

Increasing Compliance by Improving the Deal: The That's-Not-All Technique

Jerry M. Burger
Santa Clara University

Seven experiments were conducted to demonstrate and explain the effectiveness of a compliance procedure dubbed the "that's-not-all" technique. The procedure consists of offering a product at a high price, not allowing the customer to respond for a few seconds, then offering a better deal by either adding another product or lowering the price. Experiments 1 and 2 demonstrated the effectiveness of this procedure over a control group that was given the better deal initially. The results of Experiments 3 and 4 suggested that this effectiveness may be partially explained through a norm of reciprocity that calls for the customer to respond to the seller's new offer. Experiment 5 results suggest that the effect also results from an altering of the anchor point subjects use to judge the new price. Experiment 6 results indicate the effectiveness of the procedure cannot be explained as the subject perceiving the lower price as a bargain. Finally, Experiment 7 examined the differences between the that's-not-all and the "door-in-the-face" procedures.

Research on social influence processes has demonstrated the effectiveness of several compliance techniques that apparently have been understood and practiced by recruiters, salespersons, and con artists for many years (Cialdini, 1984). Among these techniques now demonstrated by psychologists are the "foot-in-the-door" procedure (cf. Beaman, Cole, Preston, Klentz, & Steblay, 1983; DeJong, 1979), in which agreement to a small initial request increases the likelihood of agreement to a larger request; the "door-in-the-face" technique (Cialdini et al., 1975; Mowen & Cialdini, 1980), in which saying no to a large initial request increases compliance to a second, smaller request; and the "low-ball" procedure (Burger & Petty, 1981; Cialdini, Cacioppo, Bassett, & Miller, 1978), in which agreement to a low price increases agreement to a then-raised higher price.

To better understand these phenomena, Cialdini (1980) advocated a "full-cycle social psychology" strategy. He suggested that psychologists can learn much about social influence by observing those who have developed and refined social influence techniques for a living. Thus, researchers can test the effectiveness of various sales ploys in controlled experiments and, if the ploys are found to be effective, determine the reasons for the effectiveness of the procedures and the conditions under which they will work.

The present series of experiments represents an application of this strategy. The case in point is a frequently observed sales technique in which the salesperson presents a product and a price but does not allow the buyer to respond immediately. Instead, after a few seconds of mulling over the price, the buyer is told "that's not all"; that is, there is an additional small product that goes along with the larger item, or that "just for you" or perhaps "today only" the price is lower than that originally

cited. The seller, of course, had planned to sell the items together or at the lower price all along but allows the buyer to think about the possibility of buying the single item or the higher priced item first. Supposedly, this approach is more effective than presenting the eventual deal to the customer in the beginning.

The first step in better understanding this that's-not-all technique is in demonstrating its effectiveness. Experiments 1 and 2 were designed to test the effectiveness of the procedure using both the additional product and the lower priced version of the technique. Next, in Experiments 3, 4, 5, and 6, three possible mediators of this effect were examined, and the procedure was compared with another type of compliance technique in Experiment 7.

Experiment 1

The first experiment was designed to test the effect of including an additional product into the sales package after giving the price but before allowing the buyer to respond. Using a psychology club bake sale as the experimental setting, customers were offered an additional package of cookies at no extra charge after thinking about buying a cupcake. It was predicted that these customers would be more likely to buy the items than would subjects who were told about the entire package and the price together.

Method

Subjects. Sixty adults and teenagers who approached one of three booths set up on a college campus, at an art fair, and in front of a grocery store participated as subjects. Customers who appeared to be preteenage or who appeared to have heard part of an interaction with another customer were not used as subjects. Twenty subjects were used at each site.

Procedure. Two experimenters sat at each of the tables with a sign that announced the university's psychology club bake sale. No prices were listed. Cupcakes were displayed on the table, but the cookies used

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jerry M. Burger, Department of Psychology, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, California 95053.

in the study were hidden from view. Only people who stopped at the table and asked about the price of the cupcakes were used as subjects.

According to a prearranged random ordering, subjects were given one of two responses about the price. Subjects in the that's-not-all (TNA; $N = 30$) condition were told that the cupcakes were 75¢ each. At this exact moment the second experimenter, who had been looking down at some papers, tapped the first experimenter on the shoulder. The first experimenter held up his or her hand and said to the customer "wait a second" without allowing the customer to respond to the price of the cupcake. After a very brief exchange between the experimenters (approximately 2–3 s), the first experimenter lowered his hand and announced to the subjects that the price included two medium-sized cookies. The experimenter then produced a small plastic bag with the cookies from behind a box on the table. If the subject asked about buying the products separately, the experimenter said, "I'm sorry. I have to keep track of how many packages I sell. I don't even know what the price would be to sell them separately."

Subjects in the control condition ($N = 30$) were shown the cookies as soon as they asked about the price of the cupcakes and were told that the package sold for 75¢. Once again, if subjects inquired, the experimenter explained that the cupcakes and cookies could not be sold separately.

Results and Discussion

The numbers of subjects who purchased and did not purchase at least one cupcake-cookies package were calculated for each condition. It was found that more subjects purchased products in the TNA condition (73%) than in the control condition (40%), $\chi^2(1, N = 60) = 6.79, p < .01$. The results thus support the prediction and demonstrate that the TNA technique appears to have been effective in increasing sales in this situation.

Experiment 2

The results of Experiment 1 demonstrate that adding a product to the package to be purchased after giving the price but before allowing the customer to respond is an effective technique for increasing sales. An alternate procedure for implementing this technique would be to reduce the price of the object to be purchased between the initial price citation and the customer's response. As in the added-product procedure, the customer is getting a better value for his or her money when the salesperson suddenly comes back with a lower price. It was predicted, therefore, that customers presented with the lower price after being allowed to think about a higher price would be more likely to buy the product than customers presented only with the lower price.

Method

Subjects. Fifty-three adults and teenagers who approached one of three booths set up around the university campus were used as subjects. Preteens and customers who overheard part of a conversation with another customer were not included.

Procedure. As in Experiment 1, two experimenters sold cupcakes at a psychology club bake sale. Subjects were randomly preassigned to either the that's-not-all ($N = 26$) or control ($N = 27$) conditions. In the TNA condition, customers who asked about the price were told that the cupcakes cost \$1.00 each. As in Experiment 1, the first experimenter was interrupted for 2–3 s by the second experimenter. The customer's response again was delayed by a "wait a second" and a raised hand by

the first experimenter. When the experimenter turned his or her attention back to the customer, he or she explained, "But, because we are planning to close down pretty soon, we are going to start selling them for 75¢." Subjects in the control condition were simply told that the cupcakes were 75¢ each when they asked about the price.

Results and Discussion

The numbers of subjects who did and did not purchase cupcakes in each of the two conditions were compared. As in Experiment 1, it was found that more subjects purchased the cupcakes in the TNA condition (73%) than in the control condition (44%), $\chi^2(1, N = 53) = 4.47, p < .05$. Thus, the results provide additional support for the prediction that the that's-not-all technique is an effective procedure for increasing sales. The technique appears to be nearly equally effective when the salesperson adds a new product to the deal as when he or she lowers the original price of the object.

Experiment 3

The that's-not-all technique appears to be a genuinely effective technique developed by salespeople to increase customer compliance to their sales requests. However, the next step in the full-cycle social psychology strategy is to explain *why* this procedure works. Two principles from social psychological theory and past research appear to be likely explanations for the effect. These are the norm of reciprocity and the use of different anchoring points in attitudinal judgments. Experiments 3, 4, and 5 are designed to test these two explanations.

First, researchers from various areas in social psychology have utilized the notion of a norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). That is, one of the social rules that members of our culture appear to follow is that we need to return a favor—if people do something nice for us, we should do something nice for them. As a demonstration of this, Regan (1971) found that a confederate was able to sell more raffle tickets to an unsuspecting subject when the confederate had earlier brought a soft drink to the subject. Cialdini et al. (1975) applied this norm when explaining the door-in-the-face technique, in which subjects agree to a small request after refusing a larger one. They explain that the requester in this situation has seduced the buyer into a negotiation-type situation. After the buyer says no, the requester then lowers his or her demands. The norm of reciprocity deems that the customer is then obligated to "meet halfway" with the requester and agree to the smaller request.

As applied to the that's-not-all technique, it can be speculated that the customer also has entered into a type of negotiation with the seller. The seller has offered to come down from his or her price or to sweeten the deal with an additional product. Abiding by the reciprocity norm, therefore, the customer should feel an increased obligation to purchase the product and thereby reciprocate the seller's negotiating action.

If a norm of reciprocity is operating in the that's-not-all situation, it would be expected that manipulating the extent to which the seller's action appears to be a personal negotiation will affect the effectiveness of the technique. If the seller's action is seen as something he or she is forced to do, and therefore not a negotiating action calling for reciprocity, there is no need to reciprocate by buying the product. On the other hand, if the price reduction

or added product is perceived as a personal gesture, then increased compliance should follow. Experiment 3 was designed to test this prediction. Subjects purchased cupcakes in one of two that's-not-all situations. In one condition the seller's role in the reduced price was made salient. In another condition the reduced price appeared out of the seller's hands. It was predicted that the former procedure would be more effective in increasing sales over a control group than the latter.

Method

Subjects. Sixty adults and teenagers who approached one of five bake sale booths set up around the university campus and in front of nearby stores were used as subjects. Preteens and customers who overheard conversations with other subjects were not included.

Procedure. Two experimenters sat at each of the tables with attractively displayed cupcakes. As in the earlier experiments, a sign identifying the psychology club bake sale, without prices, was attached to the table. Customers who approached the table and asked about the price of the cupcakes were used as subjects. Each had been randomly preassigned to one of three conditions. In the negotiation condition ($N = 20$) the experimenter announced that the cupcakes sold for \$1.00 each. As in the two earlier experiments, the second experimenter interrupted, delaying the subject's response. When returning his or her attention to the customer after 2–3 s, the experimenter explained, "But I want to leave soon, so I'd be willing to sell them to you for 75¢ each."

In the no-negotiation condition ($N = 20$), the customer also was told that the price of the cupcakes was \$1.00 each. Again the second experimenter interrupted and delayed the subject's response for a few seconds. However, the message from the second experimenter, loud enough for the subject to hear, was that the cupcakes really sell for 75¢. The first experimenter then turned toward the subject and announced that he or she had just started selling that day and that *these* cupcakes were really 75¢. Subjects in the control condition ($N = 20$) were told only that the cupcakes cost 75¢ apiece.

Results and Discussion

The numbers of subjects who did and did not buy at least one cupcake were determined for each condition. Subjects in the negotiation condition were more likely to make a purchase (85%) than were subjects in the control condition (50%), $\chi^2(1, N = 40) = 5.58, p < .02$. However, the no-negotiation subjects (70%), although slightly more likely to buy a product than the control subjects, did not differ from these subjects significantly.

The results thus suggest that a perception of negotiation on the part of the seller is at least partly responsible for the effectiveness of the that's-not-all effect. Apparently, a salesperson who lowers the price of an object or who throws in another product or feature is seen as making a personal move toward some agreeable price. Although the extent to which the seller's second offer was a personal concession was fairly ambiguous in Experiments 1 and 2, these findings suggest that many customers interpreted the action as a type of concession and responded accordingly.

On the other hand, lowering the price of the object because one is supposed to also increased the compliance rate (from 50% to 70%), but not significantly so. This pattern of results suggests, albeit weakly, that although the appearance of negotiation increases the effectiveness of the technique, a norm of reciprocity alone may not account for the effectiveness of the tech-

nique. This argument would have been strengthened, of course, if the difference between the no-negotiation and the other two conditions had been found to be significant. It may be that such significant findings would have been uncovered if a different procedure had been used. Experiment 4 was designed to test this.

Experiment 4

At least two features of the procedures used in the previous experiment may have reduced the probability of obtaining the predicted results. First, the base rate, as indicated in the control condition, was probably too high. It is difficult to increase compliance rates significantly from a base rate of 50%. One reason for this high rate may have been that, despite the seemingly high cost of a single cupcake, only people who approached the table and inquired about the cupcakes were used as subjects. Thus, these people probably represent those more inclined to buy cupcakes than the average person who passes by the table. Therefore, a door-to-door sales procedure was employed in Experiment 4 to take care of this problem and thereby lower the base rate of compliance.

A second potential problem in Experiment 3 was the weak personal negotiation manipulation. That is, experimenters in the negotiation condition made an offer to lower the price, but apparently at little personal loss, and maybe even some gain for the seller. The subjects may have perceived this salesperson as willing to cost the psychology club some profits in order to go home early that day. Because this salesperson may have actually been the one to benefit from lowering the price of the cupcake, the perception that he or she was personally negotiating may have been weakened. Therefore, in Experiment 4 requesters presented themselves as salespeople sacrificing their own profit.

As in Experiment 3, two that's-not-all conditions were used, one that emphasized the requester's personal negotiation and the other that de-emphasized this. It was predicted that both procedures would increase sales significantly over a group presented only with the price of the object. In addition, it was predicted that the negotiation condition would increase sales over the other that's-not-all condition.

Method

Subjects. One hundred five adults who answered their door during one of several evenings were used as subjects.

Procedure. Two experimenters, a male and a female, approached houses in the early evening in a middle-class neighborhood. All homes except those with signs specifically restricting salespeople were approached. If the person answering the door appeared to be less than 18 years old, the experimenters asked to speak to an adult. If no adult was present or if no one answered the door, the home was not included in the study.

Each usable home was preassigned to one of three conditions. There were 35 subjects in each condition. In the negotiation condition the male experimenter introduced himself and explained that he and the female experimenter were selling candles to raise money for their school expenses. After briefly describing the candles, he announced that they were being sold for \$3.00 each. At that instant the other experimenter tapped him on the shoulder. The first experimenter then held up his hand toward the subject and said "excuse me." The second experimenter said out loud, "No, we decided to sell these for \$2.00 now." The

first experimenter then turned back toward the subject and announced, "I'm sorry. We decided to try to sell more candles at a lower price. So now we're selling them for only \$2.00."

In the no-negotiation condition the male experimenter also described the candles they were selling. However, this time when the female experimenter interrupted him she said, "No, we sold all of those. These are the \$2.00 candles." The first experimenter then turned back toward the subject and explained, "I'm sorry. We sold those. I meant to say the price is \$2.00." In the control condition subjects were told only that the candles were \$2.00.

Results and Discussion

The number of subjects in each condition who bought one or more of the candles were compared. The that's-not-all technique again appeared to be successful in increasing compliance over the control condition. The rates of compliance in the three conditions were as follows: negotiation, 57.1%; no negotiation, 37.1%; control, 14.3%. Both the negotiation condition, $\chi^2(1, N = 70) = 14.00, p < .001$, and the no-negotiation condition, $\chi^2(1, N = 70) = 4.79, p < .05$, increased compliance over the control group. The difference between the two TNA conditions, however, was only marginally significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 70) = 2.81, p < .10$.

The results therefore are generally in agreement with the predictions. Together with the results of Experiment 3, it can be concluded that the norm of reciprocity appears to play a role in the effectiveness of the that's-not-all technique. Increasing the salience of the experimenter's personal negotiation seems to bring about a need for the subject to reciprocate by purchasing the product. However, it also appears that something beyond the norm of reciprocity is operating here. The pattern of results in both Experiments 3 and 4 suggests that although this increased perception of personal negotiation is effective, the TNA technique may also work without it. Specifically, when the lowering of the price in Experiment 4 appeared to be the result of an error by the requester (no-negotiation condition), rather than a personal negotiation, the procedure was still more effective than the base rate presentation. This is especially interesting in that in this condition the subject was allowed to think about paying \$3.00 for the candle he or she saw and then was told that the value of the items was only \$2.00. Experiment 5 was designed to test an additional mediator of the effect.

Experiment 5

A second explanation for the that's-not-all effect is suggested by Sherif's work on attitudinal judgments (Sherif & Sherif, 1967). Borrowing from adaptation level theory (Helson, 1964), Sherif's social judgment theory maintains that attitudinal judgments, such as agreeing or not agreeing with a statement, need to be considered within the particular frame of reference of the individual making the judgment. Sherif and Sherif argued that the individual judges the new object against an anchor point to make this assessment.

An important feature of this process demonstrated in later research is that the anchor against which the judgment is made can be altered through various experiences (e.g., Brickman, Coates, & Janoff-Bulman, 1978; Kenrick & Gutierrez, 1980; Manis & Moore, 1978; Pepitone & DiNubile, 1976). For exam-

ple, Brickman et al. found that everyday experiences, such as talking to a friend, were less enjoyable for people who had won large amounts of money in lotteries than for those who had not. Similarly, Kenrick and Gutierrez found that males rated a woman as less physically attractive after they had watched an episode of "Charlie's Angels," featuring very attractive actresses. Thus, such social judgments as happiness and physical attractiveness appear to be made relative to an anchor point that can be altered with experience.

When applied to the that's-not-all effect, it can be argued that the value of some products (e.g., a cupcake at a bake sale) are fairly vague. The customer's anchor point for making the buy-not-buy judgment therefore might be susceptible to some simple and subtle manipulation by the experimenter. In the cupcake example, the customer is asked to make a judgment about a reasonable price for a cupcake. If the salesperson first introduces an anchor point of \$1.00 and allows a few seconds for this to operate as the basis of the customer's deliberations, then a price of 75¢ for the same cupcake will appear more reasonable than if an anchor point of 75¢ was introduced initially. In social judgment theory terms, by altering the anchor point the salesperson has increased the likelihood that the eventual price will fall within the customer's range of acceptance.

Experiment 5 was designed to examine this possibility. Subjects were asked to provide estimates of what they would be likely to pay for a cupcake and what they believed would be an honest price for a cupcake. It was predicted that these estimates would be higher when the subjects are informed first that the cupcakes have been selling for \$1.00 than when told the price has been 75¢.

Method

Subjects. Twenty-eight undergraduates served as subjects as part of an introductory psychology course class exercise.

Procedure. Subjects were presented with a short questionnaire that asked them to imagine that the psychology club was selling cupcakes at a bake sale on campus. Half of the subjects received a questionnaire that explained that the club was selling the cupcakes for \$1.00 each. The other half read that the cupcakes were being sold at 75¢ each. Subjects were then asked to imagine that they stopped by the booth where the sale was going on and were thinking about buying a cupcake. The questionnaire then asked two questions. First, subjects read "Forgetting for a moment that the club has been charging (\$1.00/75¢) per cupcake, what is the highest amount you believe you would be willing to pay for a cupcake in this situation?" Next, subjects read "Again forgetting that the club has been charging (\$1.00/75¢) per cupcake, what do you believe is an honest amount to charge for the cupcake—high enough to make a profit for the club but not so high that the customers feel cheated?" Subjects were instructed to provide an exact figure for each question.

Results and Discussion

Responses on the two questions were compared for the \$1.00 and 75¢ anchor subjects. It was found that the \$1.00 subject ($M = 51.4¢$) indicated they would pay more for the cupcake than did subjects in the 75¢ condition ($M = 44.6¢$), although this fell short of significance. More important, the \$1.00 subjects reported a higher honest price for the cupcake ($M =$

66.1¢) than did the 75¢ subjects ($M = 51.4¢$), $F(1, 26) = 5.84$, $p < .03$.¹

The findings suggest, as speculated, that the value of a cupcake at a bake sale is fairly vague. In making a judgment about whether to buy the item, customers may be attempting to compare the price of the object with their idea of what the product's value is. By introducing a higher price through the that's-not-all procedure, the salesperson appears to be altering the anchor point against which this judgment is being made. The likelihood of the eventual price falling within the customer's range of acceptance is increased if the salesperson can raise the anchor point, as appears to be done with introducing the higher price first.

Experiment 6

A close examination of the last two experiments suggests an alternate interpretation of the results that needs to be explored. In Experiment 4, for example, subjects were told in one condition that the candles had been sold for \$3.00 but now were being sold for \$2.00. It is possible that the increase in compliance in this condition simply was the result of perceiving a bargain, in this case a dollar off the retail value. That is, subjects were more likely to pay \$2.00 for a candle they believed was worth \$3.00 than pay \$2.00 for a \$2.00 candle. To examine this possibility, another cupcake sale study was conducted that included a "bargain" condition; that is, people were told that the product was being sold at a lower price than before but without the other features of the that's-not-all procedure. It was predicted that subjects presented with the TNA procedure would be more likely to buy the product than subjects told only that the price is a bargain or told only the eventual price.

Method

Subjects. Sixty adults and teenagers who approached booths set up around the university campus were used as subjects. As in earlier research, those who appeared to be preteens and customers who overheard part of an interaction with another customer were not included.

Procedure. Two experimenters sold cupcakes at a psychology club bake sale booth. Customers had been randomly preassigned to one of three conditions, with 20 subjects in each condition. In the that's-not-all condition subjects were told that the price of a cupcake was \$1.25. At this point the second experimenter interrupted. The customer's response was delayed, as before, with a raised hand and a "wait a second" by the first experimenter. After 2–3 s the first experimenter turned to the customer and said, as in Experiment 2, that because they were planning to close down pretty soon, he or she would be willing to sell the cupcake for only \$1.00. The price of the cupcake was raised in this experiment beyond the price in earlier studies to reduce the compliance rate in the control condition.

Subjects in the bargain condition, when asking about the price, were told, "These are only a dollar now. We were selling them for \$1.25 earlier." Subjects in the control condition were told only that the price of the cupcake was \$1.00.

Results and Discussion

The numbers of subjects who did and did not purchase at least one cupcake were compared across the three conditions. It was found, as predicted, that the TNA subjects were signifi-

cantly more likely to purchase a cupcake (55%) than were subjects in the control condition (20%), $\chi^2(1, N = 40) = 5.23$, $p < .05$. In addition, the TNA subjects tended to be more likely to buy the product than the bargain subjects (25%), $\chi^2(1, N = 40) = 3.75$, $p < .07$. The bargain and control conditions did not differ significantly. The results thus suggest that the appearance of a bargain by itself does not appear to be responsible for the effectiveness of the TNA procedure in the earlier investigations. Both the TNA and bargain subjects believed that they were being offered a \$1.25 product at \$1.00, yet only the TNA procedure appeared to significantly increase compliance beyond the base rate.

Conditions in two of the earlier experiments also found the that's-not-all technique to be effective without confounding the procedure with the perception of a bargain price. In Experiment 1, subjects had an additional product (cookies) added to the sales package and thus were not likely to change their perceived value of the cupcakes. In addition, in the no-negotiation condition in Experiment 3, subjects were told that the experimenter had been mistaken and that the lower price was the true price of the cupcakes. Combined with the results of Experiment 6, these findings argue strongly that a perceived-bargain interpretation cannot account for the effectiveness of the that's-not-all procedure.

Experiment 7

A final question to be addressed here concerns the relation between the that's-not-all technique and the door-in-the-face (DITF) technique. In the latter case, increased compliance to a request results from getting the person to first say no to a costly request. The most obvious difference between the two procedures is that the subject is allowed the opportunity to refuse the initial request in the DITF procedure but is not allowed to respond in the TNA procedure. It is not clear, however, how this difference might affect the effectiveness of the procedures. Thus, Experiment 7 was designed to compare the two compliance procedures.

Method

Subjects. Sixty adults and teenagers who approached booths set up around the university campus were used as subjects. As in earlier research, those who appeared to be preteens and customers who overheard part of an interaction with another customer were not included.

Procedure. As in the earlier cupcake sale procedures, two experimenters sold cupcakes for a psychology club bake sale to customers who had been randomly preassigned to one of three conditions, with 20 subjects in each condition. In the that's-not-all condition, subjects were told that the price of a cupcake was \$1.25. At this point the experimenter was interrupted by the second experimenter. The customer's response was delayed with a "wait a second" and a raised hand. After two to three seconds the first experimenter turned to the customer and said, as in

¹ Although the 66.1¢ figure is still below the 75¢ requested in the experiment, the high compliance rate in the earlier studies probably can be explained by the subject selection procedure. That is, only those who already were interested in purchasing a cupcake were used as subjects. In addition, the power of the requester's personal negotiation, demonstrated in Experiments 3 and 4, was not operating here.

Experiment 2, that because they were planning to close down pretty soon, the price was now \$1.00.

The door-in-the-face subjects also were told initially that the price was \$1.25. The experimenter, however, was not interrupted and waited for the subject to respond. If the subject agreed to the price (two did), the cupcake was sold at \$1.25. If the subject refused the price, the same experimenter said immediately, "Well, we were planning to close down pretty soon, so I'll start selling them for \$1.00." Subjects assigned to the control condition were told only that the price of a cupcake was \$1.00.

Results and Discussion

The number of subjects in each condition who purchased one or more cupcakes was calculated. The two subjects who agreed to the higher price in the DITF procedure were included in the purchase group, based on the assumption that they also would have purchased a cupcake at the \$1.00 price. It was found that both the TNA procedure (50% compliance) and the DITF procedures (35%) increased sales over the control group (20%). However, only the difference between the TNA and the control group was significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 40) = 3.96, p < .05$.

The results thus suggest that the that's-not-all procedure may be more effective than the door-in-the-face technique. Subjects in the TNA condition were significantly more likely to purchase a cupcake than were control group subjects. However, the DITF procedure did not produce this significant difference. Unfortunately, because the TNA subjects did not comply at a rate significantly higher than that of the DITF subjects, these data do not indicate whether the two procedures produce distinctly different results. The importance of allowing the customer to refuse the initial request needs to be explored further.

General Discussion

The research reported here demonstrates the effectiveness of the that's-not-all technique. In six experiments it was found that presenting a product at a high price, allowing the customer to think about the price, and then improving the deal through an additional product or lowering the price increased compliance to the purchase request over that of appropriate control groups. Further investigations suggested that this effect can be explained in part by two theories. First, it appears that the technique is effective because the requester is seen as negotiating on the purchase price. Following a norm of reciprocity, the customer may feel some obligation to reciprocate this act by agreeing to the better price. Second, the introduction of the original price appears to alter the anchor point against which the purchase decision is made. When the salesperson then asks for a lower price or includes another product, making the price seem better, the chances of the second price falling within the range of acceptance created by this new anchor point are increased. It should be noted, however, that the data for the anchor point interpretation were not tied to actual behaviors (i.e., purchasing the product).

Several questions about this effect remain, however. There is the large question about generalization to other products and other types of requests. The products used in this research, cupcakes and candles, probably have sufficiently vague value that an altering of the anchor point is possible. The procedure might not be effective with products for which people have a fairly

solid anchor point, such as grocery items purchased frequently. Whether the technique would be effective with requests other than sales also needs to be determined. For example, one might use the that's-not-all procedure when soliciting donations. Informing people that the minimum donation is a certain amount followed by a revised lower minimum might increase the number of people willing to give that second amount.

An additional concern that must be addressed is that of experimenter bias. That is, experimenters aware of the experimental hypothesis, or who anticipate the hypothesis, might inadvertently behave differently toward subjects in one condition than in another and thereby generate behavior that confirms the prediction. Experimenter bias can be particularly problematic in compliance research in which experimenters cannot be kept blind to conditions and the hypotheses are usually fairly easy to figure out. Although the potential influence of experimenter bias in the present research cannot be ruled out completely, it seems unlikely that it could account for all of the findings. It is possible the experimenters guessed that the TNA procedure should increase compliance in the studies with only two conditions (Experiments 1 and 2). However, there is no apparent reason to believe that the experimenters would understand which of the two experimental conditions would be more effective in the remaining studies. Indeed, the failure to produce a significant increase in compliance with the door-in-the-face procedure in Experiment 7 represents a failure at replicating an effect that the experimenters may have heard about or logically predicted. Similarly, although common sense suggests that subjects will buy more when the product is identified as a bargain, a significant increase in compliance was not found in the bargain condition in Experiment 6. Thus, it is unlikely that experimenter bias was particularly influential in these studies.

Further research might also focus on better understanding of the reasons for the effectiveness of the TNA procedure. The two explanations examined here, the norm of reciprocity and altering anchor points, appear to be at least partly responsible. However, there may be other contributing elements. In addition, it may be useful to distinguish between this and other types of compliance procedures. For example, as demonstrated in Experiment 7, whether the subject is allowed to refuse the initial request (the door-in-the-face) may have an effect on the effectiveness of the procedure. A better understanding of the reasons for this effectiveness and the impact of the various features in each of the techniques may allow for greater prediction of which procedure is the most effective in a given situation.

References

- Beaman, A. L., Cole, C. M., Preston, M., Klentz, B., & Steblay, N. M. (1983). Fifteen years of foot-in-the-door research: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, 181-196.
- Brickman, P., Coates, D., & Janoff-Bulman, R. (1978). Lottery winners and accident victims: Is happiness relative? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 917-927.
- Burger, J. M., & Petty, R. E. (1981). The low-ball compliance technique: Task or person commitment? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 492-500.
- Cialdini, R. B. (1980). Full-cycle social psychology. *Applied Social Psychology Annual*, 1, 21-45.
- Cialdini, R. B. (1984). *Influence: How and why people agree to things*. New York: Morrow.

- Cialdini, R. B., Cacioppo, J. T., Bassett, R., & Miller, J. A. (1978). Low-ball procedure for producing compliance: Commitment then cost. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 463-476.
- Cialdini, R. B., Vincent, J. E., Lewis, S. K., Catalan, J., Wheeler, D., & Darby, B. (1975). Reciprocal concessions procedure for inducing compliance: The door-in-the-face technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 206-215.
- DeJong, W. (1979). An examination of self-perception mediation of the foot-in-the-door effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 2221-2239.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Helson, H. (1964). *Adaptation-level theory*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kenrick, D. T., & Gutierrez, S. E. (1980). Contrast effects and judgments of physical attractiveness: When beauty becomes a social problem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 131-140.
- Manis, M., & Moore, J. C. (1978). Summarizing controversial messages: Retroactive effects due to subsequent information. *Social Psychology*, 41, 62-68.
- Mowen, J. C., & Cialdini, R. B. (1980). On implementing the door-in-the-face compliance technique in a business context. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 253-258.
- Pepitone, A., & DiNubile, M. (1976). Contrast effects in judgments of crime severity and the punishment of criminal violators. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 33, 448-459.
- Regan, D. T. (1971). Effects of a favor and liking on compliance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 7, 627-639.
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1967). Attitude as the individual's own categories: The social judgment-involvement approach to attitude and attitude change. In C. W. Sherif & M. Sherif (Eds.), *Attitude, ego-involvement, and change* (pp. 105-139). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Received August 15, 1985

Revision received March 3, 1986 ■

Integrating Personality and Social Psychology: Call for Papers

The editors intend to publish a special issue devoted to papers demonstrating that social behavior is best understood by integrating the diverse concerns of the three sections of *JSPS*. Papers are invited that deal with particular substantive issues crossing the boundaries of individual differences, social cognition, and interpersonal relations. Papers should represent practical demonstrations that the diverse concerns of this journal belong together in a full understanding of social behavior. We seek previously unpublished contributions, primarily empirical studies, but we are also amenable to syntheses of long-term research programs and to innovative theoretical statements.

Contributions intended for the special issue should be sent to the guest editor:

John F. Kihlstrom, PhD
W. J. Brogden Psychology Building
University of Wisconsin
1202 West Johnson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Interested authors should send an abstract of their article to the guest editor by September 1, 1986 and plan to submit a completed manuscript by December 1, 1986, at which time the paper will become subject to the usual peer review process.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology editors:

*Attitudes and Social
Cognition*
Steven J. Sherman
Charles M. Judd

*Interpersonal Relations and
Group Processes*
Harry T. Reis
Norbert L. Kerr

*Personality Processes and
Individual Differences*
Irwin G. Sarason
Edward F. Diener
Warren H. Jones
