

Reciprocal Concessions Procedure for Inducing Compliance: The Door-in-the-Face Technique

Posted on September 22, 2018

Overview of the Door-in-the-Face Technique

This article was published in the “Journal of Personality and Social Psychology” by a team of researchers who have conducted three experiments to test the effectiveness of the rejection rather than the moderation procedure. (Cialdini et al., 1975) Some different techniques used by past researchers were also used. Freedman and Fraser investigated the foot-in-the-door method in 1966. Another work on reciprocation was completed by Gouldner in 1960. It was the investigation of the concept of reciprocation which explained that this concept exists in approximately all societies. Chertkoff and Conley, in 1967, also conducted an experiment in which the bargaining situation is described and its effect on the opponent’s concessions. In the very next year on this study, Komorita and Brenner also conducted research in which they concluded that if one individual reaches a fair price, the others don’t find it compelling overall to agree on it.

Reciprocal Concessions and Compliance

In a precise explanation, the paper is composed after the experiments in which the authors have conducted three tests in which initially, an extreme favor is asked, which is commonly rejected, and then the smaller favor is requested, which is accepted. This technique is known as the rejection-then-moderation procedure. They verified that by understanding the other person’s strategy by self-perception would be useful. Some separate experiments were conducted to help the reader understand the primary purpose of the paper and the tests being performed.

Experiment One on Initial and Smaller Requests

The first experiment was to check the efficiency of inducing compliance. The main experiment theme was that the individual who initially requested an extreme favor and refused would find acceptance on the smaller request rather than the person who only applied for a more modest request. Seventy-two individuals were included, and both male and female gender were included. The meetings and interviews with university students were conducted (Interview technique for the collection of data). The prediction was that the initial central theme would be correct. Results explained that none expressed a positive response towards extreme favor. 50% refused entirely; there was only 25% of

the exposure control, and 16% approved a smaller request.

Experiment Two on Requester Identity

In the second experiment, the scenario is slightly changed. One person will conduct the first request for the extreme favor, and the second person will undertake the second request for the smaller favor. The targeted individual would not perceive enough conceding, and thus, there would be no reciprocation mediated in the tendency. In total, fifty-eight participants contributed to the study. They were all male candidates. Experimenter 1 asked for an extreme favor, and Experimenter 2 asked for a smaller favor. The prediction was similar to the experiment 1, but the results were entirely different. There was rejection-moderation condition compliance was 55%. The two requester control was 10.5%, and the smaller request control was also 31%. These results significantly favored the first experiment.

Experiment Three on Control Conditions

The third experiment was different from the first two. In this experiment, the two requests of favor were being asked by the two different tests. Both requests were the smaller favors. Seventy-two participants were included in this experiment, and both male and female participants were included. The third experiment resulted comparatively close to the first experiment. The compliance was in the Rejection-moderation condition of 54%. The Equivalent request control was only 33.3, and similarly, the smaller request was only controlled at 33.3%. The results included that 22 out of 24 subjects responded to both requests similarly.

Comparative Findings of the Experiments

In a general discussion, all the experiments are analyzed and discussed in detail. It is evaluated that all three tests have indicated that the proposal of the extreme request and then moving towards the smaller request after rejection increases compliance with the smaller request as it is easy to handle. This effect is explained to be highly applicable and powerful for inducing compliance. (Spielman et al., 2020) The study of Frebyman and Fraser conducted in 1966 shows that the tendency seen in the method of the foot-in-the-door is similar to the experiments performed in this study. It is preferred that the critical request be counted as a smaller request than the initial request. The requester would not be entertained for the critical request, mostly, even if it is asked initially. These methods are highly studied and are practiced in the common world. The rejection-then-modification procedure has another benefit in that it is effective and would provide positive results in the average life.

Psychological Basis of Compliance

The feelings of the targeted person are also discussed as an advantage towards the outcome of the interaction. Benton, Kelley, and Liebling's study, conducted in 1972, explains that the person who has applied for the request will feel more confident and relaxed with the outcome of the specified techniques. The bargaining is aided by the opponents who demand the maximum, moderate, and failure and get some payoff for themselves in an allocation of the agreement.

Implications for Future Research

The end of the discussion proceeded with future research guidance in which operationalization and moderation from the more significant and extreme requests to the smaller ones' benefits are explained. The two concepts are being discussed in which the target will no doubt be perceived, and the second one revealed that they would only be gained by the process being discussed above. Further investigation is required to determine whether the aspects of concession induce compliance involve the granting of something, or anything like that, or maybe both.

References

- 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(2), 206-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076284>
- Spielman, R. M., Jenkins, W. J., & Lovett, M. D. (2020). Psychology 2e. OpenStax. <https://openstax.org/details/books/psychology-2e>