

2004

The Effects Of Psuedo-altruistic Behavior On The Likelihood Of Reciprocity And Perceptions Of The Source

Reagan Rule
University of Central Florida



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Rule, Reagan, "The Effects Of Psuedo-altruistic Behavior On The Likelihood Of Reciprocity And Perceptions Of The Source" (2004). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 13.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/13>



THE EFFECTS OF PSUEDO-ALTRUISTIC BEHAVIOR ON THE
LIKELIHOOD OF RECIPROCITY AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE SOURCE

by

REAGAN RULE

B.A. Florida Gulf Coast University, Fort Myers 2002

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Nicholson School of Communication
in the College of Arts and Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2004

ABSTRACT

The current study examines the roles of expectancy disconfirmation and pseudo-altruistic behaviors as communication strategies to increase receiver compliance, and their effects on perceptions of the source, including credibility and likeability ratings. While adding to the previous research, this investigation examines the effects on compliance when pseudo-altruistic practices are employed in a sales situation. Additionally, subjects' compliance responses in the treatment groups are analyzed for relationships between compliance and several possible mediators, including participant's evaluations of the source, and feelings of obligation and guilt.

A focus group was held to discuss the face validity of the scenarios. Additionally, a pilot study was conducted to verify the operationalization of the independent variable, and to reveal any items that needed to be modified before the actual study was conducted. 141 undergraduate students were assigned to one of six treatment groups, and responded to the scenario and questionnaire. Five-point Likert type scales were used for the source factor and compliance items, and seven-point semantic differential scales were used for the items which measured source perceptions. Additionally, an optional open-ended item was employed for subjects to explain the motives behind their decisions.

Analysis of the data showed that participants in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions were more likely to return to Store or Dealership A, or tipped the server more than usual. They also rated the source as more expert and of higher character in the treatment groups than the neutral, control groups.

This increase in compliance was consistent across all three scenarios. Regression analyses also revealed that source factors including concern, helpfulness, unexpected behavior, expertise, character, honesty, and likeability predicted 26% of the compliance variance.

In conclusion, subjects were more likely to comply in the pseudo-altruistic treatment condition, regardless of the scenario. Their compliance is attributed to feelings of liking and higher ratings of the source, which facilitated reciprocal altruism and benefited the salesperson or server for their selfless behavior.

To my grandparents- without their immeasurable support and love, I would not be where I am today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are some people in life that you will meet and instantly admire. Their warmth and kindness instantly captivate the world in which they thrive. During the past two years, I have been privileged to get to know people like this. Their kindness, concern, and generosity have enabled me to conquer the many challenges that have been presented to me thus far.

Most importantly, I must thank Dr. Burt Pryor for his wisdom, helpfulness, and tremendously calm sense of humor. Dr. Pryor has been an admirable mentor, and his patience and dedication have supported me throughout my stay here at UCF.

I must also thank Maggie for her truly amazing spirit. Her kindness and personality can light up a room, and her laughter is the most infectious I have ever encountered. Thank you so much for listening and understanding- your ability and strength is inspiring to me.

Then there's Wayne, my ever supportive cheerleader. Real friendship is rare, and friends that help you code data over the weekend are even harder to come by.

I also want to thank Pedro, Brian, and Susan for letting me use their students for the study. This research would not have been possible without your help.

Lastly, but most importantly, I would be lost without my family, Christopher, and Peggy. While a chapter in my life is getting ready to close, I know you will all be there in the pages that follow.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
Compliance-Gaining	3
The Norm of Reciprocity	4
Pseudo-Altruism	4
Expectancy Disconfirmation.....	5
Credibility Dimensions: Expertise and Trustworthiness	7
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	9
METHODOLOGY	11
Participants and Design.....	11
Independent Variable	11
Development of the Scenarios: Focus Group and Pilot Test	12
Dependent and Mediating Variables.....	14
Procedure	14
RESULTS	16
Manipulation Checks	16
Tests of Research Questions	17
Open-Ended Item	21
Regression Analysis.....	22
DISCUSSION	25
Manipulation Check Findings.....	25
Findings from the Research Questions	26
Internal Validity	30
External Validity	30
Summary and Conclusions	31
APPENDIX A FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS	33
APPENDIX B SCENARIOS: TREATMENT AND CONTROL CONDITIONS.....	35

APPENDIX C SOURCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	43
APPENDIX D INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROCTORING THE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	45
APPENDIX E INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL	47
REFERENCES	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Manipulation Check Means and Main Effect Findings	16
Table 2: Means and Main Effects for Pseudo-Altruism	18
Table 3: Regression Analysis Summary for Guilt, Unexpected, and Obligation	23
Table 4: Regression Analysis Summary for Source Characteristics	23

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, the field of persuasion and social influence has received a significant amount of attention from both scholars and practitioners. While theories and models of attitude change have been developed, the actual strategies for persuading and compliance remain the focal point for many researchers (Woodward & Denton, 2000). Although there is an abundance of research that deals with compliance gaining, reciprocity, and expectancy disconfirmation, few studies combine these concepts or incorporate the characteristic of pseudo-altruism.

The current study examines the roles of expectancy disconfirmation and pseudo-altruistic behaviors as communication strategies to increase compliance, and their effects on perceptions of the source, including credibility and likeability ratings. While adding to the previous research, this investigation will examine the effects on compliance when pseudo-altruistic practices are employed (Baglan, Lalumia, & Bayless, 1986). Additionally, subjects' compliance responses in the treatment groups will be analyzed for relationships between compliance and several possible mediators, including participant's evaluations of the source, and feelings of obligation and guilt.

To appropriately examine these variables, a detailed foundation of the literature regarding compliance gaining and the norm of reciprocity follows. In addition, expectancy disconfirmation and the term pseudo-altruism are defined and analyzed. Lastly, perceptions of the source will be examined in relation to the pseudo-altruistic behaviors.

Central to the study is the Attributional Analysis of Persuasion theory concerned with the disconfirmation of expectancies. The theory predicts that expectancy disconfirmation leads to increased persuasion, since message recipients make judgments about the source's truthfulness based upon the position they take, if it's expected or unexpected (Priester & Petty, 1995). The

current study contributes to this theory by combining the research concerned with pseudo-altruism, reciprocity, and compliance gaining.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Compliance-Gaining

Synonyms of the term compliance include submission, obedience, and fulfillment of a request. When one substitutes these terms in place of compliance-gaining, the concept is easily defined. Basically, when an agent performs in a certain manner to gain the submission and obedience of another, who is often called the target, fulfillment or compliance of the request occurs (Garko & Cissna, 1988).

Extensive planning often goes into the agent's strategies, and past experiences generally play an active role in the development of those tactics (Garko & Cissna, 1988). While effective planning increases the likelihood of compliance, there are other factors that need to be considered. When the communicator acts as though they are taking into consideration the best interests of the receiver, it is crucial that they maintain an altruistic appearance (Gass & Seiter, 1999). Otherwise, their behaviors can be portrayed as fake bribery, and any willingness to comply evaporates.

Research also reveals that feelings of obligation and liking are related and lead to increased compliance (Goei, Lindsey, Boster, Skalski, & Bowman, 2003). When the agent is perceived as friendly, helpful, or sincere, and if they provide the receiver with a favor, whether it be advice or assistance, the agent's chances of benefiting from the encounter are enhanced. Providing the favor may increase the receivers' feelings of obligation and possibly guilt, and liking acts as a mediator to induce compliance. This phenomenon can be attributed to the fact that, "favors increase liking and we comply more with those whom we like to create or maintain positive relationships" (Goei et al., 2003).

The Norm of Reciprocity

When individuals feel an internal pressure to comply with someone who has previously provided them with a favor, they are experiencing the norm of reciprocity (Goei et al., 2003; Whatley, Webster, Smith & Rhodes, 1999). As a leading principle governing pro-social behaviors, the norm's common theme states that, if someone helps you, you should help them in return (Lippa, 1990). Additionally, individuals may choose to comply with a request from someone who has provided them with a favor in order to relieve any possible feelings of obligation or guilt.

Cialdini (2001) also provides examples of how this reciprocity rule acts as an agent for commitment, and “governs many situations of a purely interpersonal nature where neither money nor commercial exchange is at issue.” In other words, when a person is made to feel that they owe someone something, they feel pressured to reciprocate the favor.

Particularly important to the study is the term reciprocal altruism, which is a combination of reciprocity and altruistic behaviors, and is defined as “behavior that benefits another with the proviso that the other is expected to return the favor” (Lippa, 1990). This concept is central to the research because of its altruistic roots that are not quite genuine. Essentially, persuasion practitioners will find that the norm of reciprocity acts as an invisible, binding force that requires their target to comply with requests and return favors.

Pseudo-Altruism

Altruism is generally considered a helpful, selfless behavior wherein the needs of others are met without any consideration of an individual's own self interests. However, this behavior in its true form is rare, as in most cases altruism is driven by internal motivating factors (Lippa,

1990; Piliavin & Charng, 1990). When this occurs, the behavior takes on a “pseudo-altruistic” appearance, and the actor is rewarded for their pro-social act by experiencing increased pleasure or decreased pain (Lippa, 1990).

However, it is common for a person’s internal, motivating self-interests to be perceived as charitable by others, and in many cases the individual is considered more likable and trustworthy for being concerned with the best interests of the other person or persons (Holmes, Miller, & Lerner, 2002; Gass & Seiter, 1999). The downfall to this kind of behavior is that it not only threatens the ‘common good’ (Batson, Ahmad, Yin, Bedell, Johnson, Templin, & Whiteside, 1999), but it can also lead to the receiver experiencing feelings of reciprocity and obligation. When these feelings occur, the person who has performed the pseudo- altruistic behavior has accomplished their mission, and they will ultimately profit from the encounter.

Expectancy Disconfirmation

When a source offers a message that is contrary to what we expect, their position may appear unbiased, and the message more persuasive (Eagly & Himmelfarb, 1978). Also, once the communicator disconfirms the expected response, by appearing to argue against their own self interests, the audience is led to believe that the source is both an expert as well as trustworthy (O’Keefe, 2002).

The Attributional Analysis of Persuasion (AAP) theory expects that, “we can make inferences about a source’s accuracy on the basis of whether the source confirms or disconfirms our expectancies about the specific message position to be taken” (Priester & Petty, 1995). Priester and Petty (1995) report findings that show when the source is perceived as honest, and introduces a message that disconfirms expectancies, message processing decreases.

Consequently, subjects who are primarily low in need for cognition are more susceptible to influence or persuasion since they treat the disconfirming message as a peripheral cue.

However, other studies find that expectancy disconfirmation actually leads to increased message processing, since the unexpectedness causes individuals to become more engaged in the message (Priester & Petty, 1995).

McPeck and Edwards (1975) examined the effects of expectancy disconfirmation on attitude change and reported that, “interpersonal perceptions and behaviors are partly guided by the prior expectations which the participants bring to social interactions.” Essentially this means that we enter into situations with established expectations, and when these expectations are disconfirmed, we experience expectancy disconfirmation. Unexpected behavior may be helpful advice or behavior that appears to place the best interests of the receiver first; which may also increase perceptions of source credibility and compliance. Additionally, an individual who “violates the expectancies associated with a specific role- will be seen as more sincere than a person who conforms to the expectations for that role” (McPeck & Edwards, 1975).

Advertisers sometimes use expectancy disconfirmation in “non-refutational two-sided” advertisements to surprise consumers and get their attention, in a positive way. Instead of the anticipated message for an insurance agency, which may promote them as being the best, the advertisement instead may urge consumers to look around for the best deal before actually turning to their agency. Since expectancy disconfirmation occurs when individuals receive an unexpected message, it may impress the receiver, and expose them to increased persuasion. Advertisers are well aware of this approach, and are often perceived as credible sources when they publicly admit that their competition produces a product of equal quality (O’Keefe, 2002).

Research by Hunt and Kernan (1984) exposed students to advertisements that either met their expectations or disconfirmed them. Their data indicated that “treatment subjects who viewed ads that disconfirmed bias-related expectancies were more likely to accept the content of that advertising, than were those who received ads confirming such expectations.”

The concept of expectancy disconfirmation correlates with pseudo-altruism in the sense that knowledgeable communicators may decide to act falsely, by promoting an inaccurate position if it is one that will benefit them in the end. When communicators promote such an unexpected position they may also be considered by the audience to be knowledgeable, trustworthy, and above all, a credible source.

Credibility Dimensions: Expertise and Trustworthiness

Persuasion research divides the term credibility into two main divisions, source expertise and trustworthiness (Sternthal, Phillips, & Dholakia, 1978; O’Keefe, 2002; Gass & Seiter, 1999). As a multidimensional construct, credibility is determined by the receivers’ perceptions of the source (Gass & Seiter, 1999). A communicator who is not knowledgeable or truly sincere can still be considered a credible source if they appear so. It is also important to note that while liking is found to increase perceptions of source trustworthiness, it doesn’t actually lead to higher perceptions of expertise (O’Keefe, 2002).

Source expertise is generally defined as “the extent to which a speaker is perceived to be capable of making correct assertions,” and they generally “induce more behavioral compliance than do sources having less credibility” (Sternthal et al., 1978).

Trustworthiness validates the expert claims made by the speaker, and builds audience support for the advocated position. Sources who are perceived as trustworthy are also believed

to consider the audiences' interests above all. In addition, "receivers are more willing to accept what a persuader says if they believe that his or her intentions are honorable" (Woodward & Denton, 2000). Gass & Seiter (1999) discuss several methods for developing and increasing ones' credibility. One suggestion advises the communicator to conceal any possible motivators or self-interests and act as though the other person's interests are being taken to heart.

Once trustworthiness and source expertise are identified, and overall credibility is perceived by the audience, the aforementioned variables of compliance, reciprocity, pseudo-altruism, and expectancy disconfirmation begin to create an ideal environment for persuasion. Each variable is linked to another, and the relationship in turn creates a persuasion infrastructure.

While the individual variables have received attention, the combined relationship has not. The researcher feels that there is a lack of adequate information regarding the relationships between the compliance research, reciprocity, pseudo-altruism, and expectancy disconfirmation. The association of these variables may also help to provide an avenue for future research that can further expand these concepts.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

While there is a plethora of research that involves compliance-gaining, reciprocity, expectancy disconfirmation, and altruism there is an insufficient amount of data that bridges these concepts. Additionally, the possible mediating variables of credibility (trustworthiness and expertise), liking, and reasons to reciprocate will be analyzed to determine their relationship to pseudo-altruism effects. Consequently, they will be tested within the framework of the following research questions.

Considering 3 different scenarios (involving salespersons, servers and customers) and 2 conditions (pseudo-altruistic treatment group, control group), the following research questions were developed:

- RQ1: Will subjects be more likely to comply in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?
- RQ2: Will feelings of obligation to comply be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?
- RQ3: Will feelings of guilt about the prospect of non-compliance be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?
- RQ4: Will perceptions of source character be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?
- RQ5: Will perceptions of source expertise be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?
- RQ6: Will ratings of source honesty be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?
- RQ7: Will feelings of liking for the source be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment

conditions than in the neutral control conditions?

METHODOLOGY

Participants and Design

In the actual study, 141 undergraduate SPC 1600 students participated in the investigation, (n=141). Subjects were randomly assigned to one of six conditions in a 3 (written scenarios) X 2 (pseudo-altruism versus control conditions) design. The treatments were administered simultaneously in a total of six sessions. In three sessions, the instructor addressed the class, read the instructions and the researcher entered once everyone was finished to debrief them. In the other three sessions, the instructor left the classroom and a confederate read the instructions to the class, while the researcher remained silent until they were finished.

Independent Variable

The main predictor variable in this study was pseudo-altruism, and is associated with expectancy disconfirmation in the treatment condition. Pseudo-altruism was manipulated in the written scenarios as a sincere, helpful statement from the salesperson that appeared to regard the customer's best interests, (i.e. "If I were you, I would want to find the best deal. Besides, it wouldn't take you very long to go over there and check it out"). In each scenario, the statement was one to two sentences in length, and was similar in nature.

The control condition replaced the pseudo-altruistic message with a neutral response from the salesperson or server. For instance, the salespersons and server in the control condition simply respond with "I don't know what the competitors' price is," or "the rib-eye is a popular choice, but everything on the menu is good." This type of message is not necessarily helpful, and

does not urge the customer to shop around. A neutral message was used instead of polar, opposite responses (ex: “you’d be crazy to go anywhere else”).

Manipulation checks for the independent variable were measured using five-point Likert type scales, and included ratings of source concern, source helpfulness, and the sources’ unexpected behavior.

Development of the Scenarios: Focus Group and Pilot Test

Three scenarios were written to increase generalizability and commonality within the study. These situations include a computer store, a restaurant, and a car dealership. There are also two conditions per scenario, (treatment and control group), therefore six scenarios constituted the post-test only investigation. Although the restaurant and car dealership scenarios were discussed in previous literature, they all required pilot testing to ensure their clarity and consistency.

Therefore, a focus group and a pilot test were conducted to gather commentary, suggestions, and any concerns for flaws that may have not been initially apparent. The feedback from these exercises was used to make slight modifications to the scenarios to enhance their validity and believability.

Participants in the focus group (n=45) were highly participative and offered valuable feedback for the study. Students enrolled in an undergraduate persuasion course participated in an informal discussion to determine the face validity of the scenarios by reviewing copies of each scenario and offering comments. The students were asked to review each scenario and provide any relevant comments or concerns. The discussion lasted approximately 50 minutes, and a set of questions (Appendix A) served as an informal agenda.

Their observations and concerns included issues of convenience, subject's possible biases, and past experiences that could possibly influence their ratings of the source. Once their responses were recorded and the focus group concluded, their suggestions were reviewed for consideration.

Several changes were made in each scenario to maintain consistency, however, one of the primary changes involved the computer store scenario, which was altered to place the two stores in the same mall. This made it easier for the participants to choose to return to Store A, where the source had displayed pseudo-altruistic behavior.

In addition, SPC 1600 students (n=26) were administered the scenarios and questionnaires in a pilot study. Subjects were treated as though they were participating in the actual study (Appendix B), and randomly assigned to one of the six written scenarios with its subsequent questionnaire.

The findings revealed that individuals perceived the source as helpful in both the treatment and control groups for Scenario I. Since the source in the control condition received similar ratings as the source in the pseudo-altruistic condition, adjustments were made to further neutralize the salesperson's response in control condition scenario by removing any words that possibly described the salesperson as being helpful.

Additionally, alterations were made to the treatment condition to make the salesperson appear more helpful and friendly. Specifically, "offers their assistance" was omitted from both conditions, and for the treatment group, the pseudo-altruistic message was changed from: "The salesperson encourages you to go look at Store B, and says, 'If it were me, I know I'd be looking for the best price.'" To, "Well, since Store B is here in the same mall, it would be a good idea

for you to go check them out to see what they have to offer. Besides, if it were me I know I'd be looking for the best price.”

Dependent and Mediating Variables

After reading the randomly assigned scenario, subjects in the actual study completed the dependent measures and manipulation check questionnaire (see Appendix B). First, respondents answered seven questions. The first item measured compliance, items 2,3, and 4 were manipulation checks for pseudo-altruism, and items 5 and 6 assessed possible motivators. An open-ended item was also included, so that participants could provide reasons or explanations for their decisions.

Participants also responded to eleven items measuring perceptions of source credibility, five character and five expertise items from McCroskey's (1966) scales were included, along with a measure of source likeability (Rubin, Rubin, & Piele, 2000). This process enabled the investigator to appropriately examine relationships between the perceptions of source credibility, liking and compliance.

All research questions were tested using 2 (Treatment) X 3 (Scenarios) ANOVAs. The effects of potential mediating variables on compliance were explored with correlation coefficients and regression analyses in the results section.

Procedure

Participants in the actual study received instructions to carefully read and answer the attached questionnaire (Appendix B) to the best of their ability. Their participation was completely voluntary, and they did not receive anything for their responses. The packet of

materials began with the scenario, the seven questions regarding compliance effects, and a version of McCroskey's character and expertise scales (Appendix C). Participants were also instructed to turn the questionnaire upside down and wait until everyone had finished before passing them forward. Once completed, the participants were thanked and debriefed by the researcher.

RESULTS

Manipulation Checks

A series of 2 (Treatment) X 3 (Scenarios) ANOVAs were conducted to assess the manipulations of ratings of concern, helpfulness, and unexpectedness. Likert-type scales were coded from 1 to 5, one representing “strongly agree,” and five representing “strongly disagree.” Therefore, lower means indicate higher or greater ratings for each item. The findings are summarized below in Table 1.

Table 1: Manipulation Check Means and Main Effect Findings

Manipulation Checks	Treatment Mean	Control Mean	F (1,135)	p =	Eta Squared
<u>Concern</u>					
Computer Store	1.50	2.12	-	-	-
Restaurant	1.61	2.08	-	-	-
Car Dealership	1.68	2.13	-	-	-
<i>Total</i>	1.59	2.11	12.66	.001	.09
<u>Not Expected</u>					
Computer Store	1.87	3.00	-	-	-
Restaurant	2.00	3.00	-	-	-
Car Dealership	2.00	2.92	-	-	-
<i>Total</i>	1.96	2.97	51.73	.00	.28
<u>Helpful</u>					
Computer Store	1.58	1.83	-	-	-
Restaurant	1.57	1.75	-	-	-
Car Dealership	1.68	1.83	-	-	-
<i>Total</i>	1.61	1.81	2.47	.12	.02

With an N of 141, power for a significant treatment main effect ($p=.05$) was .84, assuming a medium effect size (Faul & Erdfelder, 1992).

As shown in Table 1, the treatment main effects for ratings of concern and unexpectedness were statistically significant. Since the treatment by scenario interactions were non-significant, this indicates consistently higher ratings of both concern and unexpectedness in the pseudo-altruistic conditions than in the control groups. The ratings of source helpfulness produced a non-significant treatment main effect ($p=.12$), and a non-significant interaction ($p=.95$). Though the means are directionally similar to those obtained for ratings of concern and unexpected, they show that participants tended to rate the source in both the treatment and control group as helpful.

The manipulation check data could arguably be treated in the context of directional predictions, thereby increasing the significance level for helpfulness to ($t = .27, p < .06$). With two of the measures producing the intended significant differences, and the third measure (helpfulness) yielding a similar trend, the data demonstrate a successful manipulation of this operationalization of pseudo-altruism.

Tests of Research Questions

This successful manipulation of pseudo-altruism justified testing of the seven research questions. A series of 2 (Treatment/ Control) X 3 (Scenario) ANOVAs were conducted to test these research questions. Each research question required examination of the main effect of the treatment. The two-factor ANOVAs also facilitated tests for treatment by scenario interactions. Findings for each research question are summarized in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Means and Main Effects for Pseudo-Altruism

Dependent Measure	Treatment Mean	Control Mean	F (1,135)	p =	Eta Squared
<u>Likelihood</u>					
Computer Store	2.25	2.79	-	-	-
Restaurant	2.04	2.46	-	-	-
Car Dealership	2.86	3.21	-	-	-
<i>Total</i>	2.38	2.82	4.97	.03	.04
<u>Guilt</u>					
Computer Store	3.29	3.79	-	-	-
Restaurant	2.83	2.75	-	-	-
Car Dealership	3.36	3.79	-	-	-
<i>Total</i>	3.16	3.44	2.16	.14	.02
<u>Obligation</u>					
Computer Store	3.79	3.92	-	-	-
Restaurant	3.26	2.67	-	-	-
Car Dealership	3.59	3.79	-	-	-
<i>Total</i>	3.55	3.46	.26	.61	.00
<u>Character</u>					
Computer Store	7.20	10.63	-	-	-
Restaurant	8.70	10.63	-	-	-
Car Dealership	7.05	12.20	-	-	-
<i>Total</i>	7.65	11.15	31.89	.00	.19
<u>Expertise</u>					
Computer Store	13.46	15.79	-	-	-
Restaurant	12.70	15.04	-	-	-
Car Dealership	13.77	16.17	-	-	-
<i>Total</i>	13.30	15.66	8.41	.00	.06
<u>Honest</u>					
Computer Store	2.00	2.50	-	-	-
Restaurant	1.91	2.79	-	-	-
Car Dealership	1.73	5.71	-	-	-
<i>Total</i>	1.88	3.67	5.88	.02	.04
<u>Likeable</u>					
Computer Store	1.79	2.63	-	-	-
Restaurant	2.22	2.38	-	-	-
Car Dealership	1.82	3.04	-	-	-
<i>Total</i>	1.94	2.68	16.46	.00	.11

RQ1: Will subjects be more likely to comply in the pseudo-altruistic treatment group than in the neutral control conditions?

The item concerned with likelihood was the primary measure for compliance in the questionnaire. Compliance in this investigation involved tipping the server more than usual, or returning to Store A or Dealership A to purchase the product from the salesperson.

A 2 X 3 ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for subjects' increased likelihood of compliance in the pseudo-altruistic conditions ($p=.03$). Inspection of the means in Table 2 shows that all three scenarios contribute to this effect. The treatment by scenario interaction was non-significant ($F=.05$).

RQ2: Will feelings of obligation to comply be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?

The 2 x 3 ANOVA produced a non-significant main effect for obligation ($F=.26$). While the treatment by scenario interaction was also non-significant, a main effect for scenario did emerge. Newman-Keuls contrasts showed that subjects reported more obligation to the server ($M=3.26$), than the computer salesperson ($M=3.85$), or the car salesperson ($M=3.70$, $p<.05$), regardless of whether they participated in the treatment or the control condition.

RQ3: Will feelings of guilt about the prospect of non-compliance be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?

The results for guilt paralleled those for obligation. Again, the main effect of treatment ($F=2.16$) and the treatment by scenario interaction ($F=.88$) were non-significant. As with obligation, reported feelings of guilt were not affected by the pseudo-altruistic behavior.

A main effect for scenario was again obtained. The Newman-Keuls post-hoc test revealed that participants experienced higher levels of guilt in the restaurant scenario ($M=2.79$), than in the computer store ($M=3.54$) or the car dealership ($M= 3.59$) scenarios, regardless of the condition.

Research questions four through seven dealt with participant's ratings of source expertise and trustworthiness. The scales employed in the analysis were comprised of four character items and five items concerning source expertise. Additional items measured honesty and likeability.

RQ4: Will perceptions of source character be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?

The four items included in this analysis were “sincere,” “friendly,” “pleasant,” and “unselfish.” Cronbach's alpha was .87 for these four items. A fifth item, “honest,” was analyzed separately since its inclusion reduced the reliability coefficient to .62.

Seven-point semantic differential scales were used for these items. Thus, means could range from four to twenty eight, with lower scores indicating more favorable ratings. A significant main effect showed that the pseudo-altruistic behavior produced higher ratings of source character ($M=7.65$) than the control condition ($M=11.15$, $F=31.89$, $p=.00$). The interactions and scenario main effects were non-significant.

RQ5: Will perceptions of source expertise be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?

Items in the category of source expertise included “informed,” “qualified,” “intelligent,” “valuable,” and “expert.” These items combined produced a Cronbach alpha level of .85.

Pseudo-altruism produced significantly higher ratings of source expertise ($M=13.30$), in comparison to the control conditions ($M=15.66$, $F=8.41$, $p=.004$). Neither the interaction nor the scenario main effect were statistically significant.

RQ6: Will ratings of source honesty be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?

The item dealing with honesty was treated separately, due to its low inter-correlation with the remaining McCroskey character items. The 2 x 3 ANOVA showed that participants rated the pseudo-altruistic sources as more honest ($M=1.88$) than the control group sources ($M=3.67$, $F=5.88$, $p=.02$). Again, the treatment by scenario interactions and the scenario main effects were non-significant.

RQ7: Will ratings of liking for the source be greater in the pseudo-altruistic treatment conditions than in the neutral control conditions?

Source likeability was measured with a 7-point scale, ranging from 1, likeable, to 7, dislikable. The 2 x 3 ANOVA showed that ratings of likeability were higher in the pseudo-altruistic conditions ($M=1.94$) than in the control conditions ($M=2.68$, $F=16.45$, $p=.00$). The treatment by scenario interaction and the scenario main effect were non-significant.

Open-Ended Item

Subjects were also given the opportunity to provide explanations for their responses with an open-ended question. Although there were students who provided comments that did not

pertain to the actual scenario, the majority of individuals who complied in the treatment groups responded similarly, as did the subjects who didn't comply in the neutral control groups.

Explanations from compliant individuals in the pseudo-altruistic condition include, "the honesty of the salesperson and the fact that they are looking out for my best interests rather than the gain of the store would influence me to return," and "salespeople that look in your best interest and don't just treat you as any other customer should be rewarded." Comments from both conditions of the restaurant scenario revealed that subjects would tip well regardless, because of previous experience or empathy for the server.

The neutral control groups produced responses that were more focused on issues of time and convenience. Explanations like, "if it's the same car at the same price, I would just buy it from where I'm at," and "I was already at store B- convenience and time are important," reveal that individuals did not feel any sort of appreciation for the neutral source, who did not go out of their way to be helpful or concerned. Consequently, positive source attributions did not develop and the subjects were less likely to comply.

Regression Analysis

A regression analysis was performed in order to assess the percentage of compliance variance accounted for by three predictor variables. These included the self-reports of "obligation" and "guilt," plus the ratings of the degree to which the source's behavior was unexpected.

These three predictor variables were selected for analysis because they have previously been identified as possible explanations for reciprocity effects (O'Keefe, 2002; Cialdini, 2001;

Gass & Seiter, 1999). The analysis indicated that this three-factor model accounted for only 11% of the variance. Table 3, below, summarizes the results for these three predictor variables.

Table 3: Regression Analysis Summary for Guilt, Unexpected, and Obligation

Predictor Variables	Beta	t	p=
Guilt	.224	1.673	.097
Not Expected	.113	1.393	.166
Obligation	.088	.666	.507

As the data indicate, none of the predictor variables accounted for a significant amount of the compliance variance. For comparison purposes, another regression analysis was performed using all source characteristics as predictors.

The source characteristic items included ratings of concern, helpfulness, unexpected behavior, expertise, character, honesty, and likeability. Taken together, the source factors predicted 26% of the compliance variance. Table 4 below summarizes the regression findings.

Table 4: Regression Analysis Summary for Source Characteristics

Source Factors	Beta	t	p=
Concern	.001	.009	.993
Helpfulness	.366	3.270	.001
Not Expected	.011	.133	.894
Expertise	.001	.011	.992
Character	.284	1.177	.241
Honesty	.128	.676	.500
Likeability	.064	.530	.597

As shown in the table, only one item, concern, was a statistically significant predictor of compliance.

DISCUSSION

The current research was concerned with pseudo-altruistic behavior as a compliance-gaining strategy, and the relationships between pseudo-altruism and reciprocity, expectancy disconfirmation, and source perceptions. Specifically, participants' responses to the sources' pseudo-altruistic behaviors were analyzed and compared to responses in situations where the sources' behaviors were "neutral," not pseudo-altruistic.

The main independent variable, pseudo-altruism, was operationalized by a brief statement from the source that seemed more helpful and unexpected than the comparison response from the neutral, control group source.

Manipulation Check Findings

Manipulation checks were conducted on the variables of helpfulness, concern, and degree of unexpectedness to determine whether or not the independent variable was properly manipulated. Results showed that the pseudo-altruistic source was perceived as significantly more concerned for the receivers' welfare. The pseudo-altruistic sources' behavior was also rated as more "unexpected" than the neutral source.

The data show that statements like, "if it were me, I know I'd be looking for the best price," and "well, it's always a good idea to do some comparison shopping on a big purchase like this. If it were me, I'd go over there and check them out," (see Appendix B), enhanced perceptions of source character. It is hoped that the successful manipulation of "concerned" and "unexpected" will provide foundational guidelines for operationally defining pseudo-altruism in future research.

The third manipulation check characteristic was receiver's ratings of source helpfulness. Despite modifications to the scenarios following the pilot test, the perceived helpfulness of the pseudo-altruistic source only marginally exceeded ratings for the neutral source. Particularly, subjects who received both conditions of the restaurant scenario tended to rate the sources as more helpful.

One possible explanation for this trend may lie in the source characteristics. Many of the participants who recorded their decisions in the open-ended item revealed that they had previous or related experience in the restaurant industry. This experience may have influenced participant's decisions and their beliefs on tipping, and what behaviors are considered helpful. Additionally, in both scenarios, the food and service are described as good. This may have caused more of the decision to be based on the service, instead of the behaviors and responses from the server. Future studies should seek ways to better differentiate levels of helpfulness between the conditions. Description of the quality of the service may be discussed less, while source interactions may need to be emphasized more.

Findings from the Research Questions

Analysis of the data revealed five significant main effects. In each, the pseudo-altruistic treatment condition was found to produce higher levels of compliance and more favorable perceptions of the source.

The primary finding concerned the subjects' likelihood to return to Store A or Dealership A, or to tip the server in the restaurant scenario more than usual. Data for the item "likelihood" revealed an increase in compliance and a positive response to the pseudo-altruistic behavior. The main effect findings show that this was consistent across all three scenarios.

Pseudo-altruism was also found to produce significantly higher ratings of source expertise, character, honesty, and likeability. Again, these source perception findings were consistent across all three conditions. Findings show when the source employs pseudo-altruistic behavior in their message, the receiver not only rates them as more expert, but they also perceive them as having a higher, more positive character.

Goei et al. (2003), posits that higher levels of compliance can be justified by liking for the source, which is strengthened when someone provides us with a favor. In the current study, favors are displays of seemingly genuine concern and helpfulness. These behaviors, which are truly pseudo-altruistic in nature, did actually generate feelings of liking, which may have mediated other ratings of the source. Previous research shows that liking mediates persuasion effects for two other source characteristics, similarity and attractiveness (O’Keefe, 2002). The correlations between likeability and expertise ($r = .52$), character (.62), and honesty (.29), were all statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Guilt in this case, is not directly linked to obligation, wherein the individual was initially thought to feel obligation to the source, and consequently compliance would be guilt induced. O’Keefe (2002) discussed the persuasion-based DITF (door-in-the-face) effects which motivate compliance from the targeted individual by employing guilt or expectations of guilt. The current findings show that guilt did not vary as a function of pseudo-altruistic behaviors.

A viable explanation for this finding may be that subjects were more likely to comply based on feelings of liking and perceptions of the source, instead of feelings of obligation or guilt, because the pseudo-altruistic behaviors were volunteered, not requested.

In other words, the target-subjects in each scenario did not enter the situation asking the salesperson “Can you give me a good deal,” or the server “what would you suggest?” Had

subjects directly requested help from the server or salesperson, they may have been more likely to experience guilt or obligation in the pseudo-altruistic conditions. Since the pseudo-altruistic behaviors were volunteered in these situations, the subjects may have not felt badly about returning a favor since they did not ask for it, and reciprocity became based solely on liking. Future research could study the effects of initial requests and pseudo-altruism, and whether or not obligation and guilt increase under these conditions.

Although Goei et al. (2003) define the norm of reciprocity in terms of an obligation to comply or return the favor, the findings of the current study show that a source perception explanation is at least as viable as guilt or obligation-based explorations.

Lippa (1990) discussed the term reciprocal altruism, wherein the “cost of giving up some resources for the benefit of another is more than offset by the later reciprocated favor.” This concept fits the current pattern, that the source’s pseudo-altruistic behavior is rewarded on a much higher level, with an actual monetary amount.

The item concerned with unexpectedness was initially thought to produce higher ratings of source character and credibility (McPeck & Edwards, 1974). When a source behaves or responds in an unexpected manner, seemingly going against their own self-interests, the audience perceives them to be more sincere and honest. In each scenario, the source was described as being either on commission or working for tips, therefore, their possible motivator of self-interest was presented.

Overall, the findings of the study indicate that pseudo-altruism can be a strong compliance-gaining strategy. The helpful statements in the pseudo-altruistic conditions elicited higher ratings of the source, and a greater likelihood to comply from the participants. The

pseudo-altruistic sources were also perceived as more concerned, expert, likable, trustworthy and honest than the neutral sources.

A possible explanation for the findings may be derived from the perceptions of the source, which are generated from the unexpected pseudo-altruistic behavior. Subjects may have initially been surprised at the apparent sincerity, and consequently experienced feelings of appreciation and gratitude. Once the subjects began to like the source and perceive them as more expert, the norm of reciprocity influenced their decision to return to the Store A or tip the server more, to reward their helpful behavior.

Future research will be required to clarify pseudo-altruism's boundaries and discover any possible detrimental effects if the receiver perceives the behavior as a ploy. While participants in the current investigation may not have focused on the source's self-interests, it would be worthwhile to explore individuals' reactions to pseudo-altruistic behavior if they were aware of the strategy. Target-individuals who recognize this behavior may decide to avoid the source altogether or to take their business elsewhere.

A replication of the current study could vary the degree of "difficulty" or convenience level of returning to Store A. It may be interesting to study the effects of pseudo-altruism on subjects who may have to travel a long distance to get back to the original salesperson. This type of investigation may reveal how far subjects are willing to go to reciprocate the helpful behavior.

An entirely new direction that could expand on the current research is the customers' use of compliance-gaining strategies. Investigation could determine whether there are tactics or behaviors that individuals employ when they encounter salespersons to persuade or gain their compliance. Customers may employ pseudo-altruistic behaviors to make the salesperson feel guilty about not giving them the best deal. Further studies in this area may provide interesting

data about the effects of pseudo-altruism and extend compliance-gaining strategies to the consumers' perspective.

Internal Validity

Several steps were taken to maintain the study's internal validity. Foremost, all six conditions were administered simultaneously at the beginning of each session, thereby controlling for the possible threats of history and maturation.

Questionnaires were randomly assigned to the participants to avoid selection bias. Additionally, the experimenter did not interact with the class until they had finished. These processes also helped to prevent experimenter bias that could have potentially threatened the study's validity.

External Validity

Generalizability was enhanced by the use of three different scenarios. The computer store, restaurant, and car dealership scenarios were chosen, since it was believed that these situations would be identifiable and would allow the subjects to relate to the situation. The main effect findings show that the compliance effects were not unique to a specific situation, but were robust in nature.

Previous research on compliance strategies has shown the effects of reciprocity on compliance were greater in non-profit based situations than in profit-based situations (O'Keefe, 2002). The scenarios in the current study were all profit-based venues. If previous research findings are predictive of the pseudo-altruistic effect obtained in the three scenarios, the results

may be even stronger in scenarios involving non-for-profit sources. Replications based on such scenarios would also provide a better understanding of the generalizability of the current data.

Other populations of participants should also be considered in future research. The current investigation tested college students in their late teens to early twenties. A factor to take into consideration when dealing with this type of sample is that many students who are in college are working as servers in restaurants, or as sales representatives. It may be interesting to explore other demographics, such as age and gender to further examine internal validity.

Another possible approach includes field experimentation or observations, and conducting interviews to further define and explore why and how sources use this technique. In-depth interviews could prove to be beneficial by providing researchers and persuasion practitioners with insight as to how applicable and successful these pseudo-altruistic behaviors can be. Although this type of investigation could enhance the boundaries of external validity, it may prove to be costly and time consuming.

Lastly, future explorations could investigate the use of a third, or negative response, in addition to the neutral and treatment conditions. Only two conditions, the treatment and neutral control groups, were employed for this study because it was felt that a baseline needed to be developed in order to explore any possible relations that may be present.

Summary and Conclusions

These findings are not only statistically significant, but they are also critical for the development of future compliance-gaining research. It is felt by the researcher that pseudo-altruism has not been explored as fully as it should, and merits further systematic investigation.

The current data produced a foundation for pseudo-altruism as it relates to compliance-gaining strategies, and contributed to the previous research by exploring the relational combinations of the variables. The findings are applicable to everyday situations and encounters, wherein persuasion practitioners and sales representatives attempt to gain compliance from a target-individual. Likewise, individuals who are more susceptible to this form of compliance-gaining may want to evaluate situations differently, and be cautious of seemingly sincere individuals.

Returning to Lippa's (1990) discussion, pure altruism in its true form is rare. Beliefs and cultural backgrounds can affect individuals in different situations, and may influence their compliance-gaining behaviors. However, the norms of our society and culture today, are driven by time, money and efficiency. People tend to want things the way they want them, immediately.

This investigation confronted participants with two situations, one where they are helped by a friendly, seemingly honest and caring person, and the second, by an individual who does not demonstrate concern about whether they make the right decision or purchase. Although the subjects were unaware of the source's underlying motives, the data suggest that individuals appreciate helpfulness, honesty and sincerity, whether it's purely altruistic or not.

APPENDIX A
FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

The following questions were included in the focus group discussion.

1. Were you able to relate to this experience?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Somewhat

2. Is the scenario believable?

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neutral ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

3. Is there anything confusing in the scenario (i.e. the way it is worded or presented)?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Explain:

4. Suggestions/Comments:

APPENDIX B
SCENARIOS: TREATMENT AND CONTROL CONDITIONS

SCENARIO I: Computer Store (treatment condition).

Imagine you are computer shopping, and you are definitely going to purchase a computer that day. The two computer stores in your area are located in the same mall. The sales staff at each store works on a commission basis.

Your search begins at Store A, and once you enter you begin to look around. A salesperson approaches you and asks you what it is you're interested in, and offers their assistance.

After you explain what you need, the salesperson shows you the appropriate computer system and gives you their price. Your next question for the salesperson is whether or not Store B sells that same system, and whether their price is less.

The sales person explains that Store B does sell the same system, but is not sure of their price. The salesperson encourages you to go and look at Store B, and says, "If it were me, I know I'd be looking for the best price." You thank the salesperson for their assistance and proceed to Store B, where you find the same computer system at exactly the same price.

1. Assuming you are definitely buying a computer that day, what is the likelihood you would return to Store A to purchase a computer?
___Very Likely ___Likely ___Uncertain ___Unlikely ___Very Unlikely

Please indicate the extent to which each of the following would influence your decision.

2. Salesperson A was helpful.
___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Neutral ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
3. Salesperson A showed concern for my best interests.
___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Neutral ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
4. The response from Salesperson A was not expected.
___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Neutral ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
5. I would feel guilty if I didn't buy the computer from the salesperson at Store A.
___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Neutral ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
6. I would feel obligated to purchase the computer from the salesperson at Store A. ___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Neutral ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
7. Briefly explain any other reasons for your decision:

SCENARIO I: Computer Store (control condition).

Imagine you are computer shopping, and you are definitely going to purchase a computer that day. The two computer stores in your area are located in the same mall. The sales staff at each store works on a commission basis.

Your search begins at Store A, and once you enter you begin to look around. A salesperson approaches you and asks you what it is you're interested in, and offers their assistance.

After you explain what you need, the salesperson shows you the appropriate computer system and gives you their price. Your next question for the salesperson is whether or not Store B sells that same system, and whether their price is less.

The sales person says that Store B does sell the same system, but is not sure of their price. You thank the salesperson for their assistance and proceed to Store B, where you find the same computer system at exactly the same price.

1. Assuming you are definitely buying a computer that day, what is the likelihood you would return to Store A to purchase a computer?
___ Very Likely ___ Likely ___ Uncertain ___ Unlikely ___ Very Unlikely

Please indicate the extent to which each of the following would influence your decision.

2. Salesperson A was helpful.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
3. Salesperson A showed concern for my best interests.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
4. The response from Salesperson A was not expected.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
5. I would feel guilty if I didn't buy the computer from the salesperson at Store A.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
6. I would feel obligated to purchase the computer from the salesperson at Store A. ___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
7. Briefly explain any other reasons for your decision:

SCENARIO II: Restaurant (treatment condition).

Imagine yourself going to a restaurant with a few friends. When the server comes to take your order, you explain that you are considering either the rib-eye steak or the chicken dinner (which is \$4 less), but you're leaning more toward the steak.

The server glances around, and in a quieter voice, says to you: "Our steak shipment wasn't very good this week, and the rib-eye is a little tough. Tonight I'd recommend the marinated chicken, which by the way, is our most popular dish." You decide to take the server's suggestion.

The dinners arrive and you enjoy your meal. The server returns periodically to refill drinks and make sure everyone is doing fine. Once the bill comes, you all pay separately.

1. What is the likelihood you would tip the Server more than you normally tip?
___ Very Likely ___ Likely ___ Uncertain ___ Unlikely ___ Very Unlikely

Please indicate the extent to which each of the following would influence your decision.

2. The Server was helpful.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
3. The Server showed concern for my best interests.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
4. The Server's response was not expected.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
5. I would feel guilty if I didn't tip the server well.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
6. I would feel obligated to tip the Server well.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
7. Briefly explain any other reasons for your decision:

SCENARIO II: Restaurant (control condition).

Imagine yourself going to a restaurant with a few friends. When the server comes to take your order, you explain that you are considering either the rib-eye steak or the chicken dinner (which is \$4 less), but you're leaning more toward the steak.

The server tells you that, "we sell a lot of rib-eye, but everything on the menu is good." You decide to order the rib-eye dinner.

The dinners arrive and you enjoy your meal. The server returns periodically to refill drinks and make sure everyone is doing fine. Once the bill comes, you all pay separately.

1. What is the likelihood you would tip the Server more than you normally tip?
___ Very Likely ___ Likely ___ Uncertain ___ Unlikely ___ Very Unlikely

Please indicate the extent to which each of the following would influence your decision.

2. The Server was helpful.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
3. The Server showed concern for my best interests.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
4. The Server's response was not expected.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
5. I would feel guilty if I didn't tip the server well.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
6. I would feel obligated to tip the Server well.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
7. Briefly explain any other reasons for your decision:

SCENARIO III: Car Dealership (treatment condition)

Imagine that today you have to buy a new car. There are two car dealerships less than a mile apart that sell the model you are interested in. You begin your search at Dealership A.

As you browse some of the cars out on the lot, you are approached by a salesperson. First, the sales representative welcomes and thanks you for visiting the dealership. Then they ask if there is a particular vehicle you are looking for, and if there are any options you would like, aside from the standard features.

You explain what you're looking for, and the salesperson says, "We do have that model here, with the exact specifications you're looking for." You then accompany the salesperson to their office where you negotiate a good price.

Next, you ask the salesperson whether the price is comparable to what you could get at Dealership B. The salesperson responds, "Well, it's always a good idea to do some comparison shopping on a big purchase like this. If it were me, I'd go over there and check them out."

You decide to check out Dealership B, where you find the exact model and negotiate the same price as Dealership A.

1. Assuming that you are going to buy a car that day, what is the likelihood you would return to Dealership A to purchase the car?
___ Very Likely ___ Likely ___ Uncertain ___ Unlikely ___ Very Unlikely

Please indicate the extent to which each of the following would influence your decision.

2. The Salesperson from Dealership A was helpful.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
3. The Salesperson showed concern for my best interests.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
4. The Salesperson's response was not expected.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
5. I would feel guilty if I didn't purchase the car from the Salesperson at Dealership A.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
6. I would feel obligated to buy the car from the Salesperson at Dealership A.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree

7. Briefly explain any other reasons for your decision:

SCENARIO III: Car Dealership (control condition).

Imagine that today you have to buy a new car. There are two car dealerships less than a mile apart that sell the model you are interested in. You begin your search at Dealership A.

As you browse some of the cars out on the lot, you are approached by a salesperson. First the salesperson welcomes and thanks you for visiting the dealership. They ask if there is a particular vehicle you are looking for, and if there are any options you would like, aside from the standard features.

You explain what you're looking for, and the salesperson says, "We do have that model here, with the exact specifications you're looking for." You then accompany the salesperson to their office where you negotiate a good price.

Next, you ask the salesperson whether the price is comparable to what you could get at Dealership B. The salesperson responds, "I don't know, but our dealership has great prices."

You decide to check out Dealership B, where you find the exact model and negotiate the same price as Dealership A.

1. Assuming that you are going to buy a car that day, what is the likelihood you would return to Dealership A to purchase the car?
___ Very Likely ___ Likely ___ Uncertain ___ Unlikely ___ Very Unlikely

Please indicate the extent to which each of the following would influence your decision.

2. The Salesperson from Dealership A was helpful.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
3. The Salesperson showed concern for my best interests.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
4. The Salesperson's response was not expected.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
5. I would feel guilty if I didn't purchase the car from the Salesperson at Dealership A.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
6. I would feel obligated to buy the car from the Salesperson at Dealership A.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree
7. Briefly explain any other reasons for your decision:

APPENDIX C
SOURCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate your perceptions or feelings about the salesperson in the scenario by placing a single check along each scale. If you feel strongly one way or another, place your check next to that description. If you feel undecided or neutral, place a check somewhere in between the two words.

Your perception of the source:

1. Sincere _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Insincere
2. Informed _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Uninformed
3. Qualified _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unqualified
4. Intelligent _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unintelligent
5. Valuable _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Worthless
6. Expert _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Inexpert
7. Honest _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Dishonest
8. Friendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unfriendly
9. Unselfish _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Selfish
10. Helpful _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unhelpful
11. Likable _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Dislikable

APPENDIX D
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROCTORING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS:

Instructors, please read the verbal consent announcement to your class. If someone does not want to participate in the study, they may either exit or wait quietly for everyone to finish. Next, please pass out the scenarios and questionnaires that are already in order. Do not rearrange the materials; they are organized so that everyone will be randomly assigned a scenario. Ask the class to turn their papers upside down and wait till everyone has received their materials before proceeding.

Please read the following passage to the class:

This exercise should only take 10-15 minutes. Please read the scenario and questions carefully. Your responses are very important, and your honest feelings and feedback are critical.

Additionally, if you have a question or are unable to respond to an item, please leave it blank or make a comment in the margins of the questionnaire. Do not ask questions during the exercise- the researcher will be present once everyone has finished and will answer any questions or concerns the class may have.

Please take your time, this is very important- when you complete the questions, turn your papers over and wait until everyone has finished.

APPENDIX E
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL



THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

IRB Committee Approval Form

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S): Reagan Rule

PROJECT TITLE: Thesis entitled: The Effects of Pseudo-Altruistic Behavior on the Likelihood of Reciprocity and Perceptions of the Source.

Committee Members:

☐ Contingent Approval
Dated: _____

☐ Final Approval
Dated: _____

Dr. Theodore Angelopoulos: _____
Ms. Sandra Browdy: _____
Dr. Jacqui Byers: _____
Dr. Ratna Chakrabarti: _____
Dr. Karen Dennis: _____
Dr. Barbara Fritzsche: _____
Dr. Robert Kennedy: _____
Dr. Gene Lee: _____
Ms. Gail McKinney: _____
Dr. Debra Reinhart: _____
Dr. Valerie Sims: _____

☒ Expedited
Dated: 2/25/2004

☐ Exempt
Dated: _____

Chair, IRB
Signed: [Signature]
Dr. Sophia Dziegielewski

NOTES FROM IRB CHAIR (IF APPLICABLE): _____

REFERENCES

- Baglan, T., Lalumia, J., & Bayless, L.O. (1986). Utilization of Compliance-Gaining Strategies: A Research Note. *Communication Monographs*, 53, 289-293.
- Batson, C.D., Ahmad, N., Yin, J., Bedell, J.S., Johnson, W.J., Templin, M.C., & Whiteside, A. (1999). Two Threats to the Common Good: Self-Interested Egoism and Empathy-Induced Altruism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(1), 3-16.
- Benoit, L.W. (1987). Argumentation and Credibility Appeals in Persuasion. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 52, 181-197.
- Burgoon, M., Dillard, P.J., & Doran, N.E. (1983). Friendly or Unfriendly Persuasion: The Effects of Violations of Expectations by Males and Females. *Human Communication Research*, 10(2), 283-294.
- Cialdini, B.R. (2001). Influence: Science and Practice (4th Ed). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Eagly, A.H., & Himmelfarb, S. (1978). Attitudes and Opinions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 29, 517-554.
- Faul, F. & Erdfedler, E. (1992). GPOWER: A priori, post-hoc, and compromise power analyses for MS-DOS (Computer Program). Bonn, FRG: Bonn University, department of Psychology.
- Garro, M.G., & Cissna, N.K. (1988). An Axiological Reinterpretation of I.A. Richards's Theory of Communication and its Application to the Study of Compliance-Gaining. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 53(2), 121-139.
- Gass, R.H., & Seiter, J.S. (1999). *Persuasion, Social Influence, and Compliance Gaining*.

- Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Goei, R., Lindsey, L.M., Skalski, P.D., & Bowman, J.M. (2003). The Mediating Roles of Liking and Obligation on the Relationship Between Favors and Compliance. *Communication Research*, 30 (2), 178-197.
- Hertzog, L.R., & Bradac, J.J. (1984). Perceptions of Compliance-Gaining Situations: An Extended Analysis. *Communication Research*, 11(3), 363-391.
- Holmes, G.T., Miller, T.D., & Lerner, J.M. (2002). Committing Altruism Under the Cloak of Self-Interest: The Exchange Fiction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 144-151.
- Hunt & Kernan. (1984). The Role of Disconfirmed Expectancies in the Processing of Advertising Messages. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 124(2), 229-236.
- Lippa, A. R. (1990). *Introduction to Social Psychology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1966). Special Reports: Scales for the Measurement of Ethos. *Speech Monographs*, 33, 65-72.
- McPeck, W. R., & Edwards, D. J. (1975). Expectancy Disconfirmation and Attitude Change. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 96(2), 193-208.
- O'Keefe, J.D. (2002). *Persuasion: Theory and Research* (2nd Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Petty, E.R., & Cacioppo, T.J. (1986). *Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral Routes to Attitude Change*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Petty, E.R., & Priester, R.J. (1995). Source Attributions and Persuasion: Perceived Honesty as a Determinant of Message Scrutiny. *Personality and Social*

- Psychology Bulletin*, 21(6), 637-654.
- Pillavin, J.A., & Charng, H. (1990). Altruism: A Review of Recent Theory and Research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 27-39.
- Rubin, R.B., Rubin, A.M., & Piele, L.J. (2000). Communication Research: Strategies and Sources (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Staub, E. (1978). *Positive Social Behavior and Morality; Social and Personal Influences*. New York: Academic Press.
- Smith, M.J. (1984). Contingency Rules Theory, Context, and Compliance Behaviors. *Human Communication Research*, 10(4), 489-512.
- Sternthal, B., Phillips, W.L., & Dholakia, R. (1978). The Persuasive Effect of Source Credibility: A Situational Analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 285-314.
- Uehara, E.S. (1995). Reciprocity Reconsidered: Gouldner's 'Moral Norm of Reciprocity' and Social Support. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 12(4), 483-502.
- Whatley, M.A., Webster, M.J., Smith, R.H., & Rhodes, A. (1999). The Effect of a Favor on Public and Private Compliance: How internalized is the Norm of Reciprocity? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 21(3), 251-259.