Political Preferences

4/2013

CONTENTS

5

INTRODUCTION

We give readers the fourth volume of „Political Preferences", an interdisciplinary journal devoted to the study of voting behavior issues, especially political determinants of identification. Magazine publishers are the Institute of Political Science and Journalism at the University of Silesia and the Center for Innovation, Technology Transfer and Development Foundation of the University of Silesia. Patronage of the project holds Polish Political Science Association and the Society for Academic Initiatives. The research community centered around „Political Preferences" was initiated by the Section at the Polish Electoral Studies Political Science Association and is actively involved in international research projects devoted to electoral behavior.

Journal in his intention promote empirical research in the plane of electoral behavior. Multidimensional and interdisciplinary research in political circumstances of individuals and their motivation to participate actively in political life is important for the development of civil society, one of the important dimensions of the electoral participation. Magazine publishers are particularly keen on cooperation with researchers of different disciplines who take an empirical analysis of the problem of political preferences: political science, psychology, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, and others. The degree of involvement of citizens and ultimately the decisions made in the electoral process is subject to many levels, giving you the opportunity to take the identification and analysis of the correlation existing between them.

This issue of „Political Preferences," in contrast to the previous, is a report of empirical research, but devoted to the diversity of issues, the common denominator is the study of reality social, political and economic, affecting voting behavior. This is another step in the development of writing, involving not only the extension of the existing formula, but also its internationalization. The international dimension „Political Preferences" has been achieved not only by initiating the release number in the English language, but also by expanding the group of authors and reviewers who write about the people

Dariusz Doliński   **Robert Wiszniowski**
Warsaw School of Social Sciences   University of Wroclaw
and Humanities, Poland   Poland

TECHNIQUES OF SOCIAL INFLUENCE
WITH REFERENCE TO POLITICAL LIFE[1]

Abstract:

The present paper presents various social influence techniques – practices aimed at increasing the likelihood that people will comply with requests, persuasion and suggestion they are addressed with. It describes sequential techniques (*foot-in-the-door, door-in-the-face, foot-in-the-face, low ball*) as well as techniques based on cognitive mechanisms (*that's not all, even a penny helps, dialogue involvement*) or on emotional mechanisms (*induction of guilt, embarrassment, fear-then-relief*). The paper also presents examples of using the above mentioned techniques with special focus on some which were taken from political life.

Introduction

People can take a range of actions to increase the likelihood of effectively persuading us to act according to their wishes. As indicated by Robert Cialdini (2001), most of the various techniques used by practitioners of social influence can be classified into six main principles: reciprocation, consistency,

social proof, liking, authority and scarcity. The proposal by Cialdini has some undeniable advantages. However, one problem is that it is not always clear which of these six rules a given trick or technique used by a social influence practitioner is based on, and sometimes the psychological explanation of the effectiveness of a particular technique is beyond the limited list of these six principles. Therefore, in this article, the reader will be successively presented the different social influence techniques, and following each one will be offered a discussion of the psychological mechanisms that underlie their effectiveness. This presentation will be accompanied, in turn, by illustration of using the technique by politicians.

Of course, the individual techniques are grouped into certain categories, but the basis of such an arrangement is not the psychological mechanism underlying their effectiveness, but rather the mere formal similarities between the different techniques.

Sequential techniques

Several well-documented interpersonal influence strategies use sequential-request scripts. Depending on the particular technique, the initial request may be easier or harder to fulfil than the target request. Let us start the presentation of this group of techniques from the earliest one described in the psychological literature.

Foot-in-the-door

The foot-in-the door technique [Freedman, Fraser 1966], involves a persuasion technique in which an initial (rather easy) request is followed by a subsequent larger request. Compliance with the first request increases the chances of compliance with the second (the target) request.

In an attempt to see whether the foot-in-the-door technique or a more straightforward request would be more successful in obtaining compliance, Freedman and Fraser [1966] conducted a study among residents of California. They were interested in seeing how many residents would comply with a request to place a large "Drive Carefully" billboard in their front yard. In the control condition, an experimenter who identified himself as representing a citizens' organization for safe driving approached the participants at their homes and asked them whether they would allow the large billboard to be installed in their front yards. In one of experimental group an experimenter asked the participants to place a small sign that read "Be a Safe Driver" in a window of their homes or cars. In another, the experimenter asked participants to sign a petition

promoting safe driving. Two weeks after the participants were approached by the first experimenter, a second experimenter came to their homes and asked them to place large "Drive Carefully" billboard in their yards. The results showed that the foot-in-the-door technique was successful in influencing others. Participants were more likely to agree to a large request if they had already agreed to comply with a smaller request than if they had not.

So, Freedman and Fraser demonstrated that the trick "first a small request and then the big, critical one" is an effective technique of social influence. Pondering the psychological mechanism of the rule they observed in their study, the researchers adopted the assumption that people who agree to meet the first request without any apparent pressure (threats, blackmail, proposals of financial rewards, etc.) begin to perceive themselves as "the kind of people who do this sort of thing" [Freedman, Fraser 1966: 201]. As the subsequent main request is consistent with their newly formed self-image, they comply with it. Thus the authors suggested the presence of a mechanism that was fully described in the following years by Daryl Bem [1967, 1972] and is known today as the self-perception theory.

A couple of decades have passed since the publication of Freedman and Fraser's experiments. During this time there have been many studies showing that the technique is effective in marketing and charity [see: Burger 1999 for review]. Kraut and McConahay [1973] have shown its effectiveness in the domain of politics. They randomly assigned lists of American registered voters to experimental and control conditions. Participants in the experimental conditions were contacted as part of an opinion survey two weeks prior to a 1970 Democratic primary election in May. In the control group different contacts or none at all occurred. It has been found that the experimental group voted at significantly higher rates not only in May, but also in the following August. Gerber, Green and Shachar [2003] have obtained a similar pattern of results in their field experiment, Vierasu, Hertanu, Talpau and Balasescu [2011] in turn, suggest that the foot-in-the-door technique is used very often by politicians when they want to manipulate people.

It is obvious, foot-in-the-door technique salesman often use. If you can persuade the customer to buy a small gift, there is a chance that if it comes to the house might be able to persuade his/her client to buy something then you can earn. Similarly, it can be assumed that this type of technique used by canvassers during the election campaigning (especially the local ones) as classical traditional technique of encouraging voters at their sites.

In principle, one can point to a common share of this technique in the political rivalry, both during the election as well as in general sense – during political activity of leaders, party activists in long-time period. This is a problem

of generating pro-political behaviour of commitment and implementation of planned strategic outcomes. We are thinking of producing electoral support among the citizens, and because not only for one unique election and attitudes of classified group of citizens' addictive to party alignments. For example, during election campaigns each political candidate (including the members of his/her election party team) use techniques foot-in-the-door, the same as trying to get to the psychological nature of people by sending messages of an escalating political requests directly addressed to customer's (voter) to strive to achieve multiple support (in long-term) on the basis of the "hidden" intent to obtain the best possible result in the election. Of course, this technique of multi-stage and manipulative sense is not the only exclusive solution for building political support, as it is based on the often deceptive and uncertain solutions to the end. Generally speaking, the postulate of „penetration" into the psyche of the "payee" to the next level and meets increasingly diverse binding and involving requests. The question about the limits of their feasibility, as each human behaviour should be viewed through the prism of unquestioned profit and loss calculations and so. You can, therefore, treat this technique in politics as a support, but not prior. There are examples of when during the election campaign, the party leader asks citizens to promote the idea of democratic freedoms, the same would then ask for a vote on each other during the election. But there are doubts about the uniqueness of this technique in political life, especially if you change the formula of direct contacts with party leaders to contact voters *via* the mass media. The restoration of the primary role of this technique, which is expected to become more important in a situation of political activity, will be re-developed at the level of Web 2.0 communication.

Door-in-the-face

A reversal of the foot-in-the-door technique has also been suggested. Cialdini, Vincent, Lewis, Catalan, Wheeler, Darby [1975] suggested that one way to get an individual to agree to perform a moderately large task is by first asking her or him to perform a difficult task. Ones he or she refuses to carry out the large task then ask him or her to comply with the smaller request. In one of their studies, the experimenter presented himself as an employee of an institution for juvenile offenders and asked the participants to join the institution as volunteers. The control group was asked to go for a two-hour trip to the zoo with a group of young people who had come into conflict with the law. This request was complied with by fewer than 17% of the respondents. In the experimental group, a very difficult initial request was formulated: to take up the role of a tutor of juvenile offenders. This would require two hours of activity per

week over the following two years. The vast majority of respondents refused to comply with this request. When, however, they were then asked to perform a one-time activity – to take some juvenile delinquents to the zoo - as many as 50% of them expressed their consent.

The authors suggest that the possible mechanisms that could be responsible for the effectiveness of the technique of the door in the face technique: is the principle of reciprocation of concessions. This principle is a particular variant of a broader and more general norm of reciprocity, according to which one should reciprocate the good things received from others [Uehara 1995]. In the case of door-in-the-face, the principle of mutual concessions is present in the fact that when someone poses a request difficult to fulfil, then reduces the scope of the request upon hearing an initial refusal to comply - thus reducing own expectations towards the subject - they in fact make a concession of a specific kind. A series of empirical studies have confirmed that such a mechanism underlies the effectiveness of the door-in-the face technique [see O'Keefe, Hale 2001; Cialdini, Goldstein 2004].

The mutual concessions are forcing us to a sense of responsibility. They produce sets of chances to keep the promise. In addition, it's associated with achieving a pleasant satisfaction which is greater even when such technique is implementing.

This technique is particularly useful in its time when discussions about changes in laws or relates to unreasonable political demands, such as the opposition party. It is quite often to meet the leader of the opposition claims that the reforms carried out do not meet the highest standards; they are not ambitious, and thus less effective or inefficient from a social point of view. Adequate example is the call to strike with maximum demands even while assuming minimal success. Trade unions often assume that strike activity is not intended to meet all the demands, but rather to achieve a satisfactory solution, or open public debate. Today's strikes in Greece, Portugal, Spain (as a consequence of the economic crisis) proves this thesis.

The door-in-the-face technique is also commonly used in the international negotiations. Following this strategy, an international negotiator may make an extreme demand, than claim compensation for withdrawing the unrealistic proposal. Recognizing that the principle of reciprocity may be used for manipulation, states may not feel under any obligation to reciprocate. For example, in the 1950s, the Eisenhower declined to respond to Khrushchev's unilateral troop reductions because the Soviet army was bloated and the troops could be put better use in civilian pursuits [Larson 1988, 1998].

Foot-in-the-face

In the case of the foot-in-the-door technique, an easier first request is used to increase the chances the subject will fulfil the subsequent, more difficult critical request. In the case of the door-in-the-face technique, the principle is reversed – first, a clearly difficult request is formulated in the hope that its rejection will make the subject more compliant with the easier request.

However, this observation can lead to the question of what happens when we apply a sequence of two requests of completely different character, but of similar degrees of difficulty.

In three experimental studies [Dolinski 2011], participants were sequentially given two requests that were different in content but similar in their level of difficulty. In one of the studies, half of the students living in residence halls were asked to complete a questionnaire, and the other half to tape-record the contents of a book to help a blind student in preparing for an exam. Regardless of the subject's decision of whether to satisfy the first request, another request was then formulated (students who had been initially invited to complete the questionnaire were now asked to make the recording and those first asked to record the book were now asked to complete the questionnaire). It turned out that the technique worked well. The request which appeared second in the sequence was fulfilled more frequently than in control conditions where it was posed directly.

At the highest political levels observed strong commitment to the process of exchange of goods and services. Sometimes, the MPs vote contrary to the provisions of his/her own party, which at first glance seems to be incomprehensible. In practice, it is a principle of re-paying liabilities incurred in the voters during the campaign. You can not ignore that there is a relationship difficult to grasp for the average voter from politics to business. From the extra point of voters view, there are some interesting facts on how to cast additional votes by bestows, even by offering the smallest service. This is not only associated with the so-called sphere of election promises, but it can be rooted in the mentality and patterns of political behaviours, because the sum of the implemented policies are sometimes carefully calculated for future recommendations and estimations. For example, parliamentarians sometimes underline their opposition made even against own party in order to emphasize independence, integrity and potential position – even deliberately violating party discipline, thereby realizing liabilities incurred before the election.

Low-ball

In a manoeuvre that is similar to the foot-in-the-door, another persuasion technique is to establish commitment by "throwing a low ball". This technique induces a person to make an active decision to engage in a particular action such as making a purchase. When the consumer agrees to pay the cost, she or he is told that the cost has actually risen. However, the consumer is so committed to the decision that he or she is likely to bear the increased cost.

The low-ball technique is often used in the sale of new cars. Imagine you are buying a car and you have just made the decision to purchase it for the stated price. Right at the moment the seller tells you that the price does not include devices, which you really want to have but which suddenly turn out to be an extra cost. It is still likely that you will buy the car for the higher price, but if you had known its final price before taking the decision to buy, you might have tried to find something cheaper.

Cialdini, Cacioppo, Basett and Miller [1978] demonstrated the low-ball effect experimentally. Participants were asked if they wished to take part in the study concerning thinking processes. In the control condition, participants were informed that the experiment would require them to arrive at the laboratory early morning. It was the obvious cost that the student had to incur to participate in the study: it was put to the control participants in a straightforward fashion. The participants in the low-ball condition were initially asked if they wished to participate. If the participant said "yes", the experimenter then revealed the true cost – the experiment would begin early morning. Much more participants who had been low-balled came to the laboratory…

The situation in which politicians intentionally outstand the promise with spectacular advantage is mostly used in a long-term standing commitment (e.g. politicians highly motivated during the pre-election party alliances/games, for example the case of LiD[2] or within the construction of coalitional government, such as unforgettable "marriage": PiS - LPR, and Self-Defence[3]).

---

[2]   Left and Democrats (Lewica i Demokraci, LiD) was a centre-left electoral alliance which was created on 3 September 2006, before the municipal Polish election of 2006. The coalition's aim was to provide an alternative for both the national-conservative party, Law and Justice (Prawo i Sprawiedliwość, PiS) and the liberal-conservative Civic Platform (Platforma Obywatelska, PO). LiD contested their first national election in parliamentary elections held on October, 2007, and finally won 53 seats to the Sejm (to lower chamber of Polish parliament). In fact, the LiD alliance was dissolved in April 2008, following a rift between the member parties.

[3]   A coalitional government was formed on May 5, 2006, and practically dissolved until August 2007. Leaders of allied parties have signed a coalition agreement together. It was not a secret that the representatives of the Polish Self-Defence hoped for lucrative political position. The reality was different, and in September 2006 inside the coalition was a crisis.

The technique relies on the fact that luring large benefits, nevertheless in the last moment it appears that the real "costs" will be much higher than promised benefits. However, due to the existing commitment to withdraw from "common" project is not possible consequently. Although the "pay-off" is drastically, it can lead to retreat even greater adverse consequences – "losing face".

Social influence techniques based on cognitive mechanisms

Another group of social influence techniques to which psychologists have devoted much attention are those based on cognitive mechanisms – primarily the rules of functioning of our memory and attention, as well as decision-making. Subtle differences in the formulation of requests, suggestions, or proposals make the difference.

That's-not-all

The that's-not-all technique is the tactic consists of offering a product at a high price, not allowing the customer to respond for a two or three seconds, and then offering a better deal by adding another product or lowering the price. The sweetening of the deal invokes a feeling of indebtedness that increases compliance.

In the study to test the effectiveness of the that's-not-all technique, the participants were people who approached a stand selling cookies and asked about their price. They were randomly assigned to one of two groups. In control conditions, the participants were informed that the cookies were sold in sets consisting of two packets, at the price of 75 cents. In experimental conditions, the seller said that the cookies cost 75 cents, and after a while he added that this was the price for a set consisting of two packets. Burger found nearly double the sale of cookies using the that's-not-all technique.

Obvious examples are used in commerce but also in politics, this technique has its place particularly during the election campaign. An example is the widely used free trials (small gifts). It was the fact that the sample is free, makes it born in us a sense of obligation. Often it is in the election rallies where voters handed to various free gifts, hoping that this will increase the likelihood that the recipient desires to repay the "debt" and give your vote.

The that's-not-all technique is used especially during the election campaign. Political candidates and their campaigning staff outdo each other in inventing the next great gadgets (small gifts) that are meant to give the impression that it has been more than expected. Currently, you must also pay attention to the opportunities of receiving online gadgets (such as wallpaper patterns or

musical sounds). Advertising, promoting basically are the sort of the business or industry today. The websites of shops with products of American presidential candidates in 2012, there are more than 100 products with prices ranging from 1 up to about $ 50. These are t-shirts, stickers, collars for dogs, but also gold cufflinks and jewellery. This is of course one of the way to raise funds for the campaign, while building relationships with political candidate based on a common identification (usually visual images) [see http://www.store.barackobama.com, http://www. store.mitttomney.com].

Yet another example, but the same applies to the current American presidential campaign. Singer Beyoncé Knowles held at the NYC 40/40 Club the collection of funds for the encouraged his fans to campaign contributions; she said that anyone who gives money for the campaign has a chance to win tickets to this event [http://www.facebook.com/beyonce].

Even a penny helps

One of the most intriguing technique of social influence is based on the assumption that the phrase "even a penny will help" added to the standard request for charity donation considerably increases the probability of carrying it out without decreasing the average sum of money offered by the benefactor [Cialdini, Schroeder 1976]. What is the mechanism underlying the effectiveness of this technique? It is commonly assumed that a typical person asked for a donation must resolve a specific dilemma. On the one hand, he or she knows that the charity is worthy of support; on the other hand, he or she does not want to waste money. As a result, a person confronted by such a dilemma typically resolves it by adopting a solution that allows him or her to preserve a positive self-image and create a good impression on others, despite offering no support to charity. Such a person adopts the following thinking: "I would be glad to do it, but I can't afford it". What may block such an excuse is legitimization of paltry contribution. Yet, it is important that the requester does not indicate that he or she means precisely "one penny". As a result, people requested to donate the symbolic single penny usually give much more.

In the original experiment that tested the effectiveness of this technique, an experimenter knocked on a participant's door and asked for a donation for the American Association for Cancer Research. In the experimental group, the phrase "even a penny will help" was added to the standard message. It turned out that this simple extra statement increased the frequency of donation while maintaining the average amount of donation.

In the first election of Barack Obama (2008) for the office of President of the United States, small donor (whose contributions do not exceed $ 200)

shed more than 16 million dollars for his campaign. It was a sensation, and the result of a very simple mechanism - giving little, I gain a lot (share in the great cause and a sense of community and commitment). But we are not surely about such using technique because some other circumstances could be affected the Obama campaigning mechanism. Perhaps Obama had many small donors because he built a coalition of young people and minorities to support him who was less likely to have much money to give. And such interpretation ignores finally the technique even a penny helps.

Foot-in-the-mouth, or a question about one's well-being

Howard [1990] assumed that if you ask someone how they feel before asking them to donate to charity, and that person declares to be well, he or she will be more willing to engage in helping people who feel much worse. A person publicly telling someone that he or she is feeling wonderful will feel committed to engage in improving the well-being of those who do not feel so well.

In the Howard's experiment, a person presenting himself as an employee of a committee to combat hunger telephoned randomly-selected residents of Dallas. In the control group, the interviewees were informed that in the near future cakes at the price of 25 cents were to be sold in their neighbourhood, and the income thus obtained would be used to hold a festive meal for the hungry (the study was conducted before Thanksgiving). Each respondent was asked whether they agreed to the vendor visiting their home. In the experimental group, after the introduction, the researcher first asked the respondent about their well-being, and then – depending on the response – stated that it was either nice or sad to hear, and only then explained that a charity sale of cakes was being organized and asked the interlocutor if they would agree to purchase one. It turned out that people in the experimental group bought the cakes much more often than those in the control group. A similar result, indicating the crucial role of the very act of asking people how they are, was obtained by Fointiat [2000].

This technique is particularly justified in direct contact with the individual voter, because asking him/her about the mood to give a positive response within emotional connection. Atmosphere of well-being requires a way to want to help at the very beginning of the conversation. And public declaration increases the level of self-esteem. The condition for the effectiveness of this technique is necessary to question the well-being, which means courtesy asking the question, au caller raises a sense of obligation and increases the need for reciprocation.

Politicians, especially when direct contact with voters captures various forms of verbal and non-verbal behaviour are using the featured technique.

Probably, the handshake with a smile on politicians face is a useful introduction to electioneering. It is the evidence of openness, but also it generates the interest, or even positive emotions. This type of technique is commonly used (of course, taking into account cultural factors). In Prague, under the President Vaclav Havel are not rare situations where he can be found in the traditional beer halls in the centre of the old town, sitting modestly with a glass of beer. He asked people – what's new and how are they feel - often to the strangers. In such situations, you could see as it is important for people - enjoyed his company and appreciated all the more aware that the President is interested in order of people ordinary life. This type of behaviour fosters the relationship between the politician and the citizen, and often provides social support.

Dialogue involvement

The effectiveness of the foot-in-the-mouth technique, described earlier obviously depends on whether people asked how they are give a positive response. In American culture, this kind of response is very common. However, it would be interesting whether a similar effect would be noted in a culture where the norm is a negative declaration of feeling bad. One of the few countries with such a cultural norm is Poland [Dolinski 1996]. It turned out that although in Poland people asked about their well-being usually answered that they did not feel fine, they still more often engaged in charity work than those who were directly asked for financial support [Dolinski, Nawrat, Rudak 2001]! We can thus conclude that, although the question about one's well-being is a good technique of social influence, the psychological mechanism underlying its effectiveness must be different than Howard assumed. One should take into account that while in control conditions in Howard's studies, where the charity request is formulated directly, we are dealing with a monologue from the experimenter, in the foot-in-the-mouth situation there is a dialogue between the experimenter and the subject.

Dialogue and monologue are the basic modes of interpersonal communication. While monologue is characteristic in interactions with strangers, dialogue is typical mode in interactions with persons we know personally. Social psychology is full of empirical evidence demonstrating that in interactions with other people we often react automatically to certain stimuli, and also automatically trigger some, often complex, behavioural scripts [e.g., Langer, Blank, Chanowitz 1978; Slugoski, 1995; Bargh 1994]. Because people are more willing to meet requests made by friends rather than strangers [e.g., Argyle, Henderson 1984; Roloff, 1987], taken by a stranger who involves us in a dialogue, we automatically activate "dealing with an acquaintance script". It leads us

to agree with a request directed toward us in a polite manner, particularly when it is not a costly one.

Dolinski, Nawrat, Rudak [2001] showed that if the request was preceded with casual dialogue between the requester and the respondent, then it was fulfilled more frequently than in condition in which the requester approached the participant with a monologue type of interaction. This outcome held true for a charity request (i.e., collecting money for an orphanage), a social one (i.e., a request for a interview conducted by opinion research organization), and a marketing appeal (i.e., street sales of Indian pastilles).

A similar effect, indicating the role that dialogue plays in processes of social influence, was noted in studies by Burger, Soroka, Gonzago, Murphy and Somervell [2001], who showed that a short, 2-minutes talk with the experimenter nearly doubled the rate of compliance with the request than did a mere request (not preceded by a short talk).

Numerous representative studies have shown that people are more likely to be a subject to requests of friends and acquaintances than the requests formulated by unknown persons. Including the communication process on the other hand increases the range of customer submission, which can be used in direct contact with the politician to the voter.

The traditional form of contact in order to exchange opinions and listening different views is meetings with voters, both the smaller, as well as those with more attendants. Generally, in each of these cases is being creating a direct relationship with the individual voter in the convention of mutual conversation (dialogue). In line with this reasoning, Han [2009] presents results of experiments suggesting that political appeals that include some self-disclosure about the person making the request triggers a liking heuristic that causes subjects to be more likely to comply with a request for action.

Avoiding confrontation and dialogue with voters can greatly weaken the electoral chances of a political candidate, and engage in a dialogue with voters more likely to vote. This type of action is of course difficult for a politician because in fact, they often facing extreme behaviours, statements of persons encountered. It must, therefore, in many cases, improvise. In 2011, in Poland, during the parliamentary campaign Donald Tusk used "the Tusk-Bus" to meet voters; despite these meetings were often difficult and turbulent character. Currently an important role in the disclosure and use of this technique, play online media. Increasingly, websites of politicians, party leaders can activate the public online debate to form own judgments or opinions and get answers. Currently, popular form of communication is two-way share of the candidates on social networking sites.

Techniques that appeal to emotional mechanisms

Another group of social influence techniques is associated with one's experience of particular emotional states. Particularly in the literature on attitude change, much space is devoted to the role of mood [e.g. Dillard, Pfau 2002], and among discrete emotions – to fear [e.g. Boster, Mongeau 1984]. Researchers on behavioural compliance, however, have focused on other emotional states - guilt, embarrassment and the experience of relief.

Inspiring a sense of guilt

Guilt is an aversive feeling, associated with the unpleasant tension and arousal, together with the experience of regret and repentance [Baumesiter, Reis, Delespaul 1995]. Very often, a sense of guilt coexists with the experience of shame [Izard 1977; Tangney 1995]. A common feature of the emotions of shame and guilt is the subject's sense of violating the standards or rules that he or she professes to hold and a feeling of responsibility for some wrongdoing or transgression.

While experiencing the emotions of guilt or shame, the subject is usually unable for a long time to break free from negative thoughts about him or herself, and these threaten the subject's self-esteem. However, guilt and shame induces a desire to make restitution and to repair a self-image. Meeting requests made by other people can sometimes become a means to recover one's conviction of being a positive, valuable social entity [e.g. Konoske, Staple, Graf 1979]. In an experiment by Carlsmith and Gross [1969] students were induced to believe that they had given a series of painful shocks to another person as part of learning experiment. These shamed and guilty students were more likely to comply to subsequent request to make phone calls when asked either by a person they supposed shocked or another person, then students who were in an neutral emotional state.

Similar results, indicating a link between the experienced emotions of shame and guilt and compliance to requests, were recorded in other experiments [Wallace, Sadalla 1966; Freedman, Wallington, Bless 1967; Darlington, Macker 1966].

Public blaming of politician by journalist even for little faults can be the basis for calling the actual guilt. Then remorse may lead to an unexpected return behaviour - in line with the expectations of manipulating. It is always unexpected to implement fully such a technique, without unpredictable consequences, especially in political temper life.

Embarrassment

Embarrassment is an emotion that we experience relatively seldom, but has no doubt been experienced by almost all of us by the time we became adults. This state is typically produced when someone finds herself or himself in a predicament or committing an act that may result in a poor social evaluation. Most studies concerning the consequences of experiencing an embarrassment aimed at demonstrating that it generates the tendency to avoid others and become isolated [see: Niedenthal, Krauth-Gruber, Ric 2006]. The question of whether the state of embarrassment increases compliance with requests, suggestions or orders has rarely been the subject of empirical research. The few exceptions in this respect are experiments by Apsler [1975] who had students perform a set of embarrassing acts (like sing a silly song or imitate a 5-year-old throwing a temper tantrum) in front of another student. Compared to control participants, embarrassed students were more likely to consent to help another students with a class projects regardless of whether the requester was the person who observed them or someone who knew nothing about their acts.

Of course, the question arises why a sense of embarrassment should promote compliance. Apsler [1975] refers to an intrapsychological mechanism. Involvement in helping another person who not only needs support but is directly asking for help, can be a means of regaining one's positive mood or positive self-esteem. Both of these phenomena (i.e., mood and self-esteem) suffered while the subject was "making a fool of themselves" during the experiment.

According to Suhay [2006] embarrassment, as a self-conscious emotion, plays an important role in motivating individuals to internalize the political values of their social groups. Politicians may more easily motivate embarrassed than non-embarrassed citizens to engage in different common activities, to support their in-group members, to vote for/in group leaders, etc. Guilt and shame tend to submission. These emotional states evoke a sense of danger areas of their own values, integrity and self-control. Self-esteem can be recovered by doing something good, socially acceptable, for example, by actively supporting a political candidate in the election. Such activity can be a form of compensation (penance); can be an escape from negative thinking about themselves and their actions. Preparation of voters' guilt can be a source of very specific and sometimes effective motivation (i.e. voter stigma).

Fear-then-relief

Fans of action films are acquainted with the specific type of police interrogation scene where the brutal policeman is suddenly and unexpectedly

replaced by a gentle and compassionate cop. The subject of the interrogation, who has refused to answer questions at gun point, now, when treated with a cup of coffee, all of a sudden starts confessing everything he or she knows. Dolinski and Nawrat [1998] have conducted a program of research to demonstrate that when people experience an emotion that is then removed, they are more likely to comply with a request. For example in one of the study experimenters placed under the car wipers small leaflets that looked like police tickets. When the drivers returned and read the leaflets , it turned out these were ads for a hair-growth stimulating shampoo, or appeals for a blood donation. When the drivers were about to drive off, they were approached by a student gathering material for his master thesis and asked whether the driver would fill out a questionnaire on how to optimize the city traffic. It turned out that drivers under "fear then relief condition" were considerably more likely to fill out the questionnaire than the other drivers (control participants).

How can the mechanism of compliance in the fear-then-relief state be explained? Fear alerts the body, focuses our attention on the source of fear [e.g. Tomkins 1991], and triggers an action program specific for the given type of emotion [Frijda 1986; Lazarus 1991; Dolinski 2001]. Whilst such a reaction seems perfectly adequate and adaptive for threatening conditions, it stops being adequate when the circumstances suddenly and unexpectedly reverse, as in the bad cop-good cop interrogation procedure, or in the studies by Dolinski and Nawrat (1998). In this state of confusion and disorientation, the person is more likely to comply with a request.

The technique of bad cop-good cop is probably the most well-known technique of negotiating and handling, also often used by journalists, commentators to confront directly the politicians. Manipulation technique of such rules is quite simple. Conversation leads two journalists ("bad" and "good" one). This scheme was used in a popular Polish political talk-show "Now we do!" by Tomasz Sekielski and Andrzej Morozowski[4]. Using this technique fostered their guests to confusion and, consequently compromising the views behind the scenes of political life. Removal from the state of equilibrium and the introduction of a state of confusion increases the chance that the politician will reveal the mystery, that is to say something important, you should not say, weakening his political position.

---

[4] "Now we do!" – a talk-show which was broadcasted from 13 September 2005 to 5 July 2010 on Polish TVN which is led by Tomasz Sekielski and Andrzej Morozowski. To the tv studio were invited famous politicians, artists, experts in the various fields. During the program, presented a short film materials and the latest news and was recorded in the presence of the audience. Taking were often accused of being intransigent behaviour towards invited guests.

Final remarks

Psychological mechanism of social impact within suggestion of taking some other positions are well known from the very beginning of mankind, except that changes are conditioned by permanent development process. Manipulating the individuals or groups due to the lots of many circumstances are contextual and they also have evidence in a situation of political actors increasing competition. That it is obvious, who does not use psychological techniques does not exist. However, the diagnosis of electoral behaviour is not always confirmed the primacy of psychological approach. It turns out that we have to deal with additional environmental conditions to make final decision. In confirmation of such opinion must cite the concept of classic researcher on the theory of public choice by Downs [1957], who wrote: "As long as to retain the assumption of perfect knowledge, no citizen can possibly influence another's vote. Each knows what would benefit him most, what the government is doing, and what other parties would do if they were in power. Therefore, the citizen's political taste structure, which I assume to be fixed, leads him directly to an unambiguous decision about how he should vote. If he remains rational, no persuasion can change his mind" [Downs 1957: 139].

In line with this reasoning Fiorina [1981] suggests: "Citizens are not fools. Having often observed political equivocation, if not outright lying, should they listen carefully to campaign promises? Having heard the economic, educational, sociological, defence, and foreign policy expert advisors disagree on both the effects of past policies and the prospect on future ones, should they pay close attention to policy debates? Even if concerned and competent citizens appear to have little solid basis on which to cast their votes, save on those rare occasions when candidates take clear and differing positions on salient specific issues (e.g., abusing, abortion, the Equal Rights Amendment)" [Fiorina 1981: 5].

These are clear indications, but rather the controversy surrounding the behaviour of individuals in fact today is reflected in the rich literature on the subject [Niemi, Weisberg 1993]. Lewis-Beck in 1990 published a famous work under the crucial title: "Economics and Elections" in which he states that pocketbook voting has determined voters, especially in a position to direct or indirect financial statements. Of course, the above-mentioned count the utility of persuasion and manipulation techniques do not deny them, but rather expose their actual functions. In particular, we have to deal with that when we depart from the classic game of election to the wider sense of political life.

Of course, the overview of the social influence techniques presented in this article does not exhaust the arsenal of all possible psychological methods of encouraging people to meet the requests or suggestions addressed to them

by politicians and reversal. Actually, it seems unreasonable to expect that such a complete list of social influence techniques will ever be compiled. Human ingenuity in inventing new ways to make others perform a variety of activities seems virtually limitless.

References:

Apsler R. (1975), *Effects of embarrassment on behaviour toward others*, "Journal of

Argyle M., Henderson, M. (1984), *The rules of friendship*, "Journal of Social and Personal Relationships", 1, pp. 211-237.

Bargh J.A. (1994), *The four horsemen of automaticity: Awareness, intention, efficiency, and control in social cognition*, [in:] R.S. Wyer, T.K. Srull (eds.), *Handbook of social cognition*, 2nd ed.,1, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 1-40.

Baumeister R.F., Reis, H.T., Delespaul, P.A.E.G. (1995), *Subjective and experiential correlates of guilt in daily life*, "Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin", 21, pp. 1256-1268.

Bem D.J. (1967), *Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena*, "Psychological Review", 74, pp. 183-200.

Bem D.J. (1972), *Self-perception theory*, [in:] L. Berkowitz (ed.) *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, (vol. 6), New York: Academic Press, pp. 1-62.

Boster F.J., Mongeau, P. (1984), *Fear-arousing persuasive messages*, "Communication Yearbook", 8, pp. 330-375.

Burger J.M. (1986), *Increasing compliance by improving the deal: The that's-not-all technique*, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", 51, pp. 277-283.

Burger J.M. (1999), *The foot-in-the-door compliance procedure: A multiple-process analysis and review*, "Personality and Social Psychology Review", 3, pp. 303-325.

Burger J.M., Messian, N., Patel, S., del Prado, A., Anderson, C. (2004), *What a coincidence! The effects of incidental similarity on compliance*, "Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin", 30, pp. 35-43.

Burger J.M., Soroka, S., Gonzago, K., Murphy, E., Somervell, E. (2001), *The effect of fleeting attraction on compliance to requests*, "Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin", 27, pp. 1578-1586.

Carlsmith J.M., Gross A.E. (1969), *Some effects of guilt on compliance*, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", 11, pp. 232-239.

Cialdini R.B. (2001), *Influence: Science and practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Cialdini R.B., Cacioppo, Basset, R., J.T., Miller, J.A. (1977), *Low-ball procedure for producing compliance: Commitment then cost*, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", 36, pp. 463-476.

Cialdini R.B., Schroeder, D. (1976), *Increasing compliance by legitimizing paltry contributions: When even a penny helps*, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", 34, pp. 599-604.

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

Cialdini, R.B., Goldstein, N.J. (2004), *Social influence: Compliance and conformity*, "Annual

Cwalina W, Falkowski A., Newman, B.I. (2011), *Political marketing: Theoretical and strategic foundations*, New York: Sharpe.

Darlington R.B., Macker C.E. (1966), *Displacement of guilt-produced altruistic behaviour*,

"Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", 4, pp. 442-443.

Dillard J.P., Pfau M. (2002), *The persuasion handbook: developments in theory and*

Dolinski (2001) *Emotional seesaw, compliance, and mindlessness*, "European Psychologist", 6, pp. 194-203.

Dolinski D. (1996), *The mystery of the Polish soul. B.W. Johnson's effect a rebours*, "European Journal of Social Psychology", 26, pp. 1001-1005.

Dolinski D. (2011), *A rock or a hard place: The foot-in-the-face technique for inducing compliance without pressure*, "Journal of Applied Social Psychology", 41, pp. 1514-1537.

Dolinski D., Nawrat M., Rudak I. (2001), *Dialogue involvement as a social influence technique*, "Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin", 27, pp. 1395-1406.

Dolinski D., Nawrat R. (1998), *Fear-then-relief procedure for producing compliance. Beware when the danger is over*, "Journal of Experimental Social Psychology", 34, pp. 27-50.

door-in-the-face influence strategy, "Communication Reports", 14, pp. 31-38.

Downs A. (1957), *An Economic Theory of Political action in a Democracy*, [in:] A. Downs (1998), *Political Theory and Public Choice. The Selected Essays of Anthony Downs* Vol. 1, Cheltenham UK, Northampton MA USA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, pp.135-150.

Fiorina M.P. (1981), *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*, New Have and London: Yale University Press.

Fointiat V. (2000), '*Foot-in-the-mouth' versus 'door-in-the-face' requests*, "Journal of Social

Freedman J.L., Fraser, S. (1966), *Compliance without pressure: The foot in the door technique*, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", 4, pp. 195-202.

Freedman J.L., Wallington S.A., Bless E. (1967) *Compliance without pressure: The effects of guilt*, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", 7, pp. 117-124.

Frijda N.H. (1986), *The emotions. Studies in emotion and social interaction*, Paris: Maison de Sciences de l'Homme and Cambridge University Press.

Gerber A., Green, D., Shachar, R. (2003), *Voting may be habit-forming: Evidence from a randomized field experiment*, "American Journal of Political Science", 47, pp. 540-550.

Gouldner A.W. (1960), *The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement*, "American Sociological Review", 25, pp. 161-178.

Han H.C. (2009), *Does the content of political appeals matter in motivating participation? A field experiment on self-disclosure in political appeals*, "Political Behavior", 31, pp. 103-116.

Howard D.J. (1990), *The influence of verbal responses to common greetings on compliance behavior: The foot-in-the-mouth effect*, "Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 20, pp. 1185-1196.

http://www. store.mitttomney.com: M. Romney, 2012 0fficial Store, Homepage.

http://www.facebook.com/beyonce: Beyoncé Knowles.

http://www.store.barackobama.com: B. Obama for America, 2012, Store, Homepage**.**

Izard C.E. (1977), *Human emotions*, Plenum Press: New York and London.

Joule R.V., Gouilloux F., Weber, F. (1989), *The lure: A new compliance procedure*, "Journal of Social Psychology",129, pp. 741-749.

Kiesler C.A. (1971), *The psychology of commitment*, Academic Press: New York.

Konoske P., Staple S., Graf R.G. (1979), *Compliant reactions to guilt: Self-esteem or self-punishment*, "Journal of Social Psychology", 108, pp. 207-211.

Kraut R.E., McConohay J.B. (1973), *How being interviewed affects voting: An experiment*, "Public Opinion Quarterly", 37, pp. 398-406.

Langer E.J., Blank A., Chanowitz B. (1978), *The mindlessness of ostensibly thoughtful action: The role of 'placebic' information in interpersonal interaction*, "Journal of Personality and

---

Social Psychology", 36, pp. 635-642.

Larson D. W. (1988), *The psychology of reciprocity in international relations*, "Negotiation Journal", 4, pp. 281-301.

Larson D. W. (1998), *Exchange and reciprocity in international negotiations*, "International Negotiation", 3, pp. 121-138.

Lazarus R.S., (1991), *Emotion and adaptation*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Lewis-Beck M.S. (1990), *Economics And Elections. The Major Western Democracies*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Niedenthal P.M., Krauth-Gruber S., Ric F. (2006), *Psychology of emotion. Interpersonal, experiential, and cognitive approaches*, New York & Hove: Psychology Press.

Niemi R.G., Weisberg H.F. (1993), *Classics in Voting Behavior*, Washigton D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, Introduction.

O'Keefe D.J., Hale S.L. (2001), *An odds-ratio-based meta-analysis of research on the*

Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, pp. 145-153.

Pollock, C.L., Smith, S.D., Knowles, E.S., Bruce, H.J. (1998), *Mindfulness limits compliance with the that's-not-all technique*, "Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin", 24, pp. 1153-1157.

practice, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Pratkanis, A., Aronson, E. (2001), *Age of propaganda. The everyday use and abuse of persuasion*, New York: Freeman.

Psychology", 140, pp. 264-266.

Review of Psychology", 55, pp. 591-621.

Roloff, M.E. (1987), *Communication and reciprocity within intimate relationships*, [in:] M.E. Roloff, G.R. Miller (eds.) In*terpersonal processes: New directions in communication research*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 11-38.

Slugoski, B.R. (1995), *Mindless processing of requests? Don't ask twice*, "British Journal of Social Psychology", 34, pp. 335-350.

Suhay, E. (2006) *Emotions and Americans' political values: How pride and shame motivate the adoption of group ideals*, Conference Papers-American Political Science Association

Tangney, J.P. (1995), *Shame and guilt in interpersonal relationships*, [in:] J.P. Tangney, K.W. Fisher (eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarassement, and pride*, New York: Guilford, pp. 114-142.

Tomkins, S.S. (1991), *Affect, imagery, consciousness. Vol. III. The negative affects: Anger and fea*r, Springer: New York.

Uehara, E.S. (1995), *Reciprocity reconsidered: Gouldner's 'moral norm of reciprocity' and social support*, "Journal of Social and Personal Relationship", 12, pp. 483-502.

Vierasu, T., Hertanu, A., Talpau, A., Balasescu, M. (2011), *How to manipulate polls*, "Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov", 4, pp. 79-84.

Wallace J., Sadalla E. (1966), *Behavioral consequences of transgression: I. The effects of social recognition*m, "Journal of Experimental Research in Personality", 1, pp. 187-194.