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Consistent with Cialdini's Negative State Relief Model it has been established repeatedly that targets of compliance-gaining attempts comply with a request to help more frequently when those targets feel guilty than when they do not feel guilty. Expanding upon this result it was predicted that to the extent that a compliance-gaining message serves as a cue to link compliance with the restoration of positive or neutral affect, the compliance rate would vary. Building upon this reasoning it was hypothesized that a positive self-feeling compliance-gaining message would be more effective in producing target compliance than would a direct request message when the target felt guilty, but that the opposite relationship would hold when the target was not feeling guilty. An experiment in which both guilt and message type were varied was designed to test this hypothesis. In the main, the data were consistent with these predictions. Key words: Compliance, Guilt, Helping, Positive Self-Feeling

In the study of interpersonal influence it is axiomatic that compliance gaining messages differ in the extent to which they are effective in gaining a target's compliance.1 A corollary of this assertion is that factors other than the structure of the message contribute to the effectiveness of a compliance gaining message. Consistent with these principles Boster, Rodriguez, Cruz, and Marshall (1995) reported that the effectiveness of a pre-giving message depended on the relationship between the influencing agent and the target. Specifically, a pre-giving message produced more compliance than a direct request control message when the influencing agent and target were strangers, but the two messages were equally effective when the influencing agent and target were friends.2 Boster et al. (1995) attribute this outcome to the norm of reciprocity either being invoked or not being invoked by the relational induction, coupled with the message induction making this norm more or less salient to the target.

The effectiveness of other compliance gaining messages, however, may be contingent upon different social, or psychological, forces. These forces include, but are not limited to, various types and magnitudes of affect that targets experience. In particular, one affective state that has been shown in past research to be associated with compliance is guilt.

Guilt is an unpleasant emotional state that arises from the perception that one has acted non-normatively, or that one has failed to act normatively (cf., Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994). In a series of three experiments Freedman, Wallington, and Bless (1967) varied guilt by inducing participants either to harm another or not to harm another. Their results indicated that participants induced to feel guilty were more likely to comply with a request to help than those who were not induced to feel guilty, even when the request was made by someone other than the harmed
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party, and even when the target of the help was someone other than the harmed party. The effect was produced, however, only when the participants' help did not require them to interact subsequently with the person who had been harmed. Freedman et al. (1967) suggest that compliance, in the form of helping behavior, functions as a means of alleviating guilt, and others opine that persons avoid interacting subsequently with the harmed party either to avoid embarrassment or because they believe that the harmed party will attempt to take advantage of them (see Carlsmit & Gross, 1969, p. 238).

In two experiments Carlsmit and Gross (1969) found similar results with a different guilt induction. Other investigators report similar outcomes (Brock & Becker, 1966; Darlington & Mack, 1966; Wallace & Sadalla, 1966). In sum, given that participants are not required to interact subsequently with the harmed party, existing data suggest that participants in whom guilt has been induced are more likely to comply than are participants in whom guilt has not been induced.

Cialdini's Negative-State Relief Model (NSR) provides one explanation for these findings (e.g., see Baumann, Cialdini, & Kenrick, 1981). Applying the NSR to the specific relationship between guilt and compliance requires postulating that guilt produces an unpleasant affective state that persons seek to relieve. In the absence of countervailing forces, such as the desire to avoid interaction with a harmed other, guilt may be relieved by replacing it with experiences that generate positive affect. A common feature of most adult experience is that performing pro-social action, such as helping, is associated with obtaining rewards. Because obtaining rewards increases positive affect, it follows that complying with a request to help increases positive affect. And, thus, it further follows that complying promotes the reduction of guilt. Participants who are not guilty have no need to relieve a negative affective state. Thus, they have less reason to comply, and as a result do so less frequently.

In past experiments the compliance requests that follow the guilt inductions have been direct (Brock & Becker, 1966; Carlsmit & Gross, 1969; Darlington & Mack, 1966; Freedman et al., 1967; Wallace & Sadalla, 1966). Direct request messages do not provide an explicit link for the target between the act of compliance and the relief of negative affect. It is hypothesized that the rate of compliance would increase if the compliance gaining message associated clearly the act of compliance with the relief of negative affect.

Positive self-feeling, one of 16 compliance gaining strategies identified by Marwell and Schmitt (1967), is a message strategy that promises to enhance the probability of this association. A positive self-feeling message is of the form, "You'll feel better about yourself if you comply" (Marwell & Schmitt, 1967, p. 357). The form of the message makes salient to the influence target that there is a link between compliance and the relief of negative affect. Therefore, when guilt is induced, a positive self-feeling message is expected to increase the rate of compliance relative to a direct request.

On the other hand, when guilt is not induced, the positive self-feeling message makes little sense to the target of the compliance gaining attempt. In the absence of a negative affect induction targets are likely to be in either a neutral or positive affective state. Attempting to understand why they should feel better about themselves when their present affective state is either neutral or positive enhances the probability that they will make inferences that decrease the effectiveness of the influence attempt. For example, they may conclude that the influencing agent is
being manipulative, with the perceived threat to behavior freedom producing psychological forces that subsequently reduce the probability of compliance (e.g., see Brehm, 1966).

Suppose then that an experiment is performed in which some persons are induced to feel guilty and others are not. Subsequently, an influencing agent either makes a direct request for help or requests help employing a positive self-feeling message. The preceding reasoning implies that those targets in whom guilt has been induced will help to a greater extent if the request is made with a positive self-feeling message than if it is made with a direct request. But, those targets in whom guilt has not been induced will help to a greater extent if the request is made directly than if it is made with a positive self-feeling message. Refocusing this prediction to describe the hypothesized effect of guilt on compliance, the effectiveness of a direct request will be greater if the target has received a guilt induction than if the target has received no guilt induction. The positive self-feeling message will also produce more compliance when the target receives a guilt induction than when the target receives no guilt induction, but this difference should be substantially more pronounced than that found for the direct request message. In sum, guilt and message type are predicted to combine in a non-additive manner to affect the extent to which targets comply with requests for help.

In addition to these predictions a feature of the NSR may be tested by obtaining self-reports of relief following the compliance gaining attempt. To the extent that the NSR is correct an increase in compliance should produce a proportionate increase in relief. Because compliance serves to mediate the relationship between the predicted guilt by message type interaction and relief, the model depicted in Figure 1 follows logically. An experiment was designed to examine these predictions.

Method

Participants

In exchange for course credit 61 undergraduates enrolled in communication courses at Michigan State University agreed to participate in this experiment. Most were female (69%) and Caucasian (79%). The mean age was 22 years ($s = 11.83$ years).

Design

A 2 (no guilt, guilt) × 2 (direct request message, positive self-feeling message) independent groups design was employed. Participants were assigned randomly to treatments yielding 16 $P$s in the no guilt, direct request message condition; 14 $P$s in the no guilt, positive self-feeling message condition; 14 $P$s in the guilt, direct request message condition; and 16 $P$s in the guilt, positive self-feeling message condition.

Procedure

As the experimenter ($E$) escorted the $P$ into the laboratory a confederate ($C$) seated in the corner of the room appeared to be preparing for an examination.
Addressing the C the E said, "I'm sorry for interrupting you, but this person (the P) is going to be filling out some questionnaires in the room with you." Addressing the P the E then remarked, "(the C) here is taking a make-up exam from last semester. If you don't mind, it makes it easier on me to have both of you in one place; less running around for me." Speaking to the C the E then asked, "Are you ready to begin?" After the C responded affirmatively the E continued, "Then please put all your books and notes away before beginning. Right now there is a student in my office who really needs a few minutes of my time, but (turning to the P) since you're here I guess I can trust you (the C) to be honest. Do you have any questions?" After both the C and P indicated that they had no questions the E remarked to the C, "By the way I'm leaving town tomorrow morning, but I'll grade the test and put your grade in the secretary's mailbox tonight. Since I won't be around, the secretary promised me that you'll get your grade in the mail soon. Okay? I'll be back in about 20 minutes to see how the two of you are doing." After the P was instructed that the questionnaire dealt with social attitudes, and that responses to the questionnaire would be kept anonymous and confidential, the E exited the laboratory.

In the guilt condition the C waited several minutes after the E left the room before asking the P, "Did she say she'd be gone for 20 minutes?" After the P responded the C took his books from the corner, pulled out some notes and began to copy answers. Subsequently, he pulled out his textbook, read a passage, and began answering another question. The C exhibited similar behavior intermittently for 10 minutes. At this point the E reentered the room. Catching the C cheating she said, "What the Hell are you doing?" The C attempted to persuade the E that he was not cheating, but she did not accept his explanation. Escorting the C from the room she said, "Save it. Grab your things, let's go up to my office." While exiting the room, and without giving the P an opportunity to reply, the E turned to the P and said in an accusatory tone, "You really should have told me this was going on."

In the no guilt condition the C did not cheat. Thus, when the E reentered the room she asked if he had completed his examination. When he answered affirmatively she offered to grade it immediately, which provided a reason for the E and C to leave the room.

The message induction was performed by a second E who was blind to the experimental condition. A few minutes after the E and C had departed for the E's office she entered the room and said, "I'm taking over for (the first E). You can turn in your survey to me when you are finished." After the P completed the questionnaire the second E solicited the P's involvement in a second experiment.

In the direct request condition the second E said

By the way there's another graduate student in our department who is working on her dissertation and is collecting data. So we've been asking people to participate and to recruit their friends to participate in the study. If you would like to participate, indicate that on this form and I'll give it to her. By the way, there's no extra credit.

In the positive self-feeling condition the request was framed in the following manner,

By the way there's another graduate student in our department who is working on her dissertation and is collecting data. So we've been asking people to participate and to recruit their friends to participate in the study. If you would like to participate, indicate that on this form and I'll give it to her. By the way, there's no extra credit, but it's something that you could feel really good about if you could help us out on this one.
Ps were then asked to complete a form indicating their willingness to participate in a future study, and to provide the number of friends that they would be willing to recruit for the experiment. After completing this task they were debriefed fully, asked to complete a short questionnaire, thanked for their participation, and pledged to silence regarding the nature of the experiment.

**Instrumentation**

Two measures of compliance were obtained. First, Ps were asked if they were willing to participate in a future experiment for no credit, and second, if they agreed to participate, they were asked to indicate the number of friends, if any, that they would be willing to recruit and bring to the experiment.

The post-experimental questionnaire consisted of five semantic differential items, each with seven-point response scales, which were designed to assess the effectiveness of the guilt induction. Ps were asked to report how they felt after the E and C left the room together on a set of scales anchored by the descriptors “responsible/not responsible,” “liable/not liable,” “negative/positive,” “bad/not bad,” “guilty/not guilty.” The first two items examined cognitive responses to the activities which occurred in the experiment, the third and fourth items provided indicators of affective reactions, and the final item asked Ps to report directly on the extent to which they felt guilty. Items were coded so that a lower score corresponded to more negative affect or a more negative judgment.

Subsequently, Ps were asked to report how they felt after they had agreed or not agreed to comply with the request to participate in another experiment. These four items were accompanied by seven-point semantic differential response scales. They were preceded by the stem, “I felt . . . ,” and anchored by the descriptors “really good/really bad,” “very positive/very negative,” “very helpful/not helpful at all,” and “horrible/not horrible at all.” These items were coded such that a lower score indicated more positive affect, or, put another way, more relief.

**Results**

The distribution of responses to the single item guilt measure was bimodal with a mean of 5.14 and a standard deviation of 1.90. These data are broken down by guilt and message type, and presented in Table 1. A $2 \times 2$, guilt by message type, analysis of variance performed on these data produced a substantial main effect for guilt ($F(1, 54) = 6.94, p < .02, r = -.33$) with no other substantial or statistically significant effects emerging. An analysis of the means indicated that Ps in the guilt condition reported feeling more guilty ($M = 4.53, P(3.79 \leq \mu \leq 5.27) = .95$) than Ps in the no guilt condition ($M = 5.79, P(5.24 \leq \mu \leq 6.34) = .95$).

The two affect items (bad/not bad and negative/positive) were summed to form an index. This index was distributed bimodally with a mean of 10.26 and a standard deviation of 3.56. The reliability of this index was estimated by Cronbach’s $\alpha$, and was found to be .84. These data are broken down by guilt and message type, and presented in Table 1. A $2 \times 2$, guilt by message type, analysis of variance performed on these data produced a substantial main effect for guilt ($F(1, 54) = 10.85, p < .01, r = -.40, r^2 = -.44$) with no other substantial or statistically significant effects emerging. Inspection of the means indicated that Ps in the guilt condition reported feeling more negative affect ($M = 8.90, P(7.62 \leq \mu \leq 10.18) = .95$) than Ps in the no guilt condition ($M = 11.71, P(10.62 \leq \mu \leq 12.80) = .95$).
The two items designed to tap cognitive reactions to the experiment, responsible/not responsible and liable/not liable, were summed to form an index. The distribution of responses on this index was skewed negatively with a mean of 10.55 and a standard deviation of 3.54. The reliability was estimated as $\alpha = .89$. These data are broken down by experimental condition, and presented in Table 1. A $2 \times 2$, guilt by message type, analysis of variance performed on these data yielded no effects that were substantial or statistically significant.

The overwhelming majority of the $P$s (77%) complied with the request to sign up for the future experiment. A $2 \times 2$, guilt by message type, analysis of variance performed on these data produced a main effect for the guilt induction with no other effects that were either substantial or statistically significant. An examination of condition means (see Table 1) indicated that $P$s in the guilt condition were more likely to comply with this request (90%) than $P$s in the no guilt condition (63%). The high rate of compliance in the guilt condition rendered this dependent measure relatively insensitive to the impact of the message induction.

The number of friends that $P$s agreed to recruit and bring to the future experiment, however, proved to be more sensitive to message effects. Responses to this request ranged from zero to five, and were skewed positively with a mean of 1.02 and a standard deviation of 1.43. Breaking down this measure by guilt and message type (see Table 1) suggested that when $P$s were not induced to feel guilty, those exposed to the direct request message agreed to recruit and bring more friends ($M = .88$, $s = 1.50$) than did those exposed to the positive self-feeling message ($M = .50$, $s = 1.09$). But, when $P$s were induced to feel guilty, those exposed to the positive self-feeling message agreed to recruit and bring more friends ($M = 1.69$, $s = 1.45$) than did those exposed to the direct request message ($M = .93$, $s = 1.49$). Moreover, the direct request message resulted in $P$s agreeing to recruit and bring only slightly more friends when $P$s were induced to feel guilty ($M = .93$) and when they were not induced to feel guilty ($M = .88$); whereas, the positive self-feeling message resulted in $P$s agreeing to recruit and bring in more friends (by more than a factor of three) when they were induced to feel guilty ($M = 1.69$) than when they were not induced to feel guilty ($M = .50$).

A contrast analysis (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1985) was performed to test the specific
guilt by message type interaction that was predicted. A contrast of \( z \) was assigned to the guilt, positive self-feeling message condition; \(-2\) was assigned to the no guilt, positive self-feeling message condition; \(+1\) was assigned to the guilt, direct request message, and \(-1\) was assigned to the no guilt, direct request message condition. This analysis indicated that there was a substantial effect for the predicted interaction model \( F(1, 56) = 4.25, p < .05, r = .26 \), and that there was a trivial amount of residual explained variation \( F(2, 56) < 1.00, \text{ ns} \). Thus, this analysis indicates that the data are consistent with predictions.

Notwithstanding this outcome, and considering the relatively low power of statistical significance tests performed on small sample data, inspection of the means in Table 1 suggests that the effectiveness of the direct request message in the guilt condition differs only trivially from its effectiveness in the no guilt condition. Therefore, a second contrast analysis was performed. In this analysis it was posited that the direct request message was equally effective both in the guilt condition and in the no guilt condition, both conditions receiving contrast weights of zero. Furthermore, the positive self-feeling message was postulated to be more effective when Ps were guilty than when they were not guilty, the former receiving a contrast weight of \(+1\) and the latter receiving a contrast weight of \(-1\). Finally, from the preceding contrast weights it follows that the positive self-feeling message was presumed to be more effective than the direct request message when Ps were guilty; whereas, the opposite outcome was claimed when Ps were not guilty. The results of this analysis indicated that this model was consistent with the data as well \( F(1, 56) = 5.11, p < .05, r = .29 \), and that residual explained variation was trivial \( F(2, 56) < 1.00, \text{ ns} \). This model produces only slightly better fit than the previous model, and the difference is likely attributable to sampling error.

The four items that asked Ps to report how relieved they felt after either complying or not complying with the request (really good/really bad, very positive/very negative, very helpful/not helpful at all, horrible/not horrible at all) were summed to create a four item index. These responses were distributed normally with a mean of 13.14 and a standard deviation of 4.45. The reliability was estimated as \( \alpha = .91 \).

Because it was expected that agreeing to recruit and bring friends to the future experiment would mediate the relationship between the experimental inductions and how relieved one felt, the same pattern of means should be found for self-reported feelings of relief as for the number of friends the Ps agreed to recruit and bring to the future experiment. In fact, this relationship was found. When Ps were not induced to feel guilty, those exposed to the direct request message reported more relief \( M = 13.11, s = 5.23 \) than did those exposed to the positive self-feeling message \( M = 14.85, s = 5.13 \). But, when Ps were induced to feel guilty, those exposed to the positive self-feeling message reported more relief \( M = 11.20, s = 3.67 \) than did those exposed to the direct request message \( M = 13.4, s = 3.22 \). Furthermore, the direct request message resulted in equivalent feelings of relief when Ps were induced to feel guilty \( M = 13.33 \) and when they were not induced to feel guilty \( M = 13.40 \); whereas, the positive self-feeling message resulted in Ps reporting more relief when they were induced to feel guilty \( M = 11.20 \) than when they were not induced to feel guilty \( M = 14.85 \).

Employing the second set of contrasts employed in the analysis of the preceding dependent measure \(+1\) in the guilt, positive self-feeling message condition; \(-1\) in the no guilt, positive self-feeling message condition; and 0 in both the guilt, direct
request message and no guilt, direct request message conditions) produced a substantial effect for the model \(F(1, 56) = 4.63, p < .05, r = .27, r^2 = .28\), and trivial residual explained variation \(F(2, 56) < 1.00, \text{ns}\). Hence, these data were consistent with this model.

Finally, the hypothesis that compliance mediated the relationship between the experimental inductions and relief (see Figure 1) was tested. From the mathematics of this causal model it follows that, if ordinary least squares estimates are employed, the correlation between the interaction model and relief is the product of the correlation of the interaction model with compliance and the correlation of compliance with relief. The former correlation was .29, and the latter correlation was -.60. Thus, the predicted correlation between the interaction model and relief was \(.29)(.60) = .17\). The obtained correlation between the interaction model and relief was .27, resulting in an error of prediction of .10. This error is trivial, and well within sampling error of zero \(X^2(1) = .58, p > .05\). Therefore, the model was consistent with the data.

Discussion

It was hypothesized that the effect of guilt on compliance would be contingent on the type of compliance gaining message employed, or put another way, the effect of the type of compliance gaining message on compliance would be contingent on the extent to which the Ps felt guilty. Employing the number of friends that the Ps agreed to bring to a subsequent experiment as a measure of compliance, the data were consistent with this prediction in the main. Guilty Ps complied more when their help was solicited with a positive self-feeling message than when the request was direct; whereas, control Ps complied more when their help was solicited directly than when they received a positive self-feeling message. Focusing on the message the effectiveness of the direct request did not vary substantially as a function of the guilt of the Ps; whereas, the positive self-feeling message was much more effective when Ps were induced to feel guilty than when they were not induced to feel guilty.

Employing the dichotomous measure of compliance the results of past guilt experiments were replicated. Namely, guilty Ps complied more frequently than did those Ps who were not induced to feel guilty. There was not a substantial message effect for this measure, suggesting the possibility that a more sensitive measure, such as the number of friends one agrees to bring to the experiment, is required to observe any message effects that exist.

Additionally, reasoning from the NSR Model, it was hypothesized that the extent to which the P complied would mediate the non-additive relationship between the guilt and message inductions and feelings of relief. The data were also consistent with this prediction. The more friends Ps agreed to bring to the fictitious experiment the more relief they reported, the magnitude of these correlations being consistent with the causal model depicted in Figure 1.

The results of this experiment expand the compliance gaining corpus. Most important, they indicate that the magnitude of compliance that one might expect to obtain from a guilty target is affected by the type of compliance gaining message employed. They also suggest the possibility that the positive self-feeling message might be particularly effective with a guilty target, and the positive self-feeling message might be particularly ineffective with a target lacking guilt. Caution must be exercised, however, when forming conclusions regarding the effectiveness or ineffec-
tiveness of the positive self-feeling message. There is a large pool of compliance gaining messages available to influencing agents. Subsequent experiments may show some messages more effective than positive self-feeling in gaining the compliance of guilty targets, and some messages less effective than positive self-feeling in gaining the compliance of target who are not guilty.

Nevertheless, when targets of social influence are guilty there are reasons to expect self-feeling to fare well relative to other compliance gaining messages. When interacting, people exchange messages. Some of these messages may bring about forces that disrupt the psychological equilibrium in at least one of the actors. To the extent that an influencing agent's compliance gaining message can serve as a cue to link the target's compliance with the restoration of equilibrium that message will be successful in gaining the target's compliance. For instance, in the guilt condition of this experiment a comment from the E implied that the Ps' failure to report the C's cheating was a norm violation. The effect of this message may have been to change the valence of Ps' emotions from a positive or neutral equilibrium state to a negative emotional state, specifically guilt. The subsequent positive self-feeling message may have been more effective than the direct request because it associated compliance with restoring emotional equilibrium more clearly than did the direct request. Put differently, viewing the P as an active solution-oriented organism facing the problem of restoring positive or neutral emotional equilibrium the positive self-feeling message provided a clearer cue for solving the problem than did the direct request.

Alternatively, interaction may not produce messages that lead to a disruption in psychological equilibrium, and in the absence of such a disruption a compliance gaining message that implies that a disruption occurred is nonsensical. When persons attempt to make sense of such messages, counterproductive psychological forces may be activated. For instance, in the no guilt condition of this experiment the positive self-feeling message suggests that the second E is aware that the P has done, or failed to do, something that resulted in the P experiencing negative affect. Because Ps have not acted, or failed to act, in such a manner, this statement is likely to be confusing. Thus, Ps are required to make sense of it, and to do so rapidly, so that they can provide a thoughtful response to the second E's request. There are several ways in which Ps can make sense of the positive self-feeling message. For example, they can conclude that the E is attempting to be manipulative as a means of obtaining research participants, or they can conclude that the E has mistaken them for the C. In both cases compliance is less likely than if the second E made a direct request.

Finally, it is important to note that the effects reported in this manuscript are contingent upon certain features of the experimental context. For instance, it has been noted that the effect of guilt on compliance occurs only when the complying act does not require the P to interact with the harmed party. It should also being recognized, however, that additional contingencies may exist, and are worthy of future experimentation. For example, in all of the experiments examining the impact of guilt on compliance the request is easily able to be construed as pro-social (e.g., signing up for a study or making telephone calls for an environmental cause). To our knowledge no experiment has examined if guilt increases compliance when the request is clearly anti-social (e.g., to steal or to lie, and, if so, what type of compliance gaining message would promote or attenuate compliance under these conditions). Such experiments will begin to enhance the knowledge base in this area of interpersonal influence.
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Notes

1 In this context the term "compliance" is used to indicate a condition in which targets' conformity is obtained irrespective of their attitudes being modified. Frequently, helping behavior is labeled compliance if it is obtained in response to an explicit request; whereas, helping behavior is labeled altruism if it is obtained in the absence of an explicit request (Konecni, 1972, p. 31; see also Rawlings, 1968; Regan, 1971; Regan, Williams, & Sparling, 1972). This distinction will be maintained in this paper.

2 When the influencing agent and target were friends the message effect was ambiguous. Boster et al. (1985, p. 481) note that when the influencing agent and target were friends the data did not allow the equal effectiveness model to be distinguished from one in which the direct request message was more effective than the pre-giving message. The small mean difference in the friends condition, approximately one-fifth of a standard deviation, suggests that the hypothesis of no difference between the direct request and pre-giving messages is more plausible.

3 Alternative explanations of the relationship between negative affective states and compliance are discussed by Carlson and Miller (1987; see also, Cialdini & Fultz, 1990; Miller & Carlson, 1990). The Carlson and Miller (1987) analysis notwithstanding, it is not clear that the Attentional Focus Model explains the guilt experiments as well as the NSR, because it is unlikely that attention is being directed outward toward the woes of others, and not inward toward one's own negative affective state. Similarly, it is unlikely that the guilt experiments produce the conditions necessary for the Responsibility/Objective Self-Awareness Model to explain these results (see Carlson & Miller, 1987, pp. 92–93).

4 The reduced degrees of freedom in the denominator of the F test result from two F not completing the dependent measure. In subsequent analyses the lower degrees of freedom in the denominator are also due to missing data.

5 Confirmatory factor analyses were performed to test the content validity of the affect, cognition, and relief items. The data were consistent with this three factor model. These analyses can be obtained from the first author.
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