; the psychological process of priming.

Alternative explanations

The existing studies about sequential request techniques point to the explanation of depletion and the use of heuristics. The psychological process of priming has potential to explain the mystery of the sequential request techniques as well. Priming can be described as an incidental activation of knowledge structures by the current situational context. (Bargh et al., 1996). When the FITD technique is linked with priming, the proposition can be stated that the initial request activates the knowledge structures, which results in specific behavior with regard to the target request.

The activities of the FITD phenomena can be a mixture of conscious and unconscious behavior. Perhaps people are unconsciously primed through the first request and are therefore more aware of the context. Because of the awareness, they base their conscious response to the second request on the feelings and perceptions produced through priming (Bargh, et al., 1996). For example in a study from Bargh, et al. (1996) people who were primed with elderly stereotypes walked more slowly down the hallway than did participants in the control condition. We can state that participants that were primed with the specific stereotype felt connected to the elderly. Maybe when the primed persons in this experiment were asked to comply with a request concerning the elderly, they would comply more easily than persons that were not primed.

Influence by priming plays a stronger than usual role in subsequent behavior by the target person. The role is intensified because the perceiver is not aware of the interpretive

bias and is for that reason not capable of correcting for it (Bargh, 1994, in Bargh et al., 1996). Because the target person is not aware of the influence the initial request plays, he is not able to correct his behavior before the target request is made. When a person is primed by the initial request he could be better prepared for the second request. Like stated before, a target person will probably turn in a mindful state when he is aware of the context. When the person is mindful he could use active information processing to respond to the target request.

In summary, this research examines depletion and mindlessness as possible psychological processes that account for the FITD phenomenon. The strength model states that every time a person acts out of self-control a resource is diminished (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). Hence, when a person is exposed to an initial request the resource will be diminished. This diminished resource will result in a state of mindlessness. This state of mind contributes to a lack in self-control which results in complying with the final request. If the proposition is not confirmed by this study and indicates no depletion of the resource and a mindful state of mind, perhaps the psychological process of priming is activated through a FITD procedure.

Two studies have been conducted to test the before stated propositions. Existing knowledge points to the explanation of depletion. This is the reason that the objective of our first study is to establish the process of depletion by a sequential request technique. Does depletion mediate the process of compliance with a target request? In addition, to test the state of mind as result of the psychological process, generated through a sequential request technique, the second study was conducted.

Study 1

The first study is conducted to test the assumption if a sequential request procedure generates depletion, and if depletion mediates compliance. The consistency-based compliance technique FITD is used. We hypothesize that the FITD technique will be more

effective in gaining compliance than the control condition. Moreover, we expect this effect to be mediated by the extent of depletion. The predictions are tested in an informal encounter, where an attempt was made to recruit participants for experimental research and to collect signatures for a petition, using the FITD technique or the control condition.

Method

Overview and participants

The study employed a single factor design, whereby FITD technique versus target request only varied. A female accomplice, acting as a student, approached students at the campus of the university when they just entered a building. Participants were randomly assigned to a FITD or to a control condition (see appendix 1). The FITD procedure consists of three questions about academic research, the initial request, followed by two target requests. The topic of both target requests is academic research as well. The respondents in the control condition were only exposed to the target requests. The accomplices introduced themselves as master students who were finishing their thesis. When the introduction ended, they proceeded the conversation conform the appropriate script, a FITD script or a control script. A student participated when he was willing to listen to the whole script. Using the script, three different female confederates contacted 121 (62 male, 59 female) students, with an average age of 23 years old (SD = 3.92)

Regardless of participation in the experiment and/or signing the petition, all participants were thanked. The participants received a debriefing and a summary of the results by email. In the next sections the influence technique and the dependent variables of this study will be discussed.

Influence technique

The influence technique used is a FITD procedure consisting of three questions as initial request and two target requests (see appendix 1). The subject of the questions and

requests was academic research. ‘What do you understand by academic research?’ is de first question followed by ‘What do you think is the benefit of academic research?’. The third and last question was: ‘Which social issues are, do you think, subject of academic research?’ Answering yes or no to the questions is not enough. All questions were open-ended to stimulate cognitive thinking. The first target request was: ‘We are finishing our thesis. We need participants for our researches. Would you like to help us as participant? The second target request was: ‘The board of directors of this university has proposed to obligate each student to participate twice a year in research. Would you like to sign a petition that under scribes this proposition?’ The answers of the participants were notated.

The variation of the influence technique consists of the questions preceding the two requests. Willingness to participate in the laboratory and signing the petition was recorded as complying (Burger & Guadagno, 2003).

Depletion

In this paragraph the dependent variable, depletion, will be enunciated. A handgrip was used to measure depletion. In a study from Muraven et al. (1998) resulted the use of this measure in significant differences by participants who were not influenced by a technique, in contrast to people that were exposed to a sequential request technique. A handgrip is a commercially available device for strengthening hand muscles. It consists of two handles connected by a metal spring. In order to generate an exact measure of time squeezed, the confederate inserted a wad of paper between the two handles (Muraven et al., 1998). The way to hold the handgrip is demonstrated. The accomplice registered the amount of seconds. When the participant starts relaxing his muscles, the paper would fall out (Muraven et al., 1998).

The second measure of depletion is the estimation of the amount of marbles in a bottle. This is a derivative of the estimation task of Tice, Bratslavsky and Baumeister (2001).

To estimate correctly, the person had to engage in cognitive effort. Before the estimation, the accomplice emphasized the need to estimate instead of calculate the amount of marbles. As value counted the estimation minus the actual amount of marbles that were in the jar. We predicted that participants in the FITD condition would perform worse than participants in the control condition on both depletion measures. To prevent participants from working towards a specific goal in case of the handgrip task, the experimenter did not give the respondents any feedback (during or after the task), nor were they allowed to look at a stopwatch or wristwatch during the performance (Muraven et al., 1998). The findings of this first study are included in the next chapter.

Results

The first experimental study resulted in the following findings. At first, the results of compliance with the target requests are discussed, followed by the findings of depletion.

In total, 60.3% of the participants agreed to volunteer as participant, the first target request and 40.5% signed the petition, the second target request. An analysis using logistical regression showed no significant difference between the FITD technique and the control condition on complying with the first request. In the extended condition, 53.4 % of the respondents were prepared to participate in an experiment, whereas 46.6% of the people in the control condition were prepared (Wald(1) < 1). The other target request, signing a petition, is marginally significant (Wald(1) = 2.87, p = .09). The petition was signed by 57.1% of the people who first answered three questions. In the control condition 42.9% wrote down their signature. Results suggest that the continued questions have an effect on one of the target request. This request consists of signing the petition.

In opposite to the assumption of depletion, people who are placed in the influence condition squeezed the handgrip longer (M = 73.04, SD = 54.42) than people in the control

condition (*M* = 64.39, *SD* = 49.35). An ANOVA showed that this difference was non significant (*F* (1,114) = 1.67, *n.s.*).

People in the influence condition squeezed the handgrip longer and their predictions were closer to the real amount of marbles (*M* = 25.63, *SD* = 20.00), than people in the control condition (*M* = 30.48, *SD* = 21.18). These data analyzed through an ANOVA were non significant (*F* (1,114) = 2.07, *n.s.*). The findings suggest a tendency that participants, who are exposed to an influence technique, score better on both depletion measures than participants in the control condition.

A post-hoc analysis showed that respondents who are less prepared to volunteer as participants squeeze the handgrip longer. The ANOVA showed a marginally significant result whereby participants who did not comply with the request squeezed the handgrip longer (*M* = 85.10, *SD* = 57.36) than the group of participants that did comply (*M* = 61.09, *SD* = 46.34) (*F* (1,114) = 3.6, *p* = .06). The opposite occurred when the estimation of the marbles is analyzed. The estimation is done worse by participants that did not comply (*M* = 33.15, *SD* = 24.36) with the first target request, than people who did comply (*M* = 26.63, *SD* = 17.25). An ANOVA showed that this difference is marginally significant (*F* (1,114) = 2.99, *p* = .09). We can state that the post-hoc findings of compliance on depletion are ambiguous. People that comply score low on the handgrip tasks but high on the estimation of marbles. In the light of these findings we cannot state a firm conclusion.

In summary, it can be said that the FITD technique seem to have succeeded in compliance with one target request, signing the petition. We can suggest that people who answer open-ended questions, those who engage in cognitive action, are probably less depleted than people who only receive the target request. This is suggested because a tendency have been found that people who are exposed to an influence technique score better on both depletion measures than participants in the control condition. Those differences are

non significant. Confusing are the results of the post hoc analysis of the depletion measures from people who did or did not comply with the target requests. The first measure of exertion indicates that people who comply are more depleted, whereby the second measure suggests that people who do not comply are more depleted. The findings are discussed in the following part.

Discussion

This first study was conducted to test several propositions. We expected that participants in the influence technique would comply more with the target requests, in opposite to the respondents in the control condition. We expected as well, that participants exposed to the FITD technique would score less on both depletion measures, than participants in the target request only condition. This would indicate the process of depletion. We assumed that depletion would mediate the extent of compliance generated by the FITD technique. With those expectations in mind we will discuss the findings.

Although the results of both compliance measures are non significant, they indicated a tendency of a larger compliance rate for the people that are exposed to the FITD technique. These effects could be small because of the construction of the technique. It is possible that the FITD technique used in this study is not intense enough to generate compliance with the target request.

No results have been found that indicate the process of depletion. Instead the results indicate a tendency of a re-active state by the participants. We suggest that people who first are exposed to the initial request could have been primed by the subject and are therefore more willing to comply. No evidence is found that sequential request techniques lead to depletion, and therefore mediates compliance. Because depletion has not been demonstrated, compliance cannot have been mediated by depletion.

Like stated before, this study has not succeeded in creating an effective request technique. This can be an explanation of not finding evidence for the hypothesis of depletion. The results do not give an indication that depletion will be generated through an influence technique. They suggest the opposite, people that should be depleted in accordance with the hypothesis score better on the depletion measures. Hence, it seems appropriate to think that sequential request techniques perhaps generate priming, because participants in the FITD condition incline to active performance, instead of people in the control condition. Notably, this inclination does not point to an increase in compliance.

The present study suggests that depletion as explanation for the sequential request techniques may not be adequate. The deduction that follows naturally from these findings suggests that priming is a possible explanation for the FITD phenomenon. Another explanation could be that depletion itself cannot account for the complete effectiveness of sequential request techniques. The state of mind during the technique can potentially have a large impact on the success of the techniques. We designed the second experiment to test the following hypotheses. When a sequential request technique leads to depletion, a person will be in a state of mindlessness. But when the technique primes the participant, he will be in a mindful state. In addition, we assume that a person in a state of mindlessness will use heuristics to make a decision about the target request, whereas a participant in a mindful state will not use heuristics. In the next paragraph we will explain the construct of the second study.

Study 2

A second study is conducted to pursue the issue further. Like the first study, the proposition about depletion is supposed to be a valid explanation for the sequential request phenomenon. This assumption is made because the existing studies emphasize the possibility that depletion is the general explanation for the effectiveness of sequential request

techniques. This assumption is stated in spite of the first experiment which suggested that the FITD technique could lead to a tendency whereby people score better on cognitive tasks when they were exposed to the technique. This tendency suggests that the psychological process of priming, instead of the process of depletion, could potentially explain the FITD phenomenon.

Earlier studies have established that other psychological processes, like the use of heuristics, can play a major part in the activity of influence techniques (Burger, 1999). Hence, we expect depletion generated by request techniques to result in the use of a heuristic. The key objective of the second study is to determine if people who are exposed to a Continued Question Procedure will be more depleted and therefore mindless. The next step of this hypothesis is to expect that people that are mindless will use heuristics to make a decision about the final request. But when the results indicate a mindful state of mind, participants can be primed by the influence technique and will not use heuristics to make a decision about the final request.

The FITD technique is proposed to be effective because it induces the need for consistency (Cialdini et al., 1995). Burger (1999) suggests that the need for consistency may function under circumstance of mindlessness, to foster compliance. We hypothesize that when participants are in a state of mindlessness, as result of depletion generated through the FITD technique, people will use a heuristic for instance the need for consistency. The desire for consistency is expected to motivate compliance with the larger request. Therefore the Preference for Consistency Scale is part of the experiment (Cialdini et al., 1995). Among FITD participants there is expected that those who score high on the PFC-scale are more likely to comply with a consistent target request then with an inconsistent target request after they are exposed to the initial request. The assumptions are tested in this study after complying with the target request.

Method

Overview and Participants

Participants are Dutch speaking students and employees of a university. The participants were either asked to come to the research area at an agreed time or an accomplice approached them at the university and asked them to volunteer immediately. This resulted in a total of 115 (56 male, 63 female) participants with an average age of 23 years old (*SD* = 4.05).

The hypotheses are tested by means of a 3 (technique: FITD forty questions, FITD twenty questions versus target request only) * 2 (target request: consistent target request versus inconsistent target request) * 2 (PFC: high PFC versus low PFC) full factorial design. Participants were randomly assigned to a forty, twenty or no survey about food-habits condition (see appendix 2). The condition without questions is called the target request only condition. Conditions are manipulated by varying the consistency level of the target request as well. Participants were exposed to a consistent or an inconsistent target request. The request of the consistent version is to keep up a food diary. In the inconsistent script, participants were asked to keep up a traffic diary. The preference for consistency is measured by the PFC-scale. By means of a median split on the results of this scale, the participants are divided in two groups. They are divided in a group with high preference and a group with low preference for consistency (Cialdini et al., 1995).

Compliance, depletion and the state of mind were measured to test the hypotheses. Measurements for depletion are an IQ-test (Schmeighel et al., 2003) and a handgrip task (Muraven et al., 1998). The state of mind is measured by inventing as many as possible counter-arguments for a proposition within three minutes (Fennis, Das & Pruyn, 2004). The order of presenting these variables to the participants is discussed in the following part.

The study consists of four parts; the FITD technique with a consistent or an inconsistent target request, the depletion measures, the state of mind task and the PFC-scale. The technique and the target request vary by condition. The measures for depletion, state of mind and the PFC-scale are equal for all participants. To estimate depletion correctly by use of the handgrip, we asked participants to squeeze twice. The amount of seconds squeezed by the participant is notated. The first amount of seconds squeezed minus the second time squeezed counted as depletion measure.

The experiment started with asking the participant to squeeze the handgrip for the first time. After this part they received, depending on the condition, no survey, a survey with twenty questions or a survey with forty questions. The survey is followed by the IQ-Quiz. Participants in the control condition did not receive a survey but had to make the IQ-Quiz immediately after the first time squeezing. After finishing the IQ-Quiz they had to call the accomplice for the second handgrip task. Before they were asked to squeeze again, the (in)consistent target request was asked. After the second time squeezing, the participants could prolong the experiment and execute the state of mind task and the PFC-scale.

Continued Question Procedure

To properly test the hypotheses, the form of the FITD in the first experiment needed to be shifted. The ‘foot’ from the technique is intensified. The influence technique consists of three variations, a survey of forty questions, twenty questions or no questions (Seligman, Bush & Kirsch, 1976 in DeJong, 1979). This survey is the initial request. The participants are randomly assigned to one of the three variations of the influence technique with accompanying scripts (see appendix 3). The target request was presented as if it was unrelated to the current experiment, but in fact, the reply to it was one of the main dependent measures. Similar to the first study, answering yes on a request to perform an act in the

future, was recorded as complying with the target request. Keeping up a food diary or a traffic diary was notated as complying with the target request.

In the consistency condition the participants were asked a consistency-based target request, a final request about food habits. The confederate stated: “Another researcher of this university is looking for people to keep up food diaries. This means that you write down; what you eat, how much you eat and when you eat it. You have tot keep up this diary for one week”. The other condition was inconsistency-based. The subject of this target request was traffic habits. The accomplice asked: “Another researcher of this university is looking for people to keep up traffic diaries. This means that you write down; where you are going, when you are going there and what kind of transportation you use”. All participants could know if the target request was consistent or inconsistent. They could know because every person received the same information at the beginning of the experiment. When participants entered the research area the accomplice told them: “This experiment consists of several topics. We will test you on IQ, food habits, physical health and personality traits”. This introduction provided a consistency- or inconsistency-based condition for everyone because the subject ‘food habit’ is mentioned. After completing the experiment, participants were thanked and told that they receive a debriefing and a summary of the results by email.

Measures

Depletion. Establishment of depletion was generated through an IQ-test and a handgrip task, presented as an endurance test. The handgrip measure is the same as used in the first study. The second time squeezing minus the first time is a measure for depletion. The second time itself functions as measure for depletion as well. When participants are depleted by the technique, they will squeeze the handgrip shorter than people that only receive the target request. By analyzing this measure there has to be taken into account that

when the technique generates priming, people in the extensive condition will perform better than people in the control condition.

The second depletion task is a derivative of the multiple-choice tests used in several experiments to measure depletion (Schmeighel et al., 2003) and priming (Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998). The test includes multiple-choice questions of vocabulary, general knowledge and mathematical ability. The IQ-quiz used in this experiment also contains those subjects (see appendix 4). Dijksterhuis and Van Knippenburg (1998) have found results of the effect of priming on the performance of participants on a general knowledge task. The participants in the priming condition answered significantly more questions correct than people in the control condition. We assume that people, who perform well on this test, can retrieve information from their memory and apply simple rules (Schmeighel et al., 2003). This indicates that people who perform well on this test process information actively, which indicates a mindful state.

When the FITD technique generates depletion, we assume that people in the extended condition will perform worse on the handgrip task and the IQ-quiz than people in the control condition. This assumption is made because we expect people to be more depleted when they are exposed to an initial request than people who only receive a target request. The opposite is expected to happen when the technique primes the person. In this case, participants in the extended condition will probably perform better on the depletion measures than people in the control condition. The participants received two minutes to answer as many questions of the IQ-quiz as possible. The amount of questions made and the amount of correct answered questions were counted.

The IQ-quiz and the handgrip measured self-control as indication of depletion. Self-control is measured because the respondent has to override his normal or automatic responses and conform to standards to perform the tasks (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). We

state that overriding of self-control leads to depletion of the participant. When a person is depleted he probably will perform worse on cognitive tasks than when a person is not depleted.

Depletion, or perhaps priming, is determined three times during the study. Prior to the Continued Question Procedure, following the initial request and following the target request. These three momentary impressions give an estimation of depletion. To test the complete hypothesis the state of mind is determined as well. This variable will now be discussed.

The state of mind

To establish the state of mind of participants, they are asked to perform a task (see appendix 5). Participants were asked to give their opinion about a proposition. They had three minutes to give their opinion and to write down counter-arguments. The thesis was: The government should increase tuition with one hundred euros. Nominal scale data developed from qualitative judgments are used to interpret the arguments given by the respondents. To judge the arguments correctly, an exclusive classification has been made for the answers (Perreault & Leigh, 1989).

All participants understood the assignment and wrote the correct kind of arguments down. Two results of this assignment were recorded in the data. The first result recorded is the amount of arguments given by the respondent and the second result recorded is the relevance of the given arguments. Two persons judged the relevance of the arguments. To estimate the reliability of the judgment-based data, Cohen's kappa (.72) and a model from Perreault and Leigh (1989) were estimated (75.65). Both judges came to a percentage of agreement of 87.5%.

We hypothesize that participants in the FITD condition score worse on the state of mind task than participants in the target request only condition. When this hypothesizes is

confirmed, we can state that people exposed to the influence technique are in a state of mindlessness in contrast with people in the control condition. On the other hand when the proposition is disconfirmed, the findings indicate a mindful state.

This variable and the depletion variable are measured because they could mediate the FITD process. The PFC-scale is part of this study because it potentially can moderate the effectiveness of the sequential request technique. How this possible moderator is investigated will be explained in the following part.

Preference for consistency

The PFC-scale is used to explain the influence of the consistent or inconsistent target request on compliance. The scale predicts which respondents are susceptible to consistency-based effects (Cialdini et al., 1995). The scale contains eighteen items about consistency; all items were translated into Dutch (see appendix 6). Examples of the items are ‘I prefer to be around people whose reactions I can anticipate’ and ‘I don’t like to appear as if I am inconsistent’. These items were scored on a scale with nine categories, varying from strongly disagree till strongly agree. The developers of the scale tested the prototype in an experiment using the FITD technique. The results of the experiment supported the idea that people who score high on the scale are more eager to comply than persons who score low on the scale (Cialdini et al., 1995). The level of PFC is likely to have the greatest impact when consistency issues are relatively prominent in the consciousness (Guadagno et al., 2001). This implies that people who are assigned to the most extensive FITD condition are the most conscious of the (in)consistency of the target request. This assumption is made because those participants are exposed to a survey of forty questions about food habits. They are the most aware of (in)consistency of the target request. People in that condition with a high score on de PFC-scale should foster the compliance rate. Participants are divided into groups with a

high or a low preference for consistency. This division is made by means of a median split on the results of the PFC-scale (α = .83)..

This study was intended to extend the findings of the first study. By intensifying the influence technique we hope to find out which psychological process can be held accountable for the effectiveness of the sequential request techniques. The results of the second study are mentioned in the next section.

Results

In this part we describe and clarify the findings of the second experiment. First the results of compliance are mentioned followed by the findings of the variables depletion, state of mind and preference for consistency.

Compliance

In total, 63.3% of all participants complied with the target request. No main effect of the FITD technique on compliance has been found (Wald(1) < 1). An analysis using logistical regression showed a marginally significant distinction between people who said yes to a consistent or to an inconsistent request (Wald(1) = 3.06, p = .08). Participants that received a inconsistent target request were more eager to keep up a diary than people who receive a consistent target request. Furthermore, in combination with the variation of FITD technique or no technique there was found a marginally significant difference. The participants who answered forty food questions and received a inconsistent target request complied the most (Wald(1) = 3.53, p = .06). All participants in this group agreed to keep up a traffic diary. 29.4% of the people in the target request only condition that received an inconsistent target request agreed to keep up the traffic diary. Results indicate that, although people who received an inconsistent request complied overall more, participants exposed to the extensive FITD technique and exposed to a consistent target request were more eager to comply (75%) as well, than participants in the control condition (40%). The findings do not

underscore the effect of the FITD technique when initial and target request lay in each other's extension. The results do not replicate earlier findings of the Continued Question Procedure (DeJong, 1979).

Depletion

Depletion measures were analyzed through ANOVA. The results of the handgrip task were non significant (F (2,114) = .01, *n.s.*). The means indicate an effect in the opposite direction of the depletion viewpoint. Respondents in the extensive FITD condition have the smallest difference between the first and the second squeeze (M = 2.64, SD = 21.26), while participants who did not receive any questions have the largest difference (M = 13.00, SD = 43.18). These findings suggest that people in the target request only condition find it harder to squeeze the handgrip the second time and are therefore more depleted. When only the second time was analyzed, people in the extended condition (M = 63.99, SD = 47.88) squeezed the handgrip on average longer than participants in the control condition (M = 47.23, SD = 31.34) (F (2,114) = .08, *n.s.*). No other effects reached significance.

Similar results were found when the IQ-quiz was analyzed by use of an ANOVA. A marginal effect of FITD technique on the amount of correct answers was found (F (2,114) = 2.63, p = .08.). The findings indicate that people exposed to the FITD technique answered more questions correct (M = 7.29) than people in the control condition (M = 6.19). Subsequently a posthoc, tukey, analysis reveals a significant effect (p = .04). People in the most extensive condition answered significantly more questions correct than participants in the control condition. This indicates that a significant difference has been found between people that did not answer any questions and people that answered forty questions for the second depletion measure. The differences of scores on the IQ-quiz between no questions and twenty questions, and between twenty questions and forty questions are non significant. No other effects reached significance.

To perform a post-hoc analysis, a new variable of the IQ-Quiz was made (amount of questions answered plus amount of questions answered correct). A marginally significant result of technique was found. People in the extended condition (M = 15.82) scored better than people in the control condition (M = 13.79) (F (2,114) = 2.53, p = .08). The posthoc, tukey, analysis revealed again a significant difference between the target request only condition and the FITD condition whereby participants are exposed to forty questions (p = .05). People in the extensive FITD condition answered more questions and answered more questions correct than people in the control condition.

State of mind

Participants who received a consistent target request wrote significantly more arguments (M = 3.57) than people asked an inconsistent final request (M = 2.85) (F (1,113) = 7.64, p = .01). They also performed better on the relevance of the arguments (F (1,113) = 7.99, p = .01). This means that people that were exposed to a consistent target request give more relevant answers (M = 4.33) than people asked to keep up a traffic diary (M = 3.48).

Interaction effects, of the FITD technique and the (in)consistency of the target request on the state of mind, were found for both scores but with some implications. The ANOVA showed an effect for the amount of reasons, (F (2,113) = 3.99, p = .02.) and an effect for the relevance of the reasons (F (2,113) = 4.41, p = .01.). The next explanation applies to both findings. No main effect has been found for the FITD technique. When we investigate the findings, the significant interaction effect only applies to one level of the FITD technique. This level is the control condition. A posthoc, tukey, analysis reveals that both cells, consistent target request and inconsistent target request, of the control condition differ significantly from each other (p =. 00). No other effects reached significance.

In conclusion, a significant difference between the performances of the respondent for inventing arguments is only found for a consistent or inconsistent target request in the

control condition. These results of the state of mind measures are confirmed in the findings of a post-hoc analysis of a new variable. This variable is an aggregation of the amount of arguments invented and the relevance of those arguments. This time a main effect of consistency (F (1,113) = 8.28, p = .00) and the same ambiguous interaction effect is shown (F (2,113) = 4.43, p = .01). This indicates that people who are exposed to a consistent target request invented quantitative and qualitative more arguments, (M = 7.9) then people that received an inconsistent target request (M = 6.33), independent of FITD technique.

No significant results are found when a post hoc analysis tested the effect of compliance on the performance of the depletion and the state of mind tasks. Participants who complied with the target request score better on the quiz (M = 7.04), than participants who were not prepared to keep up a diary (M = 6.44). The state of mind measures suggest that participants who invent more relevant arguments (M = 4.11) are more eager to comply, than people that come up with irrelevant arguments (M = 3.61). These findings are non significant.

Participants have filled in the PFC-scale at the end of the study (Cialdini et al., 1995). A median split was performed and retained participants in two levels. The label ‘low’ is given to scores under the median and the label 'high' is given to scores above the median. Through a logistic regression analysis the impact of this moderator has been analyzed. The moderator has no significant impact on the results of compliance (Wald(1) = .08, n.s.).

The results of the second experiment are enumerated in the before stated part of this article. Those results affirm or enfeeble our hypotheses. The implications of the findings for the assumptions will be discussed.

Discussion

Several hypotheses are stated in the introduction of this article. These hypotheses will now be discussed. At first, what do the findings of the second experiment indicate for the

effectiveness of the sequential request technique? Exposing participants to a FITD procedure did not indicate an increase of compliance. The variation in the target request did suggest a marginally significant difference in compliance. Participants exposed to an inconsistent target request complied more than participants who received a consistent target request. People were more inclined to keep up a traffic diary. We can conclude that the sequential request technique did not result in a firm increase of compliance. Only the inconsistent version of the target request had a small effect on the compliance rate.

The findings of the second study do not suggest the depletion proposition. The results of the two depletion measures indicate the psychological process of priming. The findings of the handgrip measure and the IQ-quiz suggest that people exposed to FITD technique score better than people in the target request only condition. People that we expected to be depleted were instead in an active and mindful state. In contrast to the people who only received the target request. These findings can suggest that the initial request awakens people instead of wire them out. Furthermore, we have to keep in mind that participants in the control condition had less time between the depletion measures. Participants in the control condition did only make the IQ-quiz before the second handgrip task, whereby participants in the FITD condition made a survey and the IQ-quiz before they squeezed the second time.

The findings of this second study do not indicate that depletion leads to mindlessness. No main effect of FITD technique is found on the score of the state of mind task. Hence, the findings do suggest a tendency that people exposed to an influence technique score better on the state of mind task than people in the control condition. In summary, we can say that the FITD technique has led to an increase of cognitive action. People in these conditions can retrieve more information and perform better on cognitive tasks than people in the control condition.

The last part of the experiment is the PFC-scale. For this scale no moderation effect has been found. The simple act of compliance with a small request, answering questions, did not spur the high PFC individuals to comply with a larger consistent request. The findings contribute to a controversy in the FITD literature about the explanation in terms of self-perception. Self-perception theory suggests that compliance with an initial request provides the target person with information about his character. When confronted with the second request the person is presumed to be thinking about his earlier behavior and act consistent with this behavior. When the person complied with the initial request, he will comply again with the target request (Guadagno et al., 2001). When self-perception can explain the FITD effect, people in this study who find it important to act consistent should foster the compliance rate in the FITD condition. When participants score high on the PFC-scale the technique will probably succeed, in contrast, when the participants score low on the scale the technique will probably fail. A possible explanation for not finding an effect of FITD technique on compliance could be a low score of the participants on the PFC-scale.

In conclusion we have not found evidence of the following hypothesis. The use of a sequential request technique will generate depletion, which will lead to mindlessness. In this state of mind a person inclines to the use of heuristics. The findings do not suggest that mindlessness has been generated by the FITD technique. We can state that the FITD technique is not mediated by depletion and mindlessness. No moderator of compliance has been found as well. Research has shown that the psychological process of priming potentially can be an explanation of the sequential request phenomenon. Findings show that people are awakened by the techniques and find themselves in a mindful state. We reject the hypothesis of depletion resulting in mindlessness. Instead we embrace the assumption of priming resulting in a mindful state.

General discussion

The present studies contribute to our knowledge about the FITD phenomenon in several ways. At first, the way the technique has been presented to the participants has a large impact on the FITD effect (Burger, 1999; DeJong, 1979). In the first study only a tendency of the increase of compliance is found for the second target request. This target request consists of signing a petition. The second experiment did suggest an effect of the FITD technique, but only for the difference between the extensive FITD condition and the target request only condition.

Secondly the experiments do not indicate the process of depletion as explanation for the effectiveness of sequential request techniques. Participants who are exposed to an influence technique seem to be more alert and conduct in more cognitive action. Hence, we suggest that the FITD technique does not generate depletion. The influence technique does not generate mindlessness as well. We still assume that depletion could result in a state of mindlessness. The direct connection between depletion en mindlessness has not been investigated in both experiments. The most fitting explanation for the effectiveness of sequential request techniques after conducting both experiments is priming. We suggest that the ‘foot’ of the FITD technique primes the thoughts. Through priming the target person finds himself in a mindful state and focused on the target request.

Thirdly, the findings support the line of reasoning that the theory of self perception is not enough to explain the FITD effect. The heuristics used by self perception seem to be triggered by a psychological process. We cannot conclude that the process responsible for the use of heuristics is or is not depletion. Depletion has not been generated in both studies, therefore we cannot estimate if preference for consistency has been activated. Perhaps a reason of not finding the use of heuristics is because of the low scores of all the respondents on the PFC-scale (Cialdini et al, 1995). When all participants do not find it important to act

consistent, the results of the second experiment can be influenced. In conclusion we suggest that the compliance rate perhaps has not been moderated by consistency because of the low scores on the scale.

A fourth contribution of the present research is to determine a connection between performance on cognitive tasks and the state of mind. Participants that score high on task performances, score high at the state of mind task as well. This can be explained by the fact that people have to undergo cognitive action to perform well on the IQ-test. This test could have triggered the mind, which results in a mindful state when inventing counterarguments. The better score on these tasks by people that first answered questions is remarkable. Those results indicate that the extensive condition did not ware the participants out but instead activated them.

Finally, we can determine that the existing knowledge about the FITD phenomenon has been extended. The second study finds a significant effect of the technique on compliance when people are exposed to forty questions. No significant difference has been found when people answer twenty questions. This contributes to the discussion in the existing literature about the size and the proportion of the initial and target request. This fact is emphasized by the first study. In this study the second target request resulted in the FITD effect but the first target request failed. Perhaps this has to do with size and/or consequences of the request.

Another explanation for not finding a significant FITD effect in the first study can be that asking both requests sounded like a Door-In-The-Face technique for participants. When participants did not want to participate in the experiment en were asked to sign the petition, they could have complied out of reciprocity. They felt that the accomplice asked them a smaller request the second time. This request adjustment feels like normative pressure to the

target person and he will have the desire to reciprocate by complying with the last request (Cialdini & Guadagno, 2004).

The present findings show that the behavioral responses to the sequential request technique are linked to performance on different cognitive tasks like inventing counter-arguments, making an IQ-quiz and testing endurance. People that are influenced by an initial request score in this study on average better. This indicates that people in the FITD condition are more eager to perform. An explanation for the better performance on depletion measures and the state of mind task can be priming, but priming has not been part of the experiment. Priming has not been manipulated to generate an increase in compliance.

The results of the second study underscore the thought of priming as crucial process in fostering compliance. To discover if priming truly is (part of) the answer, expanding academic research is necessary. Perhaps a valuable contribution would be to investigate if all sorts of sequential request techniques generate priming. Although present results are consistent with the hypothesis that the FITD procedure has to do with the state of mind, it is ambiguous what the influence of sequential request is on the state of mind. Perhaps this influence differs with the kind of technique used and with the kind of initial and target request.

We cannot conclude that the present findings are consistent to earlier findings about depletion or priming in combination with influence techniques. No research on this topic has been conducted before. Hopefully this issue will be intensively investigated in the near future because the phenomenon has not been unraveled yet. Studies to investigate if the intensity of the request technique has a significant impact on the extent of depletion or priming could bring a valuable addition to this academic field. A study to explore the relationship between depletion and mindlessness or the relationship between priming and mindfulness could as well contribute to the existing knowledge.

The key objective of this article is to demonstrate that the psychological process of depletion, or priming, plays a major part in the effectiveness of sequential request techniques. Unfortunately, this objective cannot completely be reached because the techniques used in the experiments have not been effective. We did find indications for the process of priming as valid explanation for the sequential request phenomenon.

A point of consideration by all studies on the field of sequential request techniques is the fact that many cognitive processes are beyond conscious awareness or voluntary control (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Epley & Gilovich, 1999). This implicates that the activity of sequential request techniques is very hard to ascertain. This study is a small contribution to discover the key to the explanation of sequential request techniques.

Acknowledgement

The author thanks Margriet Ekker and Sylvia Wenting for their assistance with data collection. I gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments of the reviewers, especially the help and comments of dr. B.M. Fennis as instructor.

References

Bargh, J.A., Chen, M., & Burrows, L. (1996). Automaticity and social behavior: direct effects of trait construct and stereotype activation on action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71(2),* 230-244.

Baumeister, R.F. (2002). Yielding to temptation: self-control failure, impulsive purchasing, and consumer behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Research, 28*, 670 – 676.

Baumeister, R.F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D.M. (1998). Ego depletion: is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1252-1265.

Burger, J.M. (1999). The foot-in-the-door compliance procedure: a multiple process analysis and review. *Personality and Pyschology Review*, *3(4),* 303-325.

Burger, J.M. & Guadagno, R.E. (2003). Self-concept clarity and the foot-in-the-door procedure. *Basic and Apllied Social Psychology*, *25(1)*, 79-86.

Cann, A., Sherman, S.J., & Elkes, R. (1975). Effects of initial request size and timing of a second request on compliance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *32*, 774-782.

Chartrand, T.L., & Bargh, J.A. (1996). Automatic activation of impression formation and memorization goals: nonconscious goal priming reproduces effects of explicit task instructions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71(3)*, 464-478.

Cialdini, R.B., & Goldstein, N.J. (2004). Social influence: compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 591-621.

Cialdini, R.B., & Guadagno, R.E . (2004). *Sequential Request Compliance Tactics.* http://www.psych.ucsb.edu/~guadagno/pubs/sequentialfinal.pdf.

Cialdini, R.B., Trost, M.R., & Newson, J.T. (1995). Preference for consistency: the development of a valid measure and the discovery of surprising behavioural implications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69(2)*, 318-328.

Cialdini, R.B., Vincent, J.E., Lewis, S.K., & Catalan, J. (1975). Reciprocal concessions procedure for inducing compliance: the door-in-the-face technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *31(2)*, 206-215.

DeJong, W. (1979). An examination of self-perception mediation of the foot-in-the-door effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37(12)*, 2221-2239.

Dijksterhuis, A., & Van Knippenberg, A. (1998). The relation between perception and behavior, or how to win a game of trivial pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(4),* 865-877.

Dolinksi, D. (2000). On inferring one's beliefs from one's attempt and consequences for subsequent compliance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78(2)*, 260-272.

Dolinksi, D., & Nawrat, R. (1998). "Fear-then-relief" procedure for producing compliance: beware when the danger is over. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *34*, 27 – 50.

Epley, N., & Gilovich, T. (1999). Just going along: nonconscious priming and conformity to social pressure. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35*, 578-598.

Fennis, B.M. & Das, E.H.H.J. & Pruyn, A.Th.H. (in press). De disrupt-then-reframe-technique in dyadic selling situations.

Fennis, B.M. & Das, E.H.H.J. & Pruyn, A.Th.H. (2004). "If you can't dazzle them with brilliance, baffle them with nonsense": extending the impact of the disrupt-then-reframe technique of social influence. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 14(1),* 280-290.

Greenwald, A.G., & Banaji, M.R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 102(1),* 4-27

Guadagno, R.E., Asher, T., Demaine, L.J. & Cialdini, R.B. (2001). When saying yes leads to saying no: preference for consistency and the reverse foot-in-the-door effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27(7)*, 859-867.

Langer, E.L. (1989). Minding matters: the consequences of mindlessness-mindfulness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *22*, 137-73.

Muraven, M. & Baumeister, R.F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin*, *126(2)*, 249 – 259.

Muraven, M., Tice, D.M., & Baumeister, R.F. (1998). self-control as limited resource: regulatory depletion patterns. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(3)*, 774-789.

Perreault, W.D., & Leigh, L.E. (1989). Reliability of nominal data based on qualitative judgements. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *26*, 135-148.

Schmeichel, B.J., Baumeister, R.F. & Vohs, K.D. (2003). Intellectual performance and ego depletion; role of the self in logical reasoning and other information processing. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 85(1)*, 33-46.

Schwarzwald, J., Koslowsky, M. & Shalit, B. (1992). A field study of employee's attitudes and behaviours after promotion decisions. *Journal of applied psychology , 77(4)*, 511-514.

Snyder, M. & Cunningham, M.R. (1975). To comply or not comply: testing the self-perception explanation of the 'foot-in-the-door' phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *31(1)*, 64-67.

Tice, D.M., Bratslavsky, E., & Baumeister, R.F. (2001). Emotional distress regulation takes precedence over impulse control: if you feel bad, do it! Journal of *Personality and Social Psychology, 80(1)*, 53-67.

Appendix 1: Scripts Study 1

Controle Conditie

TR1: Wij zijn bezig met ons afstudeeronderzoek. Voor ons onderzoek hebben wij respondenten nodig. Wil je meedoen aan een laboratoriumexperiment? Het experiment neemt ca. 1 uur in beslag.

□ NEE

□ JA

Naam:

Emailadres:

TR2: Het college van bestuur van de UT heeft het voorstel gedaan om studenten verplicht te laten deelnemen aan twee experimenten per studiejaar. Wil je ter ondersteuning van dit voorstel je handtekening zetten?

□ NEE

□ JA (handtekeningenlijst)

DT1: Onderdeel van ons afstudeeronderzoek is een meting naar fysieke kracht en inschattingsvermogen. Wil je daarom zo lang mogelijk in deze handknijper knijpen?

□ NEE

□ JA

Tijd:

DT2: Kun je schatten hoeveel knikkers er in deze potten zitten?

□ NEE

□ JA

Schatting:

Mag ik tenslotte je leeftijd noteren?

Leeftijd:

Geslacht M/V

FITD Conditie

Wij zijn bezig met ons afstudeeronderzoek. Hiervoor willen wij in kaart brengen wat studenten vinden van wetenschappelijk onderzoek. Mag ik je hierover enkele vragen stellen?

Q1: Wat versta je onder wetenschappelijk onderzoek?

Q2: Wat denk je dat het nut is van wetenschappelijk onderzoek?

Q3: Welke maatschappelijke kwesties kunnen, denk jij, onderwerp van wetenschappelijk onderzoek zijn?

TR1: Wij zijn dus bezig met ons afstudeeronderzoek. Voor ons onderzoek hebben wij respondenten nodig. Wil je meedoen aan een laboratoriumexperiment? Het experiment neemt ca. 1 uur in beslag.

□ NEE

□ JA

Naam:

Emailadres:

TR2: Het college van bestuur van de UT heeft het voorstel gedaan om studenten verplicht te laten deelnemen aan twee experimenten per studiejaar. Wil je ter ondersteuning van dit voorstel je handtekening zetten?

□ NEE

☐ JA (handtekeningenlijst)

DT1: Onderdeel van ons afstudeeronderzoek is een meting van fysieke kracht en inschattingsvermogen. Wil je zo lang mogelijk in deze handknijper knijpen?

☐ NEE

☐ JA

Tijd:

DT2: Kun je schatten hoeveel knikkers er in deze potten zitten?

☐ NEE

☐ JA

Schatting:

Mag ik tenslotte je leeftijd noteren?

Leeftijd:

Geslacht M/V

Appendix 2: Questions about Food Habits

1. Mijn ontbijt bestaat voor het grootste deel uit brood of andere graanproducten zoals roggebrood, krentenbrood, muesli, tarwevlokken (in pap of ontbijtdranken), havermout, ontbijtkoek of crackers.

- o Ja
- o Nee

2. Ik kies vooral voor volkorenproducten (volkoren/bruinbrood, donker roggebrood) als ik brood of graanproducten eet.

- o Ja
- o Nee

3. Ik eet minstens 6 dagen in de week aardappelen, rijst of pasta.

- o Ja
- o Nee

4. Bij de warme maaltijd eet ik minstens drie kleine aardappelen of drie opscheplepels (= 150 gram) gekookte rijst of pasta.

- o Ja
- o Nee

5. Als ik pasta of rijst eet, neem ik meestal de volkorenpasta en zilvervliesrijst.

Als je nooit pasta en ook nooit rijst eet, antwoord dan 'nee'.

- o Ja

- Nee

6. Ter vervanging van of ter aanvulling op de aardappelen, rijst of pasta eet ik ook wel eens peulvruchten zoals kapucijners, witte en bruine bonen, linzen of spliterwten.

- Ja
- Nee

7. Ik eet elke dag ongeveer vier opscheplepels (=200 gram) groenten.
Rauwkost en groenten op brood tellen ook mee. Een schaaltje rauwkost is ongeveer 50 gram.

- Ja
- Nee

8. Ik eet elke dag twee keer of vaker fruit.
1 x fruit is een middelgrote appel of 2 mandarijntjes, een dessertschaaltje aardbeien of bessen. Een eetlepel gedroogd fruit, een glas ongezoet vruchtensap of dessertschaaltje appelmoes is 1 x fruit.

- Ja
- Nee

<u>Brood en broodvervangers</u>

9. Als ik brood eet, dan eet ik meestal…

- Witbrood
- bruin- of tarwebrood
- (grof)volkorenbrood, meergranenbrood of roggebrood

10. Als aanvulling op of ter vervanging van mijn boterhammen eet ik ook ontbijtkoek, (krokante)muesli, tarwevlokken (in pap), crackers of beschuit.

- o ja, elke dag
- o soms
- o nee, bijna nooit

Smeersels

11. Ik besmeer mijn brood of ontbijtkoek…

- o altijd
- o soms
- o nooit -> ga door naar vraag 6

12. Als ik boter op mijn brood of ontbijtkoek smeer dan doe ik dat met…

- o roomboter of margarine
- o dieetmargarine
- o (dieet)halvarine of een laag-vet smeersel

13. Ik smeer mijn brood of ontbijtkoek dan zo dat…

- o er een dekkende laag boter op komt
- o er een (zeer) ruime laag boter op komt
- o er nauwelijks boter op komt

Beleg

14. Als ik kaas eet dan heb ik voorkeur voor…

- zachte en buitenlandse kaas zoals Brie, Camembert, Rambol, roomkaas of Monchou
- 48+ kaas zoals Goudse kaas, Maaslander, Leerdammer of boerenkaas
- 40+ kaas zoals Edammer kaas, rookkaas of smeerkaas
- 20+ en/of 30+ kaas zoals Leidse kaas en magere smeerkaas
- ik eet (bijna) nooit kaas

15. Als ik vleeswaren eet dan heb ik voorkeur voor…

- de soorten achterham, rookvlees, rosbief, rollade, fricandeau, kipfilet, casselerrib of schouderham
- de soorten gekookte tong en rauwe ham
- de soorten bacon, bloedworst, boterhamworst, gebraden gehakt, cervelaatworst, cornedbeef,
- leverworst, paté, ontbijtspek, palingworst, salami of smeerleverworst
- ik eet (bijna) nooit vleeswaren

16. Ik eet ook vaak zoet beleg op mijn brood, dat is dan voornamelijk…

- jam, honing of appelstroop
- chocoladehagelslag of chocoladevlokken
- hazelnootpasta of kokosbrood

- ik eet (bijna) nooit zoet beleg

17. Als hartig beleg kies ik vaak…

- pindakaas, (gebakken) ei of kroket
- sandwich spread of selderij salade
- kipkerrie salade, ham-prei salade of eiersalade
- ik eet (bijna) nooit dergelijk hartig beleg

Melk- en melkproducten

18. Bij melk- en melkproducten kies ik meestal…

- de volle varianten (bijvoorbeeld volle melk, volle yoghurt, volle chocolademelk)
- de halfvolle varianten
- de magere varianten (bijvoorbeeld ook karnemelk en drinkyoghurt)
- ik drink of eet nooit melk- en melkproducten

Groenten en fruit

19. Bij de broodmaaltijd eet ik ook regelmatig groenten, zoals tomaat, radijs, komkommer etcetera.

- ja, elke dag
- soms
- nee, bijna nooit

20. Bij de broodmaaltijd eet ik ook regelmatig fruit.

- ja, elke dag
- soms
- nee, bijna nooit

21. Ik gebruik halfvolle of magere melkproducten (zoals halfvolle melk en koffiemelk, karnemelk en magere yoghurt) in plaats van volle melkproducten.

- Ja
- Nee
- Soms

22. Als ik kaas eet, neem ik minder vette kaas, dus 20+ of 30+.

- Ja
- Nee
- Soms

23. Als ik mijn brood met vleeswaren beleg, dan kies ik uit de volgende soorten: achterham, casselerrib, fricandeau, kipfilet, rookvlees, rosbief, rollade of schouderham. Als je nooit vleeswaren op brood eet, antwoord dan 'Ja'.

- Ja
- Nee
- Soms

24. Als ik mijn brood smeer dan doe ik daar (dieet) halvarine op of een zogenaamd 'laagvet smeersel' in plaats van margarine of boter. Als je nooit je brood smeert, antwoord dan 'Ja'

- o Ja
- o Nee
- o Soms

25. Als ik jus of saus gebruik bij mijn maaltijd, dan neem ik een met water aangelengde jus of een rode saus (bijvoorbeeld barbecuesaus of tomatenketchup). Als je nooit jus of saus gebruikt, antwoord dan 'Ja'.

- o Ja
- o Nee
- o Soms

26. Het bakken en braden van vlees, vis of aardappelen doe ik in roomboter of margarine uit een pakje.

- o Ja
- o Nee
- o Soms

27. Voor het roerbakken (in bijvoorbeeld een wok) van kleingesneden groenten, vlees, tahoe en dergelijke gebruik ik olie of vloeibare bak- en braadvet.

- o Ja
- o Nee
- o Soms

28. Ik vervang vlees wel eens door vis. Bij elkaar eet ik één keer vis per week of vaker. Alle soorten vis tellen mee, ook vissticks.

- o Ja
- o Nee
- o Soms

29. Ik eet per week twee keer of vaker de volgende vleessoorten: rookworst, slavink of speklappen.

- o Ja
- o Nee
- o Soms

30. Ik eet meer dan twee keer per maand snacks zoals patat, frikadel of een saucijzenbroodje.

- o Ja
- o Nee
- o Soms

31. Ik eet gemiddeld meer dan twee koekjes of chocolaatjes per dag.

- o Ja
- o Nee
- o Soms

32. Ik eet vaker dan twee keer per week een punt taart, een gebakje of een grote koek (bijvoorbeeld een gevulde koek).

- o Ja

- Nee
- Soms

33. Ik eet meer dan zeven handjes zoutjes (chips, pinda's enz.) per week.

- Ja
- Nee
- Soms

34. Ik eet meer dan één keer per week een candybar of een groot stuk chocolade.

- Ja
- Nee
- Soms

35. Groenten eet ik …

- Elke dag
- 5 of 6 dagen per week
- Hooguit 4 dagen per week of minder vaak

36. Tussendoor of bij mijn broodmaaltijd eet ik groenten, zoals rauwkost

- Ja, bijna altijd
- Soms
- Nee, (bijna) nooit

37. Als ik op een dag groenten eet, dan is dat bij elkaar

Rauwkost en groenten op brood of tussendoor tellen ook mee. Een schaaltje rauwkost is ongeveer 50 gram groenten.

- Ongeveer 2 opscheplepels (= 100 gram of minder)
- Ongeveer 3 opscheplepels (= 150 gram)
- Ongeveer 4 opscheplepels (= 200 gram of meer)

38. Fruit eet ik …

- Elke dag
- 5 of 6 dagen per week
- Hooguit 4 dagen per week of minder vaak

39. Als ik fruit eet, dan is dat

Eén keer fruit is bijvoorbeeld een middelgrote appel of twee mandarijntjes, ook een dessertschaaltje aardbeien of bessen. Ook een glas ongezoet vruchtensap of een dessertschaaltje appelmoes telt als één keer fruit

- Twee of meer keer fruit per dag
- Een keer fruit per dag
- Ik eet (bijna) nooit fruit

40. Ik drink ongezoete vruchtensappen -vers of uit een pak of fles- en dan meestal …

- Citrussappen zoals sinaasappelsap en grapefruitsap
- Overige sappen zoals appelsap en druivensap
- Ik drink (vrijwel) nooit vruchtensappen

Appendix 3 Scripts Study 2

Script 1 (Target Request Only, consistente vraag)

Het experiment bestaat uit metingen voor diverse onderzoeken. Een onderzoek naar fysieke kracht, eetpatronen en persoonlijkheidskenmerken. Op het computerscherm voor jullie staat te lezen wat van jullie wordt verwacht. Als eerste word gevraagd om zo lang mogelijk in de handknijper te knijpen met het papiertje ertussen. Een van ons klokt daarbij de tijd. Daarna beginnen jullie met de vragen op het scherm. Hierop staat precies aangegeven wat jullie moeten doen.

1. Wil je zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL.TASK1A)

TIJD:

2. Maak de volgende QUIZ zo goed mogelijk binnen twee minuten. (DEPL TASK2)

3. Onderdeel van het experiment gaat over eetgewoonten. Wil je gedurende een week een voedseldagboek bijhouden? Dit houdt in dat je exact weergeeft wanneer, waar en wat je eet. (TARGET REQUEST)

4. Wil je wederom zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL TASK1B)

5. Zoals je waarschijnlijk hebt gehoord in het nieuws, wil de overheid het collegegeld verhogen met 100 euro. Ben je het hier mee eens? (MINDLESSNESSMETINGA)

JA / NEE

6a. Zo ja, kun je zoveel mogelijk tegenargumenten bedenken waarom de overheid het collegegeld NIET moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd. (MINDLESSNESSMETINGB)

6b. Zo nee, kun je zoveel mogelijk argumenten bedenken waarom de overheid juist WEL het collegegeld moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd. (MINDLESSNESSMETINGB)

7. Wil je de volgende vragen beantwoorden? (PCS)

Bedankt voor je medewerking.

Script 2 (Target Request Only, inconsistente vraag)

Het experiment bestaat uit metingen voor diverse onderzoeken. Een onderzoek naar fysieke kracht, eetpatronen en persoonlijkheidskenmerken. Op het computerscherm voor jullie staat te lezen wat van jullie wordt verwacht. Als eerste word gevraagd om zo lang mogelijk in de handknijper te knijpen met het papiertje ertussen. Een van ons klokt hierbij de tijd. Daarna beginnen jullie met de vragen op het scherm. Hierop staat precies aangegeven wat jullie moeten doen.

1. Wil je zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL TASK 1A)

TIJD:

2. Maak de volgende QUIZ zo goed mogelijk binnen twee minuten. (DEPL TASK 2)

3. Onderdeel van het experiment gaat over verkeersgewoonten. Wil je gedurende een week een verkeersdagboek bijhouden? Dit houdt in dat je gedurende 1 week exact opschrijft wanneer, waar en hoe je je in het verkeer begeeft. (TARGET REQUEST)

4. Wil je wederom zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL TASK 1B)

5. Zoals je waarschijnlijk hebt gehoord in het nieuws, wil de overheid het collegegeld verhogen met 100 euro. Ben je het hier mee eens? (MINDELSSNESSMETINGA)

JA / NEE

6a. Zo ja, kun je zoveel mogelijk tegenargumenten bedenken waarom de overheid het collegegeld NIET moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd.

(MINDLESSNESSMETINGB)

6b. Zo nee, kun je zoveel mogelijk argumenten bedenken waarom de overheid juist WEL het collegegeld moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd. (MINDLESSNESSMETINGB)

7. Wil je de volgende vragen beantwoorden? (PFC)

Bedankt voor je medewerking.

Script 3 (FITD 20, consistente vraag)

Het experiment bestaat uit metingen voor diverse onderzoeken. Een onderzoek naar fysieke kracht, eetpatronen en persoonlijkheidskenmerken. Op het computerscherm voor jullie staat te lezen wat van jullie wordt verwacht. Als eerste word gevraagd om zo lang mogelijk in de handknijper te knijpen met het papiertje ertussen. Een van ons klokt hierbij de tijd. Daarna beginnen jullie met de vragen op het scherm. Hierop staat precies aangegeven wat jullie moeten doen.

1. Wil je zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL TASK1A)

TIJD:

2. Beantwoord de volgende vragen over eetpatronen. (FITD)

3. Maak de volgende QUIZ zo goed mogelijk binnen twee minuten. (DEPL TASK2)

4. Onderdeel van het experiment gaat over eetgewoonten. Wil je gedurende een week een voedseldagboek bijhouden? Dit houdt in dat je exact weergeeft wanneer, waar en wat je eet. (TARGET REQUEST)

5. Wil je wederom zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL TASK1B)

6. Zoals je waarschijnlijk hebt gehoord in het nieuws, wil de overheid het collegegeld verhogen met 100 euro. Ben je het hier mee eens? (MINDLESSNESSMETINGA)

JA / NEE

7a. Zo ja, kun je zoveel mogelijk tegenargumenten bedenken waarom de overheid het collegegeld NIET moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd.

(MINDLESSNESSMETINGB)

7b. Zo nee, kun je zoveel mogelijk argumenten bedenken waarom de overheid juist WEL het collegegeld moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd. (MINDLESSMETINGB)

8. Wil je de volgende vragen beantwoorden? (PCS)

Bedankt voor je medewerking.

Script 4 (FITD 40, consistente vraag)

Het experiment bestaat uit metingen voor diverse onderzoeken. Een onderzoek naar fysieke kracht, eetpatronen en persoonlijkheidskenmerken. Op het computerscherm voor jullie staat te lezen wat van jullie wordt verwacht. Als eerste word gevraagd om zo lang mogelijk in de handknijper te knijpen met het papiertje ertussen. Een van ons klokt hierbij de tijd. Daarna beginnen jullie met de vragen op het scherm. Hierop staat precies aangegeven wat jullie moeten doen.

1. Wil je zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL TASK1A)

TIJD:

2. Beantwoord de volgende vragen over eetpatronen. (FITD)

3. Maak de volgende QUIZ zo goed mogelijk binnen twee minuten. (DEPL TASK2)

4. Onderdeel van het experiment gaat over eetgewoonten. Wil je gedurende een week een voedseldagboek bijhouden? Dit houdt in dat je exact weergeeft wanneer, waar en wat je eet.(TARGET REQUEST)

5. Wil je wederom zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL TASK1B)

6. Zoals je waarschijnlijk hebt gehoord in het nieuws, wil de overheid het collegegeld verhogen met 100 euro. Ben je het hier mee eens? (MINDLESSMETINGA)

JA / NEE

7a. Zo ja, kun je zoveel mogelijk tegenargumenten bedenken waarom de overheid het collegegeld NIET moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd. (MINDLESSMETINGB)

7b. Zo nee, kun je zoveel mogelijk argumenten bedenken waarom de overheid juist WEL het collegegeld moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd. (MINDLESSMETINGB)

8. Wil je de volgende vragen beantwoorden? (PCS)

Bedankt voor je medewerking.

Script 5 (FITD 20, inconsistente vraag)

Het experiment bestaat uit metingen voor diverse onderzoeken. Een onderzoek naar fysieke kracht, eetpatronen en persoonlijkheidskenmerken. Op het computerscherm voor jullie staat te lezen wat van jullie wordt verwacht. Als eerste word gevraagd om zo lang mogelijk in de handknijper te knijpen met het papiertje ertussen. Een van ons klokt hierbij de tijd. Daarna beginnen jullie met de vragen op het scherm. Hierop staat precies aangegeven wat jullie moeten doen.

1. Wil je zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL TASK1A)

TIJD:

2. Beantwoord de volgende vragen over eetpatronen.(FITD)

3. Maak de volgende QUIZ zo goed mogelijk binnen twee minuten. (DEPL TASK 2)

4. Onderdeel van het experiment gaat over verkeersgewoonten. Wil je gedurende een week een verkeersdagboek bijhouden? Dit houdt in dat je exact weergeeft wanneer, waar en hoe je je in het verkeer begeeft. (TARGET REQUEST)

5. Wil je wederom zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL TASK1B)

6. Zoals je waarschijnlijk hebt gehoord in het nieuws, wil de overheid het collegegeld verhogen met 100 euro. Ben je het hier mee eens? (MINDLESSMETINGA)

JA / NEE

7a. Zo ja, kun je zoveel mogelijk tegenargumenten bedenken waarom de overheid het collegegeld NIET moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd. (MINDLESSMETINGB)

7b. Zo nee, kun je zoveel mogelijk argumenten bedenken waarom de overheid juist WEL het collegegeld moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd. (MINDLESSMETINGB)

8. Wil je de volgende vragen beantwoorden? (PCS)

Bedankt voor je medewerking.

Script 6 (FITD 40, inconsistente vraag)

Het experiment bestaat uit metingen voor diverse onderzoeken. Een onderzoek naar fysieke kracht, eetpatronen en persoonlijkheidskenmerken. Op het computerscherm voor jullie staat te lezen wat van jullie wordt verwacht. Als eerste word gevraagd om zo lang mogelijk in de handknijper te knijpen met het papiertje ertussen. Een van ons klokt hierbij de tijd. Daarna beginnen jullie met de vragen op het scherm. Hierop staat precies aangegeven wat jullie moeten doen.

1. Wil je zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL TASK1A)

TIJD:

2. Beantwoord de volgende vragen over eetpatronen.(FITD)

3. Maak de volgende QUIZ zo goed mogelijk binnen twee minuten. (DEPL TASK2)

4. Onderdeel van het experiment gaat over verkeersgewoonten. Wil je gedurende een week een verkeersdagboek bijhouden? Dit houdt in dat je exact weergeeft wanneer, waar en hoe je je in het verkeer begeeft. (TARGET REQUEST)

5. Wil je wederom zolang mogelijk deze handknijper inhouden? (DEPL TASK2A)

6. Zoals je waarschijnlijk hebt gehoord in het nieuws, wil de overheid het collegegeld verhogen met 100 euro. Ben je het hier mee eens? (MINDLESSMETINGA)

JA / NEE

7a. Zo ja, kun je zoveel mogelijk tegenargumenten bedenken waarom de overheid het collegegeld NIET moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd. (MINDLESSMETINGB)

7b. Zo nee, kun je zoveel mogelijk argumenten bedenken waarom de overheid juist WEL het collegegeld moet verhogen? Je krijgt 2 minuten de tijd. (MINDLESSMETINGB)

8. Wil je de volgende vragen beantwoorden? (PCS)

Bedankt voor je medewerking.

Appendix 4: IQ-Quiz

Quiz

Wat betekenen de volgende uitdrukkingen ongeveer?

Waar rook is, is vuur

a) Roken is gevaarlijk b) In geruchten zit vaak iets waars

c) Denk na voordat je wat zegt d) Vele handen maken licht werk

Bezint eer ge begint

a) Denk vooruit b) Oefening heeft betrekking op geest en lichaam

c) Je bereikt niets als je geen risico's neemt d)Wie geduldig wacht, krijgt alles

Er kunnen geen twee kapiteins zijn op een schip

a)Het is niet slim om alle schepen achter je te verbranden b) Wees niet te ambitieus

c)Het werk wordt beter gedaan als een persoon de leiding heeft d)Te veel mensen weigeren te helpen

Welk woord hoort niet in het rijtje thuis?

- Gitaar, viool, harp, blokfluit
- Aardappel, radijs, raap, tomaat
- Tocht, water, ijs, stoom

Los de volgende raadsels op

Het antwoord is een klinker die wel zit in OMARMEN, maar niet in KLOMPEN

A E I O

Het juiste antwoord is een van de letters A, B, C, of D. Het is geen klinker en zit ook niet in het woord CIDER.

A B C D

Vissen zitten vaak in vijvers. Harry is een vis. Henk zit in een vijver. Welke bewering MOET waar zijn?

a) Harry en Henk zijn allebei vissen b)Henk is een vis

c) Harry kan al dan niet in een vijver zitten d)Henk is geen vis

Als kilogram staat tot gewicht,

Staat meter tot … (omvang, grootte, afmeting, lengte)

Als veel staat tot weinig

Staat niets tot … (alles, vaak, nooit, frequent)

Als schilderen staat tot penseel,

Staat smid tot …(vuur, ijzer, hamer, aambeeld)

Wat betekenen de volgende uitdrukkingen ongeveer?

Voor niets gaat de zon op

a)Leg wat geld opzij voor moeilijkere tijden b)Je moet je schulden op tijd betalen

c)Geniet van het leven wanneer je jong bent d)Je krijgt niets voor niets

Waar gehakt wordt, vallen spaanders

a)Waar gewerkt wordt, worden ook fouten gemaakt

b) Je kunt maar beter praten dan vechten

c)Als je aan iets begint, weet je niet wat het resultaat wordt

d)Handel snel

Je moet het paard niet achter de wagen spannen

a)Veranderingen houd je niet tegen b) Iedereen heeft hulp nodig bij een lastig karwei

c)Neem de tijd om alles goed te plannen d) Pak de zaak op de juiste manier aan

Welk woord hoort niet in het rijtje thuis?

Cirkel, vierkant, ovaal, kubus

Wol, nylon, katoen, zijde

Liter, meter, el, kilogram

Los de raadsels op.

Andre is groter dan Linda. Suzanne is kleiner dan Rob. Suzanne is kleiner dan Linda. Wie is het grootst?

a) Andre b) Rob

b) Linda d) Andre of Rob

Het antwoord is een van de letters A, B, C en D. Als de laatste letter van deze zin C is, dan is het antwoord B, als deze letter D is, is het antwoord A en als deze letter iets anders is, dan is het antwoord C.

A B C D

Als Parijs niet de hoofdstad is van Duitsland, is het antwoord A, C of D, anders is het B. Als olifanten groter zijn dan katten, is het antwoord niet A. Als het in juni warmer is dan in januari, is het antwoord niet D.

A B C D

Als wortel staat tot penseel,

Staat … tot hond (vel, botten, oor, bek)

Als mens staat tot verstand, staat

a) aanleiding tot stemming
b) trilling tot toon
c) hond tot buit
d) dier tot instinct

Als roer staat tot schip, staat

a) kenteken tot motorfiets
b) lamp tot fiets
c) rem tot auto
d) stuurknuppel tot vliegtuig

Als geluid staat tot oor, staat

a) knal tot explosie
b) verkoudheid tot mens
c) smaak tot tong
d) pijn tot ziekte

Als aardbeving staat tot instorting, staat

a) roepen tot horen
b) zon tot regen
c) ochtend tot avond
d) stormvloed tot overstroming

Als inspanning staat tot ontspanning, staat

a) start tot eindpunt
b) vakantie tot reis
c) stress tot gelatenheid
d) muziek tot taal

Appendix 5: Mindlessness Task

Mindlessness script

In dit experiment inventariseren we ook wat studenten vinden van een recent voorstel van het kabinet. Zoals je waarschijnlijk wel hebt gelezen in de krant of gehoord hebt op het nieuws heeft het kabinet het voorstel gedaan om het collegegeld per jaar met ca. honderd euro te verhogen.

Steun je dit voorstel?

JA/NEE

Zo ja, kun je zoveel mogelijk argumenten TEGEN dit voorstel verzinnen en opschrijven? Hiervoor krijg je twee minuten de tijd.

Zo nee, kun je zoveel mogelijk argumenten VOOR dit voorstel verzinnen en opschrijven? Hiervoor krijg je twee minuten de tijd.

Appendix 6: PFC-scale

Vertaling PFC-schaal

1. I prefer to be around people whose reactions I can anticipate

Ik geef de voorkeur aan omgang met mensen waarbij ik kan anticiperen op hun reacties

2. It is important to me that my actions are consistent with my beliefs

Ik vind het belangrijk dat mijn gedrag consistent is met mijn waarden

3. Even if my attitudes and actions seemed consistent with one another to me, it would bother me if they did not seem consistent in the eyes of others

Zelfs wanneer mijn attitudes en gedrag consistent lijken voor mijzelf, vind ik het vervelend wanneer zij niet consistent lijken in de ogen van anderen

4. It is important to me that those who know me can predict what I will do

Ik vind het belangrijk dat diegene die mij kennen, kunnen voorspellen wat ik ga doen

5. I want to be described by others as a stable, predictable person

Ik wil dat anderen mij omschrijven als een stabiel, voorspelbaar persoon.

6. Admirable people are consistent and predictable

Mensen die ik bewonder zijn consistent en voorspelbaar

7. The appearance of consistency is an important part of the image I present to the world.

Het voordoen als een consistent persoon is een belangrijk deel van mijn imago, dat ik uitdraag aan de wereld

8. It bothers me when someone I depend upon is unpredictable.

Ik vind het vervelend wanneer ik afhankelijk ben van een onvoorspelbaar persoon

9. I don’t like to appear as if I am inconsistent

Ik vind het niet leuk wanneer ik overkom als inconsistent

10. I get uncomfortable when I find my behaviour contradicts my beliefs

Ik vind het vervelend wanneer mijn gedrag contrasteert met mijn waarden

11. An important requirement for any friend of mine is personal consistency

Een belangrijke voorwaarde voor elke vriend van mij is persoonlijke consistentie

12. I typically prefer to do things the same way

Meestal geef ik de voorkeur aan dingen op dezelfde manier te doen

13. I dislike people who are constantly changing their opinions

Ik vind mensen die constant hun meningen veranderen niet leuk

14. I want my close friends to be predictable

Ik wil dat mijn beste vrienden voorspelbaar zijn

15. It is important to me that others view me as a stable person

Ik vind het belangrijk dat andere mij beschouwen als een stabiel persoon

16. I make an effort tot appear consistent to others

Ik doe moeite om consistent over te komen bij anderen

17. I'm uncomfortable holding two beliefs that are inconsistent

Ik vind het vervelend twee waarden te hebben die inconsistent zijn

18. It doesn't bother me much if my actions are inconsistent

Ik vind het niet heel vervelend wanneer mijn gedragingen inconsistent zijn met elkaar

De waarden worden beoordeeld op een negen punt schaal

1. Strongly Disagree

Helemaal niet mee eens

2. Disagree

Niet mee eens

3. Somewhat disagree

Gedeeltelijk niet mee eens

4.Slightly disagree

Een beetje niet mee eens

5. Neither Agree nor Disagree

Niet mee eens en niet mee oneens

6.Slightly agree

Een beetje mee eens

7. Somewhat Agree

Gedeeltelijk mee eens

8. Agree

Mee eens

9. Strongly Agree

Helemaal mee eens