Effects of influence strategies, perceived social power and cost on compliance with requests¹

YOSHIAKI IMAI

Faculty of Sociology, Ryutsu Keizai University, Ryugasaki, Ibaraki 301

The present study investigated the effects of influence strategies, social power of the influencing agent and cost to comply on compliance with requests. Undergraduate students were required to imagine that one of their friends and an upperclassman in their university's extra curricular activity club were influencing agents and that the agents had asked them to lend a notebook for a final exam and to lend some money. The experimental design was a 2 (the cost to comply with requests: high, low) $\times$ 2 (a set of requests: friend-notebook and upperclassman-money, friend-money and upperclassman-notebook) $\times$ 9 (influence strategies) factorial design. Respondents rated the extent to which they would comply with the requests under nine influence strategies. The main results were as follows: (a) The respondents were likely to comply when the strategy was reasoning, promise or hinting, while they were unlikely to comply when they were asked by the agent using threat or invoking a role relationship. (b) The respondents were inclined to lend a notebook when perceived social power was high and when cost was low. Only a significant main effect of cost was found in the case of money. (c) Influence strategies such as threat, debt and invoking a role relationship lowered women's compliance more than men's.

Key words: influence strategy, social power, cost, compliance with request, sex difference.

The present study investigated the effects of influence strategies, perceived social power of the influencing agent and cost to comply with requests on compliance with requests. It especially focused on the functions of influence strategies.

Social influence processes seem to have three aspects: attributes of the influencing agents, contents of the influencing attempts and influencing strategies used by the agents (Imai, 1989). The first aspect is related to perceived social power of the influencing agent, and it is connected with the resources, expertise, interpersonal attraction, etc. of the agent. Molm (1981) asserted that the more social power influencing agents have, the more they can change behavior and/or attitudes of the influence targets. On the other hand, French and Raven (1959) emphasized the quality of social power, and they classified bases of social power into five classes: re-

ward power, coercive power, expert power, legitimate power and referent power respectively.

The second aspect is concerned with what kinds of behavior and/or attitudes of the target the influencing agent would like to change. For example, asking the targets to sign their names to protest against nuclear power, asking the targets to answer questionnaires about an advertisement, and so on. The influencing attempts have a wide range, and their content depends on social influence situations. In general, it is assumed that people consider the relationship between reward and cost in social interactions (cf. Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Thus, one of the basic attributes in this aspect is the cost to influence the target for the influencing agent and the cost to comply or not to comply with the request for the target.

The third aspect is the communication style used by the influencing agent. There are several terms for representing the communication style as follows: compliance-gaining strategy, power strategy, influence

¹ Portions of this article were presented at 22nd International Congress of Applied Psychology, Kyoto, Japan, July 27, 1990.

strategy, influence tactic and so on. The term "influence strategy" seems to be used in a wider sense than other terms, and it will be used in the present study.

Two Ways of Classifying Influence Strategies

In what way do we influence another person in everyday life? The first researchers to study influence strategies were Marwell and Schmitt (1967). Since then many researchers have followed (deTurck & Miller, 1983; Falbo, 1977; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Miller, Boster, Roloff, & Seibold, 1977, etc.). The main focus of their research has been the classification of influence strategies and the identification of determinants for selecting them.

Marwell and Schmitt (1967) presented respondents with four social influence situations and a list of 16 influence strategies. Respondents evaluated how likely they would use each strategy in each social situation. Analyzing the data by factor analysis, Marwell and Schmitt (1967) obtained five factors including rewarding activity, punishing activity and expertise.

The research method used by Marwell and Schmitt (1967) may be called "the method of presenting the list of influence strategies in specified social influence situations". Several other studies have been conducted using this method (cf. deTurck & Miller, 1983; Miller et al., 1977; Offermann & Kearney, 1988; Offermann & Schreier, 1985; Perreault & Miles, 1978; Schenck-Hamlin, Wiseman, & Georgarakos, 1982; Steffen & Eagly, 1985; Wilkinson & Kipnis, 1978; Wiseman & Schenck-Hamlin, 1981, etc.).

Another method called deductive research has been carried out using content analysis and multidimensional scaling (MDS) to classify social influence strategies and to reveal their dimensions (cf. Clark, 1979; Cowan, Drinkard, & MacGavin, 1984; Falbo, 1977; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Rule, Bisantz, & Kohn, 1985; Takagi, 1989, etc.). The method of these studies may be called "the method

of free responses in (un-)specified social influence situations".

The strategies in the former method were identified on the basis of the social interaction among individuals. However, these strategies are different depending on the study. Further the situations of social influence concerned are also dissimilar to each other. It is difficult, then, to make comparisons between the results of these studies. In the present study, the social influence situation is defined as the one in which the influencing agents ask other persons (the influence targets) what they want. In the next section I shall summarize the strategies used or revealed in several of the above-mentioned studies.

Contents of Influence Strategies

Influence strategies can be classified into four types as follows (Appendix 1): (a) promising to give rewards or giving some sort of reward to the influence targets in several ways for their complying with the influencing agent's requests; (b) threatening to punish or inflict some sort of punishment on the targets for not complying with the agent's requests; (c) telling directly/indirectly the targets to do what the agent wants without social exchange; (d) telling the target to do what the agent wants several times.

These types of influence strategies include several variations. For example, when the agents give the targets rewards for their compliance, the agents can give them to the targets before/after the influencing attempts. Rewards can be in the form of money, goods, smiles, good moods and so on.

The determinants of selecting influence strategies have been studied from the perspective of the influencing agent. They invoke the differences of social status between the agents and the targets (Cowan et al., 1984; Offermann & Schreier, 1985; Tjosvold, Johnson, & Johnson, 1984), the situational differences of influencing attempts (Miller et al., 1977), interpersonal

attraction toward the agents (Clark, 1979), the estimated responses of the targets for influencing attempts (Dillard, Segrin, & Harden, 1989; Hunter & Boster, 1987), personality traits of the agent (Machiavellianism and social desirability: Falbo, 1977; power apprehension: Offermann & Schreier, 1985), sex differences (Offermann & Kearney, 1988; Offermann & Schreier, 1985; Cowan et al., 1984; Steffen & Eagly, 1985).

The function of the influence strategies, however, has not been clearly revealed, so the present study was conducted in order to find out to what extent the influence target should comply with the requests using different strategies. As has been pointed out, when individuals comply with requests, they would consider the attributes of the influencing agents, the cost to comply with requests as well as the influencing strategies used. The first two factors were included in the experimental design of this study.

The first working hypothesis was that (1) influence strategies such as reasoning and hinting would be more effective in getting compliance with requests than strategies such as threat. This prediction was based on the results that punishments lead to negative effects on the targets and/or their performance (Sheley & Shaw, 1979; Shetty, 1978).

It was also hypothesized that (2) high social power of the influencing agent would cause more compliance with requests than would low social power. The fact that person A is perceived to have social power by person B means that person A can most influence behavior and/or attitudes of person B. So, the more a person is perceived to have social power by another person, the more he/she can get compliance by that person.

Finally, it was hypothesized that (3) low cost of compliance with requests would cause more compliance by the influence target than would high cost. It has been assumed that a person seeks to interact

with other persons with as low a cost as possible (cf. Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). This assumption will be applied to social influence in the present study.

Method

Respondents

The volunteer respondents in the present study were 216 university students. They included 114 men and 102 women, and their mean age was 20.84.

Procedure

The experimental design was a 2 (the cost to comply with requests: high, low) $\times$ 2 (a set of requests: lending a notebook for a final exam to a friend and lending some money to an upperclassman in the respondents' university extra curricular activity club, lending some money to a friend and lending a notebook to an upperclassman) $\times$ 9 (influence strategies: simple statement, reasoning, promise, threat, debt, invoking a role relationship, moral appeal, hinting and repetition) factorial design (Table 1). The last factor was a repeated measure. The reason why the influencing agent factor was not orthogonal with the request factor was to avoid the possibility of the respondents' comparing the answers for the same requests by two different influencing agents. Respondents were required to imagine one of their friends and an upperclassman when they answered the questionnaire. Those who did not have upperclassmen did not answer the questions.

The questionnaire included a description of requests under nine kinds of supposed influence strategies made by the influencing agent (see Appendix 2) and the Perceived Social Power Scale (Imai, 1989) to measure the social power of the influencing agent. The both requests were set up on the basis of everyday student life, and lending some money supposed to be more costly for respondents to comply with than lending a notebook. Nine influence

Table 1
The number of respondents in each condition

(n=216)

A set of requests		Cost of compliance with requests			
		High		Low	
		Friend	Upperclassman	Friend	Upperclassman
Friend: Notebook &		Notebook	Money	Notebook	Money
Upperclassman:		29	25	26	21
Money		30	28	24	18
Friend: Money &		Money	Notebook	Money	Notebook
Upperclassman:		29	22	30	26
Notebook		28	25	20	17
Total	114	58	47	56	47
	102	58	53	44	35

Note: The upper numbers indicate the numbers of male respondents, and the lower numbers indicate that of female respondents.

strategies were selected from four categories of influence strategy mentioned above, and those strategies that could not be used in a paper-and-pencil method were excluded.

Respondents rated the cost to comply with the requests, the possibility of their compliance using each influence strategy and perceived social power of the influencing agent on seven-point Likert-type scales.

Results

Manipulation Check

Two 2 (cost: high, low) $\times$ 2 (influencing agent: a friend, an upperclassman) factorial analyses of variance were performed on the evaluation of the cost to comply with requests for lending a notebook ($n=199$) and lending some money ($n=199$). There were significant main effects for the cost factor (notebook: $F(1, 195)=210.51$, $p<.0001$; money: $F(1, 195)=67.99$, $p<.001$) and the influencing agent factor (notebook: $F(1, 195)=19.06$, $p<.0001$; money: $F(1, 195)=25.96$, $p<.001$) for both requests. A 2 (cost: high, low) $\times$ 2 (request: lending a notebook, lending some money) factorial analysis of variance

was also performed, and there were significant main effects for the cost factor ($F(1, 394)=231.84$, $p<.0001$) and the request factor ($F(1, 394)=5.35$, $p<.05$) and a significant interaction effect for both factors ($F(1, 394)=6.96$, $p<.01$). These results confirmed the impact of the manipulation of cost factor. They also indicated that perceived cost of compliance with requests made by an upperclassman was higher than for that one made by a friend, and that perceived cost for lending some money was higher than for that one for lending a notebook in a low cost condition.

Possibility of Compliance with Requests

Multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were performed on the possibility of compliance with requests using nine influence strategies for the two requests. The between independent variables were perceived social power (high, low), cost (high, low), influencing agent (a friend, an upperclassman) and sex (male, female). The first factor was determined by the total score on the Perceived Social Power Scale. The scale was constructed from six bases of social power including attraction power (see

Table 2
Means and standard deviations of possibility of compliance with requests as a function of influence strategy and request

Request	Influence strategies								
	Simple statement	Reasoning	Promise	Threat	Debt	Role relationship	Moral appeal	Hinting	Repetition
Notebook (<i>n</i> =199)	4.46 ^d (1.75)	5.62 ^a (1.57)	5.25 ^{ab} (1.73)	2.54 ^f (1.71)	4.28 ^d (1.77)	3.19 ^a (1.76)	4.16 ^d (1.76)	5.00 ^{bc} (1.54)	4.65 ^{cd} (1.53)
Money (<i>n</i> =199)	3.70 ^{de} (1.78)	5.57 ^A (1.47)	5.06 ^{bc} (1.62)	2.35 ^g (1.65)	3.38 ^{ef} (1.79)	3.01 ^f (1.61)	3.94 ^D (1.60)	5.17 ^{AB} (1.57)	4.68 ^C (1.60)

Note: The range of possible mean scores is 1–7 with a high score indicating more compliance with the request.

Means with different subscripts differ ($p < .05$) in Scheffe's multiple comparison method.

Numbers in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Imai, 1987). High social power meant that the total score was higher than the median score.

With the use of Wilks's lambda criterion, it was revealed that the combined dependent variables were significantly affected by social power ($F(9, 175)=3.32, p < .001$), cost ($F(9, 175)=11.34, p < .001$) and sex ($F(9, 175)=2.52, p < .05$) in the case of the notebook. It also revealed a significant interaction effect of cost and sex ($F(9, 175)=2.05, p < .05$). In the case of money, the combined dependent variables were significantly affected by cost ($F(9, 174)=5.62, p < .001$) and sex ($F(9, 174)=4.27, p < .001$). These results confirmed hypothesis 3, while hypothesis 2 was confirmed in only the notebook condition. The main effect of the sex factor indicated that men were more likely to comply with requests than women.

Analyses of variance with repeated measures were performed to examine hypothesis 1 for both requests. Significant main effects for influence strategies were revealed in both conditions (notebook: $F(8, 184)=62.20, p < .001$; money: $F(8, 183)=84.89, p < .001$). With the use of Scheffe's multiple comparison method ($p < .05$), it was found that influence strategies such as reasoning, promise and hinting cause more compliance by the influence target than

threat or invoking a role relationship for both requests (Table 2). This result supported hypothesis 1.

Analyses of variance with repeated measures also revealed an interaction effect of influence strategy and cost (notebook: $F(8, 184)=6.71, p < .001$; money: $F(8, 183)=5.12, p < .001$). The results of *t*-test analyses indicated that the possibility of compliance with requests using a simple statement ($t(196)=7.49, p < .001$), reasoning ($t(194)=5.75, p < .001$), promise ($t(192)=6.04, p < .001$), threat ($t(197)=3.37, p < .001$), invoking a role relationship ($t(197)=2.81, p < .01$), moral appeal ($t(197)=5.49, p < .001$) and hinting ($t(195)=5.27, p < .001$) in a high cost condition was significantly lower than that in a low cost condition in the case of the notebook. In the case of money, possibility of compliance with requests using a simple statement ($t(197)=3.75, p < .001$), reasoning ($t(188)=6.14, p < .001$), promise ($t(196)=2.14, p < .05$) and hinting ($t(197)=2.37, p < .05$) varied as a function of cost.

A significant interaction effect of influence strategy and sex was also found (notebook: $F(8, 184)=2.57, p < .05$; money: $F(8, 183)=3.65, p < .001$). *T*-test analyses indicated that the possibility of compliance with requests using threat (notebook: $t(197)=3.15, p < .001$; money: $t(185)=$

4.47, $p < .001$), debt ($t(197) = 2.86$, $p < .01$; $t(197) = 3.68$, $p < .001$) and invoking a role relationship ($t(197) = 3.16$, $p < .01$; $t(197) = 4.07$, $p < .001$) for women was significantly lower than that for men.

Finally, multivariate regression analyses were performed to examine the effect of each social power on compliance with requests. Criterion variances were the possibility of compliance with requests using nine influence strategies, and explanatory variances were perceived cost to comply with requests and six social powers. Using Wilks's lambda criterion, the betas of perceived cost ($F(9, 178) = 18.08$, $p < .001$) for combined criterion variances were significant in the case of the notebook. In the case of money, the betas of perceived cost ($F(9, 180) = 16.43$, $p < .001$), attraction power ($F(9, 180) = 3.05$, $p < .01$) and legitimate power ($F(9, 180) = 2.36$, $p < .05$) were significant.

Discussion

Before discussing the results, the present study's methodological limitations need to be noted. Even if the influencing agent was an actual friend or an upperclassman of the respondents, the influencing attempts were hypothetical. As a consequence, the following discussion is viewed as suggestive and requires future verification using alternative methodology.

The results of the study generally supported three hypotheses. First, respondents rated the possibility of their compliance with requests depending on the influence strategy used. Influence strategies such as reasoning, promise or hinting entail more compliance than threat or invoking a role relationship. Hunter and Boster (1987) showed that the influencing agent uses the strategies that would not invoke a negative affect on the influence target, and the present study, from the perspective of the target, revealed that the target is likely to comply with requests using the former strategies.

The interaction effect of influence strategy and the cost to comply with requests was also revealed. The possibility of compliance with requests using a simple statement, reasoning, promise and hinting in a high cost condition was significantly lower than that in a low cost condition regardless of the contents of requests. The effects of debt or repetition, however, did not vary depending on the cost factor. The influence strategies that could result in compliance with requests seem to vary depending on the cost to comply.

When influence strategies that would lead to a negative affect to the influence targets were used, women were more unlikely to comply with requests than men. Women may be more sensitive to such kinds of strategies. This result seems to be consistent with the result that women as an influencing agent considered using personal/dependence and negotiation strategies more often than men (Offerman & Kearney, 1988; Offerman & Schreier, 1985).

Second, the influencing agent with high social power obtained more compliance than one with low social power in the case of the notebook. In other words, the more the influencing agent is perceived to have social power by the target, the more the agent obtains compliance from the target. Further, when the effect of each social power was examined, the effects of attraction power and legitimate power were found to be significant in the case of money.

Third, it was revealed that influence strategies with low cost to comply caused more compliance by the influence target than those with high cost. Just as Piliavin, Piliavin, and Rodin (1975) pointed out that a person tends to directly help other persons when the cost to help is low, respondents in the present study also complied with requests with a low cost.

Although the present study was conducted from a social influence perspective, it is also related to helping behavior.

Many determinants of helping behavior have been revealed. Some of them were represented by influence strategies in the present study. "Moral appeal" is a strategy to invoke a reciprocity norm (Gouldner, 1960) to the influence target, and "debt" is the one to invoke an equity norm (Adams, 1965). "Liking or ingratiation" that was not used in the present study is a method to make the target feel good (Harada, 1983; Isen, 1970, etc.). The effects of the influence strategies such as reasoning or hinting and social power of the influencing agent, however, have not been investigated in the context of helping behavior. In this sense, the present study suggests other determinants of helping behavior.

Finally, it is necessary to consider the differences of social contexts when the effects of influence strategies are investigated. The present study focused on the social influence in student life. People, however, can use special kinds of influence strategies in organizations. "Upward appeal" in Table 1 is a good example of these strategies. Pfeffer (1981) raised "use of external experts", "controlling the agenda of what is considered for decision", "cooperation and coalition formation with other subunits", "developing relationship with external groups" and so on as political strategies in organizations.

References

- Adams, J. S. 1965 Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press. Pp. 267-299.
- Cialdini, R. B., Cacioppo, J. T., Bassett, R., & Miller, J. A. 1978 Low-ball procedure for producing compliance: commitment then cost. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **36**, 463-476.
- Cialdini, R. B., Vincent, J. E., Lewis, S. K., Catalan, J., Wheeler, D., & Darby, B. L. 1975 Reciprocal concession procedure for inducing compliance: The door-in-the-face technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **31**, 206-215.
- Clark, R. E. 1979 The impact of self interest and desire for liking on the selection of communicative strategies. *Communication Monographs*, **46**, 257-273.
- Cowan, G., Drinkard, J., & MacGavin, L. 1984 The effects of target, age, and gender on use of power strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **47**, 1391-1398.
- deTurck, M. A., & Miller, G. R. 1983 Adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 543-552.
- Dillard, J. P., Segrin, C., & Harden, J. M. 1989 Primary and secondary goals in the production of interpersonal influence messages. *Communication Monographs*, **56**, 19-38.
- Falbo, T. 1977 Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **35**, 537-547.
- Falbo, T., & Peplau, L. A. 1980 Power strategies in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **38**, 618-628.
- Freedman, J. L., & Fraser, S. C. 1966 Compliance without pressure: The foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **4**, 195-202.
- French, J.R.P., Jr., & Raven, B. H. 1959 The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*. Michigan: Institute for Social Research. Pp. 150-167.
- Gouldner, A. W. 1960 The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, **25**, 161-178.
- Harada, J. 1983 The effects of positive and negative experience on helping behavior. *Japanese Psychological Research*, **25**, 47-51.
- Hunter, J. E., & Boster, F. J. 1987 A model of compliance-gaining message selection. *Communication Monographs*, **54**, 63-84.
- Imai, Y. 1987 The relationships between the perception of the influencer's social power and (A) the perception of being influenced and (B) the satisfaction with the influencer. *Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **26**, 163-173. (In Japanese)
- Imai, Y. 1989 The relationship between perceived social power and the perception of being influenced. *Japanese Psychological Research*, **31**, 97-107.
- Isen, A. M. 1970 Success, failure, attention and reaction to others: The warm glow of success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **15**, 294-301.
- Kipnis, D., Schmitt, S., & Wilkinson, I. 1980 Intraorganizational influence tactics. *Journal of*

- Applied Psychology*, **65**, 440-452.
- Marwell, G., & Schmitt, D. R. 1967 Dimension of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. *Sociometry*, **30**, 350-364.
- Miller G., Boster, F., Roloff, M., & Seibold, D. 1977 Compliance-gaining message strategies: A typology and some findings concerning effects of situational differences. *Communication Monographs*, **44**, 37-51.
- Molm, L. D. 1981 Power use in the dyad: The effects of structure, knowledge, and interaction history. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, **44**, 42-48.
- Offerman, L. R., & Kearney, C. T. 1988 Supervisor sex and subordinate influence strategies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **14**, 360-367.
- Offerman, L. R., & Schrier, P. E. 1985 Social influence strategies: The impact of sex, role, and attitude toward power. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **11**, 286-300.
- Perreault, W. D., Jr., & Miles, R. H. 1978 Influence strategy mixes in complex organizations. *Behavioral Science*, **23**, 86-98.
- Pfeffer, J. 1981 *Power in organizations*. Massachusetts: Ballinger.
- Piliavin, I. M., Piliavin, J. A., & Rodin, J. 1975 Costs, diffusion and stigmatized victim. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **13**, 289-299.
- Rule, B. G., Bisanz, G., & Kohn, M. 1985 Anatomy of persuasion schema: Targets, goals, and strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **48**, 1127-1140.
- Schank, R., & Abelson, R. 1977 *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding*. New Jersey: L.E.A.
- Schenk-Hamlin, W. J., Wiseman, R. L., & Georgarakos, G. N. 1982 A model of properties of compliance-gaining strategies. *Communication Monographs*, **30**, 92-100.
- Sheley, K., & Shaw, M. E. 1979 Social power: To use or not to use. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, **13**, 257-260.
- Shetty, Y. K. 1978 Managerial power and organizational effectiveness: A contingency analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, **15**, 176-186.
- Steffen, V. J., & Eagly, A. H. 1985 Implicit theories about influence style: The effects of status and sex. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **11**, 191-205.
- Takagi, E. 1989 Power strategies in personal relationships: A preliminary analysis. *Reports of Saitama University*, **24**, 75-90. (In Japanese)
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. 1959 *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.
- Tjosvold, D., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. 1984 Influence strategy, perspective-taking, and relationships between high- and low-power individuals in cooperative and competitive contexts. *Journal of Psychology*, **116**, 187-202.
- Wilkinson, I., & Kipnis, D. 1978 Interfirm use of power. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **63**, 315-320.
- Wiseman, R. J., & Schenck-Hamlin, W. 1981 A multidimensional scaling validation of compliance-gaining strategies. *Communication Monographs*, **48**, 251-270.

(Received Sept. 26, 1990; accepted March 22, 1991)

Appendix I
List of influence strategies

Influence strategy		Definition
Promise*	(A, E)	The influence agent offers something good to the influence target in exchange for compliance with the agent's request.
Bargaining	(B, C)	
Exchange	(D)	
Reward	(F)	
Allurement	(E)	The agent points out to the target the positive outcomes from other persons, if the target complies with the agent's request.
Pre-giving	(A)	The agent offers something good to the target before requesting.
Liking	(A)	The agent tries to make the target feel wonderful or important by smiling a lot, ingratiating and so on.
Emotion-agent	(B)	
Ingratiation	(D)	
Personal/dependence	(F)	
Buttering up	(G)	
Debt*	(A, E)	The agent reminds the target of things that the agent has done for the target in the past.
Threat*	(A, B, E)	The agent tells the target that the agent will do something negative to the target, if the target does not comply with the agent's request.
Sanctions	(D)	
Warning	(E)	The agent points out negative outcomes from other persons, if the target does not comply with the agent's request.
Pressure	(F)	
Guilt	(E)	The agent makes the target feel guilty by reminding the target of trouble with the agent in the past.
Simple statement*	(B)	The agent simply asks if the target will do what the agent wants.
Assertiveness	(D)	
Direct request	(E)	
Asking	(F)	
Reasoning*	(B, C, F)	The agent presents the target with the reasons for the agent's request.
Rationality	(D)	
Logic	(E)	
Moral appeal*	(A)	The agent tells the target that the target is immoral if the target does not comply with the agent's request.
Invoking moral principle	(G)	
Invoking a role relationship*	(G)	The agent reminds the target of an existing role relationship between the target and the agent.
Hinting*	(B, C, E)	Without directly asking the target to do what the agent wants, the agent gives the target some remarks about the agent's request.
Indirect	(F)	
Negotiation	(B)	The agent negotiates something agreeable to the target.
Compromise	(F)	
Deceit	(E, G)	The agent gives the target false reasons to make the target do what the agent wants.

Appendix 1 (Continued)

Influence strategy		Definition
Upward appeal	(D)	The agent obtains the support of higherup people to get the compliance by the target.
Repetition*		The agent repeats a simple statement several times within a certain interval.
Foot-in-the-door	(H)	First, the agent gets the target's compliance with another simple request, and then asks the target to do what the agent really wants.
Door-in-the-face	(I)	The agent intentionally gives the target a hard request and concedes if the target does not comply with the request. Actually, what the agent wants is the request after the agent conceded.
Low ball	(J)	The agent gets the target's compliance with a part of the agent's request, and then adds the other parts of the agent's requests.

Note: Alphabetical letters in parentheses indicate the following studies respectively:

A: Marwell and Schmitt (1967),

B: Falbo (1977),

C: Schank and Abelson (1977),

D: Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980),

E: Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981),

F: Offerman and Schreier (1985),

G: Rule, Bisantz, and Kohn (1985),

H: Freedman and Fraser (1966),

I: Cialdini, Vincent, Lewis, Catalan, Wheeler, and Darby (1975),

J: Cialdini, Cacioppo, Bassett, and Miller (1978).

Influence strategies with asterisks were used in the present study.

Appendix 2

The description of the request situation and nine influence strategies
(Example of the condition of "lending a notebook, low cost")

〈**The request situation**〉

You meet your friend on campus three days before the final exam. Your friend asks you to lend your notebook for a certain class so he or she can copy it by the next day. As you have already reviewed the subject and you did not take notes very carefully, you do not care very much whether you lend it or not.

〈**Nine influence strategies**〉

Simple statement: Your friend has just asked you, "Would you lend me your ____ notebook until tomorrow so I can copy it?"

Reasoning: "I missed ____ class three times. I am dying to pass the exam. I don't have any other friends who will lend me their ____ notebook, so would you lend it to me until tomorrow?"

Promise: "Would you lend me your ____ notebook until tomorrow so I can copy it? If you lend it to me, I will take you out to lunch."

Threat: "Lend me your ____ notebook until tomorrow so I can copy it. Or else..."

Debt: "Would you lend me your ____ notebook until tomorrow so I can copy it? Remember, I lent you a notebook before, didn't I?"

Invoking a role relationship: "Would you lend me your ____ notebook until tomorrow so I can copy it? We are friends, aren't we?"

Moral appeal: "Would you lend me your ____ notebook until tomorrow so I can copy it? I'd lend you mine, if you need it."

Hinting: "I missed ____ class three times, and I'm having trouble studying for the final exam. Would you do me a favor?"

Repetition: "Would you lend me your ____ notebook until tomorrow so I can copy it?" Although you refused to do it at that moment, you meet the friend again on the same day. Your friend asks you once again, "Would you lend me your ____ notebook until tomorrow?"