



**LUNDS**  
UNIVERSITET

Department of Psychology

## **Pay for it and love it more:**

A comparative study in marketing psychology  
between the two campaign methods Pay What You  
Want and Free

**Erica Jostrup & Emina Salic**

PSYK11 - Bachelors Course in Psychology, 2015

Instructor: Åse Innes-Ker

Examinator: Arvid Erlandsson

*The Swedish version was graded*

## **Abstract**

This thesis examines whether the marketing procedure Pay What You Want (PWYW) has a stronger positive influence on a consumer's attitude towards a product in relation to free product trials (FREE). This was studied on students of Lund University with the tool SC-IAT. While FREE gives the product away without further ado, PWYW allows the consumer the freedom to buy a product at any amount of their choosing. No significant change in attitude was found. The amount of money participants were willing to pay could only partially be predicted by the degree of recognition and not by any explicit measurement of attitude. However, the consumer is affected by the perceived cognitive dissonance: While the customer's internal *homo economicus* pushes them to pay the smallest possible amount, the self-image prevents them from imposing on the offer to their own advantage. Marketers of PWYW are recommended to focus on achieving acceptance of the offer, rather than what amount the consumer is willing to pay. Further studies exploring the relationship between internal dissonance and the size of the payment is proposed.

Keywords: Cognitive Dissonance, Self-image, Homo Economicus, Free, Pay What You Want, Attitude, Marketing Psychology, Campaign method, SC-IAT

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Background & Theory .....	6
FREE .....	6
PWYW .....	7
Three cognitions .....	7
<i>Cognitive dissonance</i> .....	8
<i>Payment Commitment</i> .....	9
<i>Self-image</i> .....	9
Previous research .....	10
FREE .....	10
PWYW .....	10
Method .....	11
SC-IAT .....	11
Purpose .....	12
Hypothesis .....	12
<b>Pilot study.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Method.....	13
Participants .....	13
Instruments .....	13
Design.....	13
Procedure.....	15
Ethics.....	15
Results .....	15
Data editing and correlation .....	15
Words .....	15
Discussion.....	16
Explicit measure.....	16
Words .....	16
Corrections prior to the experiment .....	16

<b>Experiment.....</b>	<b>18</b>
Method.....	18
Participants .....	18
Instruments .....	18
Design.....	18
Procedure.....	19
Ethics .....	20
Results .....	20
Data editing .....	20
Differences based on manipulation .....	20
Explicit measure .....	21
PWYW and price .....	21
Words .....	21
Order effect .....	22
<b>General discussion.....</b>	<b>23</b>
Cognitions.....	23
Cognitive dissonance.....	23
Normality .....	24
Self-image .....	24
Attitudes .....	24
Ambivalence.....	24
Choice of method .....	25
Strengths and weaknesses .....	25
Exclusion of participants .....	26
Price.....	26
The words of the test .....	26
The pictures of the test .....	27
Order effect .....	28
The design of the manipulation .....	28
Explicit measures .....	29
Validity.....	29

Tips for future marketers .....	30
Further research .....	30
Conclusion .....	31
<b>References .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>35</b>

## Introduction

In an increasingly dynamic market, a great demand for more cost-effective and smart marketing solutions is in place, especially when a new product is launched. Studies show that in the encounter of a new product, the consumer makes up their mind of it in a matter of a few seconds (Phillips, 2013; Kuys, Thong & Melles, 2010), which underlines the importance of an effective marketing method.

Giving out free samples is a common form of marketing which marketers are struggling to make profitable (Doctrine & Tsiros, 2013). Another method is the "Pay What You Want"(PWYW) method. In contrast to FREE, PWYW means that the consumer receives an offer to pay any amount, even zero, in order to obtain a product (Armstrong Soule & Madrigal, 2014). Both approaches appear as a gift to the customer. The difference is that in FREE, everyone gets the gift whereas in PWYW, it depends on the consumer's conditions whether or not the gift is received.

The question asked in this paper is whether PWYW is a more effective method than FREE. The assumption is that since PWYW requires greater reflection from the costumer due to the fact that it involves multiple cognitions such as dissonance, payment commitment and self-image, the method should stand a greater chance of grounding itself in the consumers mind and thus have a greater impact as a campaign method.

## Background & Theory

**FREE.** The method is based on the norm of reciprocal behavior, which has been a part of human nature since ancient days (Antón, Camarero & Gil, 2014). The norm is an exchange process where one party voluntarily gives or does something to another party without assuming direct reward, but embracing an expectation of experiencing the same kind of behavior back at some point (Anton et al., 2014). Simultaneously, the norm expresses the importance of returning the favor, in order to see ourselves as honest and fair people (Cialdini, pp. 20-22, 2001). One way to use this method of marketing is by initiating the exchange process, for example by giving away a free product.

Studies show that people do not always appreciate receiving services or gifts (Gbadamosi, 2009; Aronson & Aronson, p. 363, 2007). Especially not when they perceive that there is a restriction of the gesture, that the giver expects something in return. Likewise, we dislike the service or gift if we understand that the counterpart earns on it. This shows that the reciprocal norm can at times appear as restrictive and invades our feeling of freedom of choice, since it requires us to act back on the favor or gift (Aronson & Aronson, pp. 103-105,

2007). For instance, by visiting the specific store or by buying the product next time, we have returned the favor and no longer "owe" the brand anything.

The negative side of the reciprocal norm would however not be experienced when the product or favor actually is sought out for and when it is likely for the given person to purchase the product. If this is not the case, then by reluctantly being drawn into an exchange process, the person experiences an unwanted obligation to the product or brand. The consequence may be that reactance is created in which the person is trying to restore the sense of freedom, one way being by rejecting the gift (Aronson & Aronson, p. 104, 2007).

**PWYW.** Similar to FREE, this relatively new method has a reciprocal basis. Even if the gift is not obviously free, it is still an attractive offer. As previously mentioned, we feel compelled to reciprocate when someone treats us well. To obtain a good deal is equal to someone doing us a favor.

Heyman and Ariely (2004) explain that since the offer implies a financing part, it yields a different connotation than FREE. According to economic theory, homo economicus is a term used to describe how humans essentially are profit-seeking creatures and therefore strive to make decisions that give the highest revenue (Henrich et al., 2001). Unlike FREE, the consumer does not immediately receive the product. Instead, the consumer first needs to estimate to what price the product is worth paying for. Then, an amount would be subtracted from this price, in order for the consumer to take advantage of the PWYW deal and feel that a profit has been made. Finally, the consumer must pay for it.

Having the reciprocal norm in mind, it becomes difficult to make a clean profit. This wish, to appear as an honest and good person, can be a strong source of motivation for not acting selfishly and taking too great of an advantage of the deal (Armstrong Soule & Madrigal, 2014). In other words, an internal conflict is created when put in a PWYW situation: a cognitive dissonance between the desire to make a profit and the desire to see oneself as a fair person.

**Three cognitions.** The processes behind PWYW are more analytical than in FREE. Especially three cognitions are made prominent: Cognitive dissonance, payment commitment and self-image. These require the consumer to hesitate, mull through and actually evaluate the product in mind. Whereas in FREE it is unlikely that the consumer would spend a greater time and energy deciding whether to accept the product or not. However, the more energy and time that is spent on a product, the more likely is it for the customer to start liking the product and create a top-of-mind-effect which would most likely result into a purchase in the future.

**Cognitive dissonance.** In 1957 Festinger coined the term cognitive dissonance to describe an individual's internal conflict when experiencing two incompatible cognitions; ideas, attitudes, or opinions. This creates a sense of anxiety and discomfort (Aronson & Aronson p. 184, 239, 2007). Since the individual would much rather avoid the conflicting feeling, it becomes a powerful source of motivation. Aronson and Aronson (p. 182, 2007) explain that it is deeply rooted in the human nature to justify one's actions, ideas and feelings, in order to maintain the self-perception of being consistent and rational, even when its cognitions are conjointly incompatible. The theory means to describe that the human is a rationalizing rather than a rational being. The way one chooses to reduce its dissonance is by justifying the actions and thereby convincing themselves (Aronson & Aronson, pp. 182, 186-187, 2007).

After having made a difficult, time consuming or financial decision most people experience dissonance since the selected option is rarely entirely positive and the rejected option rarely entirely negative (Aronson & Aronson, p. 195, 2007). According to economic theory the rejected choice is called an opportunity cost and refers to the value of the next best option, the option the individual did not choose (Buchanan, 1999). Although no investment was made for the rejected option, the lost benefits are yet seen as a cost to the individual. Depending on whether the product is attractive for the customer or not, determines what the opportunity cost will be. If the individual declines a PWYW situation regarding an appealing product, the opportunity cost would be the product. However, if the product is undesirable the opportunity cost by accepting the product would be the money spent or the feeling of freedom; by accepting, the customer enters an involuntary exchange process. The more attractive the opportunity cost is, the more dissonance is experienced by the individual (Aronson & Aronson, p. 196, 2007). Hence, the best option for a salesman would be offering a product that is much more attractive than its price and where a futuristic exchange process would not be viewed as a burden.

Aronson and Aronson (p. 189, 2007) explain that the deeper imprinted an attitude is, the greater is the individual's ability to ignore contradicting facts. This also means that dissonance-provoking campaigns, that show the advantage of the opportunity cost, are relatively ineffective to initially strong attitudes.

Before we decide to purchase a product, we are cautious and critical of the decision (Aronson & Aronson, p. 202, 2007). It is when the decision is made that we begin reducing the dissonance by convincing ourselves of the product's high value by strengthening its positive attributes and neglecting the negative ones. Similarly, we underline the negative

attributes of the opportunity cost while we ignore the positive ones (Aronson & Aronson, p. 189, 197, 2007). A frequently referenced study on consumers' reading of ads shows that after having made a decision, the reading becomes more exclusive in order to strengthen the rationality of the individual's choice (Ehrlich, Guttman, Schönbach & Mills, 1957)

**Payment Commitment.** When the individual has decided to buy the product, he or she needs to, in a PWYW situation, make a new decision of how much they wish to spend. In a study of donations Cialdini and Schroeder (1976) showed that when the donation seeker asks for only a penny donation, and thus legitimizing such a low amount, more people choose to open their wallets. Meanwhile, it turned out that the new average donation did not differ from the old one. The study suggests that when people perceive the required payment as significantly low, they become more willing to accept the offer. To refuse the deal can be seen as a precious opportunity cost.

Another factor is the perceived irreversibility of a decision, as in when it has already been financed (Aronson & Aronson, pp. 202-203, 2007). If an individual experiences a difficulty in getting the money back, they will magnify the negative consequences of trying to revoke the purchase, even when the repurchase is possible (Aronson & Aronson, pp. 202, 204, 2007). The same experience of irrevocability occurs in PWYW, partly due to the reciprocity framework of not returning gifts, partly due to the sum that has been paid being too low to be worth the time and energy to regain it.

Even if the final price would rise and become more expensive than expected, the customer often chooses to go through with the purchase. Aronson and Aronson (p. 204, 2007) explain this phenomenon by underlining the commitment to pay for the goods. This arouses fervor and expectation of an interesting experience. Dissonance is created if the customer chooses to back out of the offer and therefore the customer avoids doing that. The same process would be underlying PWYW: The very low price leads to the consumer making a payment commitment. The reciprocity norm could, however, influence the payment and make it more expensive than expected. However, since there remains an expectation of the product, the customer chooses to complete the purchase and begin to convince oneself of the product's benefits.

**Self image.** In PWYW there is no external change in the price, because the customer decides it. How much one chooses to pay, is affected by how they want to appear to others and themselves, where a greater sum represents an image of being kind-hearted and generous (Aronson & Aronson, pp. 216-217, 2007). The most effective form of commitment occurs when a person's self-image is put into question. A selfish, greedy or ignorant action threatens

the self-confidence as it raises the question whether the person has a bad character (Aronson & Aronson, p. 236, 2007).

A study shows that even when there is a lack of an external, social pressure, people generally pay more than zero in PWYW (Armstrong Soule & Madrigal, 2014). This suggests that it is mainly their own self-image that affects how much is paid, rather than just the image of oneself that the person upholds for others. The results of Cialdini and Schroeder's (1976) donation study suggests that the low, desirable, sum legitimizes the donation whereas the dissonance in the person's self-image makes it difficult to follow through with the low payment. With this in mind, it is reasonable to believe that the same processes affects the subjects in PWYW the same way it does in the donation study; if participants make a payment commitment, the experienced dissonance would result in paying more than the minimum possible.

### **Previous research**

**FREE.** Free sampling has been studied in several different forms. It has been shown that customers value the products higher and attribute more positive advantages to products that have been obtained for free than goods that have been drastically discounted (Shampanier, Mazar & Ariely, 2007). However, there is also a risk that the customers experience the product as less worth when it is given away for free. A price reduction may signal that the product is of lower quality and therefore perceived superfluous (Kim, Natter, & Span, 2009).

**PWYW.** The method is relatively new and unexplored; thus our research contributes with new, valuable information into the area. PWYW is a kind of campaign that involves a revenue for the company and even resulted into exceeding the fixed pricing revenue (Kim et al., 2009; Chao, Fernandez, & Nahata, 2014). Thus, the method is less risky in comparison to FREE where the company does not receive any directly related revenue.

Research done on PWYW has hitherto proven to increase sales and to spread the word about a product sold by PWYW method (Kim, Natter, & Span, 2014). Thus there is a public interest in the method itself and not only the purpose; the product. This implies a risk of a novelty effect influencing the outcome; where a positive result is due to a temporary increase in interest and commitment to the new approach and not because the campaign approach is better.

The PWYW method increases the seller's trustworthiness in the way that it signals that the company is confident in its costumers and products, that the goods they sell have a

sufficient value and they are therefore not afraid of the customers' own pricing. The relationship and interaction between the buyer and the customer is therefore of great importance.

The norm of reciprocity affects the pricing situation and helps customers to establish a normative pricing level (Mak, Zwick, Rao & Pattaratanakun, 2015). Furthermore, a difference in online and face-to-face behavior has been noticed. Even though both have proven to work well, a personal encounter leads to higher pricing (Kim et al., 2009). This is explained by the researchers with the theory of social desirability, the desire to seem generous, rather than greedy. Considering the previous chapter regarding self-image, it can be concluded that both self-image and social desirability affects PWYW positively and even more so when put together.

## **Method**

**SC-IAT.** To investigate the mental processes that are the basis of an attitude, an adequate tool is required. One possibility is to make an explicit measurement by asking respondents bluntly about their opinion of the product according to the different campaign methods. The problem that arises is that a lot of bias can affect the outcome and undermine the method's validity and reliability. Indirect tests are used especially when the topic is considered sensitive and there is deemed to be a risk of the subject controlling its responses (Friend & Johnson, 2015). Gregg and Klymowsky (2013) write that the respondents may have subconscious opinions that differ from their conscious and expressed attitudes. Three common examples of these are the bias; a) Social desirability bias, the individual responds what they believe the researcher wants to hear rather than what they think; b) self-enhancement bias, the individual convinces himself of an opinion that they do not really have; c) self-ignorance bias, the individual does not know and therefore expresses an attitude that they do not have (Gregg & Klymowsky 2013). One way to avoid these three biases is by indirect measurements, such as SC-IAT.

Single Category Implicit Association Test (SC-IAT) is a subtype of Implicit Association Tests (IAT). The difference is that the IAT measures the two natural opposites and the subject's attitude to one pole in relation to the opposite pole (Karpinski & Steinman, 2006). Problems arise when the researcher wishes to make a claim of the subject's attitude to one of the poles: If pole A has stronger positive associations than pole B, it means neither that the pole B is disliked nor does it mean that pole A is liked, since the data is relative. An SC-IAT focuses instead on the subject's attitude to one object in relation to positive or negative

(Karpinski & Steinman, 2006).

Using IAT in marketing purpose is a relatively unexplored field (Friend & Johnson, 2015). However, the few researches who have done it agree that the tool has great potential, especially when examining attitudes (Friend & Johnson, 2015; Gregg & Klymowsky, 2013). The method is based on reaction time and the individual's ability to create associations, which indicates the respondent's most probable opinion (Gregg & Klymowsky, 2013). In the test, the subject presses two keys, "E" and "I" in order to categorize them depending on what word or image appears on the screen. This is done as quickly and accurately as possible. Meanwhile, the reaction time is recorded and whether the classification is correct. If the individual categorizes the examined object positively faster than negative, it would indicate that the individual has more positive associations with the item than negative, which should have facilitated the classification and thus have a stronger positive attitude towards the object. Hence, SC-IAT seems to know things before the subject knows them. One advantage of the implicit test is that only a few trials are needed to demonstrate the effect. Therefore, the test is also used when the expected responses are estimated to be fleeting and therefore could indicate incorrect answers (Gregg & Klymowsky, 2013).

It is possible to argue that a consumer's attitude regarding a product is neither sensitive nor difficult to estimate. However, to date, correlations between self-reports and implicit tests have shown to be relatively high. Moreover, it has been found that when consumers are making impulse purchases, where quick decisions need to be made, the implicit tests have a predicting value (Gregg & Klymowsky, 2013). Thus are the indirect tests at the very least highly complementary to the self-assessment reports.

## **Purpose**

The purpose of the paper is to study whether PWYW method creates a greater positive implicit attitude towards a product than FREE. Additionally, the study examines the unexplored areas of PWYW and SC-IAT. PWYW has the potential of reaching a greater outburst in Sweden: With this method customers, as well as companies, may reach an understanding in which both parties feel satisfied economically, socially and psychologically.

The question at issue is: How are attitudes towards a product influenced by either receiving a free product or by being free to decide the amount to pay, and is it measurable with a SC-IAT?

## **Hypothesis**

The research hypothesis is that a greater positive attitude towards a product is created when the consumer is exposed to PWYW rather than FREE.

## Pilot study

A pilot study was conducted before the real experiment; to test and evaluate the SC-IAT we have created and see how an explicit measurement of the participants level of recognition correlates with their attitude towards the product Kivik Pear juice. Another purpose of the pilot test was to examine the validity, which was similarly made by previous IAT and SC-IAT measurements (Greenwald, Nosek & Banaji, 2003; Karpinski & Steinman, 2006).

## Method

**Participants.** The pilot study consisted of 10 acquaintances and fellow students (2 men, 8 women). The only requirements that was asked of the participants was that they had Swedish as their first language and were of legal age.

**Instruments.** The SC-IAT used to measure the participants implicit associations was created in the *E-Prime* program by two guidebooks created by Schneider, Eschman and Zuccolotto (2007a, b). The structure that the test has been designed by has previously been used by Karpinski and Steinman (2006). The completed test was run in *E-Run* to collect data and then compiled and exported to Excel and SPSS programs through *E-Merge* and *E-Data*. An explicit form was created to investigate the test's validity.

**Design.** The test consisted of two parts, each part consisting of 24 pieces of exercise measurements directly followed by the 72 critical measurements. In total each participant completed four blocks: two training blocks and two experimental blocks.

The target words that have been used in the test have been translated from English into Swedish using Nordstedts Large English-Swedish Dictionary, edited by Wiman (2007), see Appendix 1. 11 positive words and 12 negative words used by Karpinski and Steinman (2006) were selected. The word "good" was added into the list of target words, as we believe this to be an important positive word to include in the investigation since the word can both reflect the goodness in the form of benevolence, but also in terms of taste, which is an important component we aspire to measure using the test. Two inflections was also made to suit tense of the other words in the test. A complete list of words used in the pilot test is given in Appendix 2. All words appeared in small letters in the test. The test used 9 target images on both a Kivik product pear drink (2 pieces) and pears (5 pieces) and images associated with the brand such as flowering trees (1 piece) and an apple tree (1 piece). All images had the Kivik logo on them, which was used to increase the brand recognition. The tool Random Group Creator (<http://www.aschool.us/random/random-pair.php>) was used to randomize the words

and pictures that got to be in training blocks (1 & 3) and which ones were repeated more times in the test blocks (2 & 4). All words and images in the test were shown in randomized order, without compensation.

*Table 1. Word frequency in the pilot study*

Words that were repeated five times	Words that were repeated four times
underbar	tilltalande
god	trevlig
ond	kärleksfull
toppen	ful
otrevlig	ogilla
superb	fantastisk
äcklig	utmärkt
sagolik	förödelse
glad	njutbar
förskräcklig	vidrig
smutsig	hemsk
motbjudande	illamående

Participants were given 1500ms to answering by pressing the correct key, "I" or "E", for each target word and image. Feedback was used, in the form of a green O or a red X that appeared for 150ms, to highlight whether right or wrong answer had been given. Target words, pictures and feedback always appeared centered on the screen. There were also reminders in the top corners of the screen for all target words and images, to help participants to remember which key ("E" or "I") was positively or negatively associated, and which key was connected to the target pictures. If the participants took used than 1500ms to respond, a message was shown "Please answer quicker!" in 500ms, in order to create a sense of urgency and reduce the bias of awareness of their response. Written instructions were given prior to each of the four blocks in the test. In the pilot test, it meant that the participants were informed that the key "E" was always connected to the positive category and that the "I" was always connected to the negative category, and that Kivik in some blocks would be linked to positive category and in other to negative category. A translated example of one of the four initial instructions is:

Welcome to the experiment! You will see a word or an image that you need to determine whether it belongs to either a negative or a positive category. Press "E" for "Kivik" and positive category, and "I" for negative category. Press the spacebar to start!

**Procedure.** Participants were tested either individually or in groups of two. Each participant read a consent form before the experiment (see Appendix 4). They then had to answer two questions via an explicit form before doing the test. These questions asked how well they knew the brand and what their attitude towards the product was. Both questions were valued on a 10-point scale (see Appendix 3). After the participants completed the implicit test they had a chance of giving feedback of the test and describe whether they had reacted to any specific word or an image, or considered that any of them did not fit into the test.

**Ethics.** No information about the participants of the pilot study was registered other than sex and an ID number to match explicit attitudes with the result of the implicit test.

## Results

**Data editing and correlation.** People whose answers consisted of more than 20% error were excluded from the data analysis, in the same way that was done by Karpinski and Steinman (2006). This resulted in three participants being excluded. Exercise blocks (1 and 3) were excluded from the analysis. Blocks 2 and 4 were analyzed and edited in the following way: For wrong answers a penalty of 400ms + block mean was added. Answers that were missing, or answers faster than 350ms, were removed from the analysis. Mean values of the blocks 2 and 4 for all subjects and the difference between the blocks was calculated. These differences were correlated with the explicit self-assessments that the participants had filled in. A strong correlation ( $r = .778$ ,  $n = 7$ ,  $p < .05$ ) between the implicit and explicit dimensions was found.

**Words.** None of the participants had any comments regarding the words or images used in the test. Despite this, when an analysis of mistakes was made, the words "ogilla", "motbjudande" and "superb" had the highest error rate of all words in the study (ogilla 13%, motbjudande 9%, superb 8%). The number of errors was edited to correspond to the number of times the word was repeated, see Table 1 and Appendix 5. No image stood out in terms of

high error rate. No participant had any opinions about the images used in the test, they were therefore considered to work well for their purpose.

## **Discussion**

**Explicit measure.** This measure was developed to examine how well the SC-IAT corresponds to what the participants expressed. Since the attitude towards a product is not considered to be a sensitive matter to express, a high correlation was expected and also found. Although a high correlation between the explicit measures and reaction time was recorded, the reliability can be criticized, due to the low amount of participants who completed the pilot test with an error rate below the 20% limit and also considering that the explicit measure solely consists of one question. Because of these uncertainties the explicit measure should be further developed to better fit the actual experiment, in order to provide a stronger support for the eventual discoveries that will be made there. It is also known that there may be some differences between implicit and explicit results based on reasons of social desirability bias, self-enhancement bias and self-ignorance and bias that may affect these relationships (Gregg & Klymowsky, 2013).

**Words.** The negative words have proved to have a higher error rate than the positive ones. An examination of the frequency of the high error words in the Swedish language has shown to have a very low such. This can affect how easily participants can associate words and therefore their reaction times. One can also imagine that the handedness can have an impact on the difference in error between the positive and negative words. As this pilot test only used a version where the key "E" would always be connected with the positive category, and the "I" would always be connected with the negative category, one could argue that there may be a difference in how participants' reaction times and the number of mistakes looks based on the handedness they have, it is accepted evidence that handedness has a large impact on how you perform on the SC-IAT.

**Corrections prior to the experiment.** With a foundation in the results generated from the pilot study, corrections of material prior to the experiment has been carried out. To reduce the error rate it is beneficial to exclude certain words from the experiment, or to replace some of the words with others to get a more equal frequency between words. For this occasion, we believe that it is better to use the already-proven words of a similar test, which examines drinks using the SC-IAT (Karpinski & Steinman, 2006), precisely as our SC-IAT intends to do, rather than trying to find new untested words to replace the existing words with. To compensate for handedness a reverse version of the test, where "E" connected to negative

category and "I" are connected with the positive category has been added to the experiment. In other words, the actual experiment ended up having eight different variants (2x2x2) of the test. Level 1 consists of PWYW or FREE, level 2 whether the "I" or "E" will be linked to positive or negative category and level 3 whether participants starts the test pairing "Kivik" with positive or negative words. Each participant completes two versions of the test per experiment round.

Based on the feedback that was collected from the pilot study, the instructions given prior to each block was changed, as it became clear that the participants did not read them properly before each new block. Information explaining the number trials was added to the instructions, since this was a repeating question. Furthermore, a phrase was added to the instructions that read "You will do 4 trials, read the instructions prior to every test thoroughly because they will change during the experiment."

Two negative words "ogilla" and " motbjudande" and two positive words "superb" and "tilltalande" accounted for a high number of mistakes (ogilla 13%, motbjudande 9%, superb 8%, tilltalande 8%). These were removed from the test. The remaining 10 positive and 10 negative words had 8%, or less, error (see Appendix 5).

## Experiment

The experiment was carried out to examine whether it is possible to influence participants' attitudes towards the product Kivik Pear juice through the manipulations FREE and PWYW, and to examine whether attitudes can be measured with the SC-IAT. Two SC-IAT was performed by each participant, with a manipulation carried out between the two. Control was achieved by using tools for randomization, the same lab and time of day for all manipulations, and by following a semi-structured script throughout the experiment, amongst other things.

## Method

**Participants.** 70 participants (31 men, 39 women) participated in the study at the University of Lund. These were recruited around the school area. All participants were promised a lottery ticket for their participation. Likewise to the pilot study, all participants were required to have Swedish as their first language and be of legal age.

**Instruments.** The same material as in the pilot study was used in the experiment with some changes, which included an updated, extended version of the explicit test to measure attitudes. The product used for the manipulation was Kivik Pear juice from *Kivik's muster*, 25cl, with straw. The product was given away in FREE and sold in the PWYW manipulation. This product is considered to belong to the cut-price selection.

**Design.** The updated explicit form consisted of four kinds of questions; one recognition element that was used in the first version, also a semantic differential element, an emotional thermometer and a rating scale were used (see Appendix 6). The questions used in the rating scale and the emotional thermometer were translated from Karpinski and Steinman (2006), where only the brand was replaced with Kivik to suit our study. The semantic measurement was created by combining components of similar semantic differential dimensions conducted by previous studies (Karpinski & Steinman, 2006; Prättälä & Keinonen, 1984; Heise, 1970, Spence & Townsend, 2006; <http://www.indiana.edu/~socpsy/papers/AttMeasure/attitude.htm>). Once again the tool Random Group Creator (<http://www.aschool.us/random/random-pair.php>) was used to randomize what words would appear most frequent in the test.

*Table 2. Frequency of words in the experiment.*

Words that were repeated six times	Words that were repeated five times	Words that were repeated four times
trevlig	illamående	vidrig
ond	god	
ful	utmärkt	
förödelse	toppen	
sagolik	njutbar	
hemsk	otrevlig	
smutsig	förskräcklig	
underbar	glad	
kärleksfull	fantastisk	
	äcklig	

**Procedure.** The order of the eight different versions of the test had been randomized before the start of the experiment. The dialogues that took place between the subject and the researcher followed a semi-structured script (see Appendix 7). A written consent was needed in order to start the experiment.

The subjects started out by filling out the explicit survey (see Appendix 6). Once completed the participants did two of the eight versions of the SC-IAT, with a break in the middle in which the manipulation took place and the product Kivik Pear juice was presented. Participants who were assigned to the FREE group were asked if they wanted a juice. Participants in PWYW were asked if they wanted to buy a juice at the end of the experiment, to a price of their own selection. All attempts to pay right away were dismissed until later, after the experiment. However, the price they explicitly said that they were willing to pay for the product was recorded. To make the buying situation more realistic, there was a visible cash register and a card machine placed on a table in the laboratory. These were not visible during FREE. After the manipulation the break was over and the experiment continued. The participants then carried out a reversed version of the block of tests they had. After the participants completed the final block, they received a lottery ticket. The participants who were assigned to the group PWYW were told that they would not have to pay for the product and would receive it for free as a thank you for their participation. All participants were given a debriefing.

**Ethics.** All participants were of legal age and had to read and sign a written consent that explained their rights (Appendix 4) in order to participate in the study. All participants were at start assigned an ID number under which their scores, explicit answers and sex were recorded. For participants in the FREE group it was recorded whether they said yes or no to get the product for free. For participants who were randomized into the PWYW group, it was recorded if they declined the offer and what amount the participants said that they wanted to pay, even zero would have been registered, for instance if they expressed that they wanted to take advantage of this offer but pay nothing. No money was received during or after the experiment. Instead, all participants were offered the product, even those who had declined the product once before were offered again.

All participants were given a debriefing after the experiment in which the purpose of the experiment and the hypothesis were explained. Although a change in attitude towards juices is most likely not life-changing experience, it is of ethical principle essential to act in a manner of avoiding a permanent change in the subject's attitude.

## **Results**

**Data editing.** All data from the SC-IAT was edited in the same way as in the pilot test. An error rate higher than 20% led to exclusion, even if the 20% error rate was only found in one of the blocks. This resulted in five participants' results were removed from the analysis. A person's performance was mistakenly overwritten during the data collection. Two people who had a very low attitude towards Kivik on the explicit form were excluded too. These were identified by summing the percentage units of the three explicit attitude thermal parameters; emotional, rating and semantic and then ranking the participants based on negative attitude. The two participants, representing the top (expressed an initial >83% negative attitude towards the product) were of a considerable distance from the other participants on the scale and identified as outliers. Therefore the decision was made to exclude them. The participants who turned down the offer were excluded from the analysis, PWYW (n = 9) and FREE (n = 2). Independent sample t-tests was carried out gradually as participants were excluded from the analysis, which led to a great improvement but no significant results emerged. Finally, the following analyzes were made on 54 remaining participants.

**Differences based on manipulation.** An independent sample t-test was conducted to study the differences in changes made between the groups in reaction time based on the various manipulations. No significant difference was found between the groups for FREE (M = -11.46, SD = 58.32) and PWYW (M = 15.88, SD = 67.49) regarding their change in

reaction time from before and after the manipulation ( $t(52) = -1.597, p = .116, d = -.443$ , two-tailed).

**Explicit measure.** The form that examined the explicit attitudes was compiled by dividing the different dimensions in the form ( $n = 54$ ) and produce a measure of each type of question. In other words; a measure of recognition ( $M = 4.24, SD = 1.26$ ), a semantic differential dimension ( $M = 10.00, SD = 4.64$ ), an emotional thermometer ( $M = 7.74, SD = .99$ ) and a rating scale ( $M = 4.15, SD = 1.00$ ). Correlations between the different explicit measurements were made which showed that there were correlations between the emotional thermometer and all other dimensions in the explicit form. Between the semantic differential measurement and emotional thermometer, there was a high correlation ( $r = .659, p < 0.0005$ ) as well between the emotional thermometer and rating scale ( $r = .503, p < 0.0005$ ). Between recognition and emotional thermometer, there was a medium correlation ( $r = .353, p = .009$ ). All other correlations were small.

No correlations were found between the explicit dimensions and the participants' reaction times. An independent t-test showed that there was also no significant difference between the groups in any of the dimensions that constituted the explicit test (Recognition:  $t(52) = 1.542, p = .129, d = .428$ , two-tailed; Semantic differential:  $t(52) = -.350, p = .728, d = -.097$ , two-tailed; Emotional thermometer:  $t(52) = .688, p = .494, d = .191$ , two-tailed; Rating scale: the  $t(52) = -.758, p = .452, d = -.210$ , two-tailed).

**PWYW and price.** Participants in the group PWYW ( $n = 25$ ) were willing to pay between 1 and 15 SEK for a pear drink ( $M = 4.40, SD = 3.93$ ). Moderate correlations were found between the price the participants in PWYW group chose to pay and recognition ( $r = .434, p = 0.03$ ). However, there was no significant correlation between price and the semantic differential measure, price and emotional thermometer and finally price and rating scale. There was also no correlation between price and reaction time.

**Words.** In an attempt to debug the test and find a reason why no significant results were found, the words were examined in the same way as in the pilot study. The error rates of the words' used in the experiment ( $n = 20$ ) was thus calculated. Correlations between the number of errors per word the participants had in all tests and the frequency and number of letters the words have was made, no correlation was found. Unlike in the pilot study, it was possible to see that there was no longer any significant difference between the number of errors based on whether the words were positive ( $M = 9:58, SD = 2:48$ ) or negative ( $M = 9.93, SD = 1.98$ ).

**Order effect.** In another attempt to debug the test, order effects was examined. It is possible to find these effects by studying the mean values of participants' reaction times in the different experimental blocks. In block 2, prior to the manipulation, the mean of the reaction time was  $M = 621.83$  ( $SD = 81.96$ ), whereas the mean reaction times in the block 4, prior to the manipulation, it was  $M = 624.42$  ( $SD = 73.70$ ). After the manipulation was carried out, no differences can be found between the blocks, but in the mean values of the reaction times in block 2 ( $M = 609.58$ ,  $SD = 84.90$ ) and block 4 ( $M = 610.66$ ,  $SD = 70.11$ ) which were basically equal.

## General discussion

The lack of clear effects of the manipulation is clear and therefore the research hypothesis is rejected. What it is due to is less obvious, however, there are several aspects that can be discussed.

### Cognitions

Since both FREE and PWYW come across as gifts to the customer and are based on reciprocity, the methods share a certain similarity. The difference lies in the payment that PWYW requires and the conflicting cognitions, which leads to action. In unity with the theory, a manifestation of homo economicus is essential for the PWYW method's positive results. It is possible that our participants' profit-seeking homo economicus was neglected in comparison to its counterpart, the reciprocity norm. As a consequence, no dissonance is created and both methods results arise as a consequence of the same processes, hence the lack of difference in efficacy.

**Cognitive dissonance.** There is no correlation between the amount paid and attitude towards Kivik Pear juice. The paid amount thus depends on factors other than the product's amiability. A likely source in line with the theory is the customer's experience of dissonance in their self-image. The more discomfort the participant experienced in utilizing the offer, for instance being viewed as greedy or the idea of being a part of a freedom-limiting exchange process, the more the participant is likely to have paid. To confirm this theory, further studies that measure the level of discomfort in relation to the payment amount are needed. An interesting thought is whether marketers should aim to increase consumers' level of dissonance: By bringing out the inherent homo economicus, the seller can get the buyer to abuse the offer to such a low level that it mentally hurts the customer's self-image. By doing this, the seller has satisfied the consumer's homo economicus but undermined his part in the reciprocal exchange process and thereby the freedom of making independent choices. To restore this feeling, the consumer needs to buy more of the product, making the scores even. A likely consequence is the one of self-justification, where the person convinces himself or actually takes quite a liking to the product. The ethics of such marketing purpose can be questioned. Admittedly, it is a marketer's task to increase sales, profits and recognition. However, when the customer's internal psychological mechanisms used against him to such a degree where the customer socially, economically or emotionally becomes uneasy, should such excesses be avoided.

**Normality.** Previous studies of PWYW has been made mainly in the online environment and only one study to our knowledge has examined PWYW with physical products. Good results have been shown in situations where PWYW has been investigated in relation to the online market. Mak et al (2015) emphasizes the importance of consumers establishing a normative pricing on these purchases, which in an online environment is done differently than in a physical purchase situation where social factors have a greater role. This leads to concerns about whether the concept works differently with physical products than with online services and applications.

**Self-image.** Social pressure is a factor supporting a physical PWYW market rather than the online one. Admittedly, previous research has shown that lack of this in the online market still represents an average payment greater than zero dollars (Armstrong Soule & Madrigal, 2014). On the other hand, it is arguable that in the online situations, the self-image has a great role. Furthermore, this research is not implying that an external pressure is without effect; only that other cognitions play a role. A social pressure may affect PWYW to its advantage. The sellers can be seen as people the consumers do not want to seem stingy and opportunistic in front of. The participants in our study were tested separately. If an external confirmation in the form of other participants' payment sums had been available for the participant, had the final sum possibly have been different. With visible social proofs of others who face the same offer, courage and inspiration may have been gathered and consequently a greater advantage of the offer may have been made. In relation to the previously discussed topic of dissonance, this can lead to greater benefits for the marketer. When the subjects take advantage of the offer, they undergo the exchange process. Worth mentioning is that in a real PWYW situation in the shop, customers will both see and hear each other's payments, increasing the likelihood of a better effect of PWYW in reality than in our lab.

**Attitudes.** Yet another theory that was confirmed, was the one of initially strong attitudes. When the participants who initially expressed a dislike of the product were excluded from the test, we got a better result. Thus these participants experience no cognitive dissonance and become refractory to the manipulation. It is also natural that if one usually dislikes, has an allergy or never makes a purchase of juices, the person would neither be interested in a juice campaign nor belong to the target group of potential customers.

**Ambivalence.** The result can also be interpreted from Messner and Vosgeraus' (2010) theory, which indicated the risk of one interpreting the lack of impact of the IAT as evidence that the participants did not have any specific attitudes regarding the concept. The theory they

convey says it could instead be a possibility that participants have very ambivalent views of the concept measured. Participants associate thus both the positive and negative attributes just as easily to the concept. Due to this, it is possible that the manipulation might have created an effect, but that it led to a greater ambivalence in the participants' opinions rather than directing them to a specific direction. What may have influenced a greater ambivalence level is very difficult to identify, as it can be due to many different reasons.

### **Choice of method**

Since it is changes in attitudes we measure, the SC-IAT indicates a more credible result than a direct, explicit, test does. Using only an explicit test would have meant us asking the participants after the manipulations if they like the product more now than before. This approach would, in theory, be subject to at least three bias; social desirability, self-enhancement bias and self-ignorance. Moreover, it could have suggested to the participants that we aimed to limit their sense of freedom of choice and initiate an exchange process, which could lead to incorrect answers and a negative change in itself in the attitude towards the product. Furthermore, the indirect methods of SC-IAT are relatively new, unexplored ways of exploring attitudes of campaigns. The lack of recommendations and approach was evident during the collection of information.

**Strengths and weaknesses.** Using IAT in relation to marketing is a new area, which has previously not been explored to a greater extent. This makes our study particularly interesting because it is one of its kind. To our knowledge, no previous study has used a SC-IAT to contrast two different marketing methods against each other. This provides a completely new input to the research in marketing psychology.

In hindsight, we realize that we should have done the study a little differently, given the shortcomings we have seen in the analysis. More energy was needed in some elements of the preparation for the experiment, for instance testing the updated explicit measure before we took it into use. The lack of correlations between the attitude scales indicates that they do not measure the same construct. This is a great warning sign of the explicit test not being sufficiently thorough

We also should have randomized participants over experiment leaders; so that it would have been randomly selected which experiment leader would do what experiment. However, in some cases it has been required for us to assign one of us to act as experimental leader, when the participant who was assigned to a PWYW situation was a friend or acquaintance to one of the test leaders. The limited resources forced us to make a convenience sample, which

is not preferable in a serious study. We agreed that selling the item to a friend could have a big impact on PWYW results and thus tried to avoid this. In retrospect, the accuracy of this selection can be discussed, as previous research has shown that a relationship and interaction between the buyer and the customer is of great recommendation in PWYW (Mak et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2014). This raises an interesting thought on whether the results would have been different if the experimenter had performed the buying situation with a friend. Perhaps sellers or future researchers who use the PWYW method, should be encouraged to sell to friends.

**Exclusion of participants.** Exclusion of participants was partly made with the same arguments as Karpinski and Steinman (2006), in which participants with an error rate higher than 20% were excluded, but also with the argument that we only have a purpose to study participants who are potential customers. As previously stated, we only examined participants who accepted the offers and were willing to take on a payment commitment, no matter how small, since it is these that the theory supports regarding avoidable attitudes. Hence, participants who declined PWYW or FREE were excluded.

Participants who explicitly expressed that they did not recognize the product were excluded, with the argument that it is attitudinal changes through association abilities we measured in the SC-IAT; if no association exists, there is no attitude to be measured. Participants who expressed an initially strong negative attitude towards the product were excluded because of the above-described theory of initial strength of an attitude's tenacity.

**Price.** The average price given in the PWYW situations was 4.40 SEK, which is higher than the price at which the product was bought for in the store (3.33 SEK/piece). This supports earlier theories that have shown that the method can serve as revenue for the company and has also shown exceed the revenue of fixed pricing (Kim et al., 2009; Chao et al., 2014). No payment was less than 1 SEK even though it was possible.

**The words of the test.** To mimic the previously made SC-IAT, we used the same words throughout the test with minor corrections after the pilot study's results. The experimental study shows that it is not possible to find a difference in error between the positive and the negative words when they are examined by t-test. Excluding the four words with the highest error rate prior to the experiment turned thus out to even out the differences in error. Adding a compensation of handedness may have had an impact on this as well. Although the words used in the test have a significant difference in frequency, there is no difference between the positive and negative words in the number of mistakes. The word "utmärkt" sticking out after the analysis of the experiment with the highest error rate (8%) of the 20 target words, however, the word was not to be identified as a low-frequency word, or a

word that had a high letter content. It is therefore very unclear why that particular word would be seen as different from the others. It may well be due to chance.

All words did not have the same frequency in both tests, but its frequency has been taken into account when the results were analyzed. After the experiment was conducted, a database with the Swedish word frequency level came to our attention, Språkbanken Korpusstatistik (2014). This showed that the positive words used in the test were significantly more frequent in the Swedish language than the negative. The fact that the tests lacks an equilibrium of positive and negative words, may have affected the response speed and made participants generally slower to categorize negatively, as the word association was unfamiliar. However, there was no significant difference between the number of errors based on whether the word belonged to a positive or negative category, which has strengthened the validity of the test after exclusion of words after the pilot study.

It is also possible that the low number of participants who were included in the pilot study did not give a sufficiently strong foundation to base the exclusion of words on the pilot test and experiment. In retrospect, it can be criticized how the choice in exclusion of words was made. This could have been made in a way that evened out the differences between the positive and negative words in terms of frequency. The fact that the analysis of words in the test was done too late in the experiment makes it easy to see how one could have analyzed the words in a different and more thorough way to reach more equivalent words. However, it would have been both difficult and time consuming to try to find equivalent words for the replacement of those we have chosen to exclude. The advantage of making use of already tested words was that these were proven with good results, albeit in English.

**The pictures of the test.** What feeling the images of the product conveyed may have influenced the test. One participant pointed out that the positive tone of the pictures made it difficult to classify them negatively, even if the product was disliked. If participants perceived the images as entirely positive, it may have affected their ability to link images with the negative category. On the other hand, it is important to point out that this would influence the individuals with positive and negative attitude towards Kivik to the same extent and therefore would not affect the final results. Moreover, it is not realistic to display advertising images of a product with negative elements.

Furthermore, all the images in the test were at Kivik Pear juice. There were no other pictures that could have been classified as negative or positive. Likewise, there was neither the words "Kivik" nor "Pear juice" amongst the words that were to be categorized. This meant that the participants quickly automated that all the images corresponded to Kivik and then all

they needed was to keep track of the classification applied, this can also be found when the reaction times were analyzed and edited. The targets with the greatest exclusion from the analysis, due to a reaction quicker than 350ms, were pictures. In relation to the criticism in the preceding paragraph, this means that the feeling the images conveyed was of less importance since the participants rather focused on distinguishing between image and word in the test. This result has also appeared in other studies, which have shown that the target images have a faster response than target words, which leads to less effects of the test itself (Feroni & Bel-Bahar, 2010).

**Order effect.** The order effects (Nosek, Greenwald & Banaji, 2005) that can be seen in the experiment may partly explain why it is not possible to find any significant results. The results show how the participants feel a strong cognitive inertia after having to move from one type of categorization to another between the first two and the last two blocks in each experiment. The participants showed clear difficulty in changing associations after the first practice and experiment block was implemented. These effects can, however, not be seen between the blocks in the second part of the experiment, after the manipulation was carried out, the participants had in these blocks on average very similar reaction times. One can argue that the participants had by then time to understand the format of the test and had chance to practice enough for these effects to be avoided (Messner & Vosgerau, 2010). Thus the results show that the participants needed additional practice sessions prior the first experiment block presented in the test, to fully understand how the test works. It is therefore not sufficient to carry out a counterbalancing of the blocks between participants, as this experiment was designed, but it is required to create a test that avoids the cognitive inertia of each participant. The effects could have been avoided if the test consisted of more training blocks, in which participants had to change associations between positive and negative at least three times and experiment blocks had been placed later in the test, since cognitive inertia is very difficult to avoid (Messner & Vosgerau, 2010). However, there is a risk that we would have seen the effects of fatigue among the participants instead. Also, it is known to be harder and more time consuming to recruit participants to an experiment that demands more time from the participants.

**The design of the manipulation.** Although the constituent elements existed, cash register and card machine, the lab did not constitute of a natural place for purchase and we are no Kivik vendors, which could affect the strength of the manipulation. Instead, we should have given the participants the opportunity to discuss their way to a normative pricing of goods, as previously discussed in this section. The standardization of a strict laboratory using

a semi-structured script should then possibly be avoided and instead should a social interaction be promoted in order to create the best possible conditions for the PWYW method's results.

Furthermore, the implicit test measures the attitude-related associations that are stored in long term memory (Calanchini, Sherman, Klauer & Lai, 2014). A measurement too close after the manipulation may therefore have given a too immature indication of the outcome. If there had been more time and resources for the implementation of the experiment, a repeated measures study with longer time between the tests would have been preferable. With a longer time-interval between measurements larger effects of the manipulation could have been recorded, once the cognitions behind PWYW have had the chance to sink in and the participants had time in unity of the theory to reduce their dissonance and convince themselves that they made a good choice (Aronson, p . 189; 197, 2007).

**Explicit measures.** The lack of a higher correlation between the various explicit dimensions may be due to these not measuring the same construct. Many participants felt that the example ovänlig-vänlig (47%), oärlig-ärlig (44%) and obehaglig-behaglig (27%) of the semantic differential portion were irrelevant and put these to zero, as instructed. One can argue that the explicit measures only partially measures the same construct, since correlations only could be found between the emotional thermometer and the other dimensions in the explicit form. No correlations between recognition and the other dimensions was expected, but the fact that it is not possible to find any correlations between the semantic differential measurement and rating scale can be viewed as a proof that they do not measure the same construct. However, there was a certain consistency between price in the PWYW group and recognition. This could suggest that participants who knew about the product and the brand maybe already are frequent customers and therefore would know the price and are willing to pay more for a pear drink than students who were not very familiar with the product or brand.

**Validity.** The process of implementation of the experiments should also be mentioned. Since all experiments were conducted in the same venue during the same time interval of day (09:00-17:00) during one consistent week, it can be argued that the validity can be seen as high. On the other hand, there is also a severe shortage in the test that should be highlighted. Although we tried to achieve constancy by starting from a prescribed semi-structured script, a total similarity between the two test leaders was not reached. Since only the participants and not the test leaders were randomized before the start of the experiment, the idea was for each test leader to conduct every other test. This system was later transformed into one of the test leaders only carrying out the PWYW version of the

manipulation and the other mainly the FREE version, since one leader felt more comfortable in taking on the vendor position. This is a clear weakness of the experiment. Furthermore, a part of the recruitment was based on a convenience sample. This was due to us working under a deadline, had restricted resources and that the interest of the participation of a Bachelor study is relatively low in the Department of Psychology in Lund.

### **Tips for future marketers**

Campaign leaders of PWYW should put emphasis on creating a relationship and interaction between seller and consumer. The goal should be to get people to be part of the exchange process and less focus should be put on how much is actually paid for the product. Instead, they should pressure participants into taking advantage, even abuse, the offer. The method can be seen to have a snowball effect: By doing the small act of getting a customer to make a payment obligation, a larger, self-propelled process is started. The customer experiences a cognitive dissonance between the desires of making a profit and acting in unity of an attractive self-image. If the dissonance is not resolved, for example if the person feels that they have abused the offer and paid a too low of a sum, the customer will experience a need to return the favor by purchasing the product at a later point. Another consequence of the dissonance management, which has long-term benefits for the seller, is that the customer would also convince himself of the products positive attributes. This would lead to the customer spreading the word about the product and makes it into a habit of buying the product.

Campaign leaders would do well to remember that FREE means more receivers; more people will mindlessly accept the item, regardless of whether they have an interest in it or not. PWYW have fewer recipients, however, these are more likely to be a part of the target audience. In addition, the PWYW method limits the consumer from merely receiving the product, but requires the consumer to hesitate and actually take the product into consideration when making an assessment of it.

### **Further research**

Future research in marketing should embrace the strengths of the IAT, since this is a tool with great potential in exploring consumer attitudes in addition to the explicit ways. In conjunction with our results, further studies that examine the relationship between cognitive dissonance and the size of the payment are suggested. To study the effects of PWYW in a social network is also a very interesting direction for future research.

## **Conclusion**

The lack of significant findings in the study leads to the question whether there is any effect to study at all. It is possible that the insignificant difference between the manipulations is in fact due to practice effects. However, it is equally possible that the manipulation was not powerful enough, or that the second measurement was too prematurely made and therefore the effect would not have been noticed in our analysis. If this is the case, the experiment should rather be reworked to include these elements. Therefore, the main changes we propose are; a stronger manipulation and a longer period of time between the pre- and post-measures.

## References

- Antón, C., Camarero, C., & Gil, F. (2014). The culture of gift giving: What do consumers expect from commercial and personal contexts?. *Journal Of Consumer Behaviour*, 13(1), 31-41. doi:10.1002/cb.1452
- Armstrong Soule, C. A., & Madrigal, R. (2014). Anchors and norms in anonymous pay-what-you-want pricing contexts. *Journal Of Behavioral And Experimental Economics*, doi:10.1016/j.socec.2014.10.001
- Aronson, E., & Aronson, J. (2007). *The social animal*. New York: Worth Publishers, 2007.
- Buchanan, James M. *Cost and Choice: An Inquiry in Economic Theory*. 1999. Library of Economics and Liberty. Retrieved May 11, 2015 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.econlib.org/library/Buchanan/buchCv6c1.html>
- Calanchini, J., Sherman, J. W., Klauer, K. C., & Lai, C. K. (2014). Attitudinal and Non-Attitudinal Components of IAT Performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 0146167214540723.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2000). *Influence: science and practice*. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, 2000.
- Cialdini, R. B., & Schroeder, D. (1976). Increasing compliance by legitimizing paltry contributions: When even a penny helps. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 34(4), 599-604. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.34.4.599
- Chao, Y., Fernandez, J., & Nahata, B. (2014). Pay-what-you-want pricing: Can it be profitable?. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2014.09.004>
- Ehrlich, D., Guttman, I., Schönbach, P., & Mills, J. (1957). Postdecision exposure to relevant information. *The Journal Of Abnormal And Social Psychology*, 54(1), 98-102. doi:10.1037/h0042740
- Froni, F., & Bel-Bahar, T. (2010). Picture-IAT versus Word-IAT: level of stimulus representation influences on the IAT. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(2), 321-337.
- Friend, S. B., & Johnson, J. S. (2015). Implicit measures in sales research. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 35(1) 72–84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2014.977795>
- Gbadamosi, A. (2009). Low-income consumers' reactions to low-involvement products. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 27(7), 882-899.

- Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the implicit association test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 85(2), 197.
- Gregg, A. P., & Klymowsky, J. (2013). The Implicit Association Test in Market Research: Potentials and Pitfalls. *Psychology & Marketing*, 30(7), 588-601. doi:10.1002/mar.20630
- Heise, D. R. (1970). The Semantic Differential and Attitude Research. *Attitude Measurement*. Gene F. Summers, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co.. 235-53.
- Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Camerer, C., Fehr, E., Gintis, H., & McElreath, R. (2001). In search of homo economicus: behavioral experiments in 15 small-scale societies. *American Economic Review*, 73-78.
- Heyman, J., & Ariely, D. (2004). Effort for payment a tale of two markets. *Psychological science*, 15(11), 787-793.
- Karpinski, A., & Steinman, R. B. (2006). The single category implicit association test as a measure of implicit social cognition. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 91(1), 16.
- Kim, J. Y., Natter, M., & Spann, M. (2009). Pay what you want: A new participative pricing mechanism. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(1), 44-58.
- Kim, J. Y., Natter, M., & Spann, M. (2014). Sampling, discounts or pay-what-you-want: Two field experiments. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 31(3), 327-334.
- Kim, J. Y., Kaufmann, K., & Stegemann, M. (2014). The impact of buyer–seller relationships and reference prices on the effectiveness of the pay what you want pricing mechanism. *Marketing Letters*, 25(4), 409-423.
- Kuys, B., Thong, C., Melles G. (2010, June 28th - July 1st). *First impressions count: the importance of high-quality visuals in the Product Design Engineering discipline*. Paper presented at the Connected: 2nd International Conference on Design Education, Sydney. Melbourne: Swinburne University of Technology.
- Laran, J., & Tsiros, M. (2013). An Investigation of the Effectiveness of Uncertainty in Marketing Promotions Involving Free Gifts. *Journal Of Marketing*, 77(2), 112-123.
- Mak, V., Zwick, R., Rao, A. R., & Pattaratanakun, J. A. (2015). “Pay what you want” as threshold public good provision. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 127, 30-43.
- Messner, C., & Vosgerau, J. (2010). Cognitive inertia and the implicit association test. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47(2), 374-386.

- Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: II. Method variables and construct validity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(2), 166-180.
- Phillips, S. (2013). Product design: first impressions count. *Engineer (Online Edition)*, 8.
- Prättälä, R., & Keinonen, M. (1984). The use and the attributions of some sweet foods. *Appetite*, 5(3), 199-207.
- Schneider, W., Eschman, A., & Zuccolotto, A. (2007a). E-Prime getting started guide. *Psychology software tools*.
- Schneider, W., Eschman, A., & Zuccolotto, A. (2007b). E-Prime: User's guide. *Psychology software tools*.
- Shampanier, K., Mazar, N., & Ariely, D. (2007). Zero as a special price: The true value of free products. *Marketing science*, 26(6), 742-757.
- Spence, A., & Townsend, E. (2006). Implicit attitudes towards genetically modified (GM) foods: A comparison of context-free and context-dependent evaluations. *Appetite*, 46(1), 67-74.
- Språkbanken Korpusstatistik (2014) *Bloggmix 2014*. Hämtad 2015-05-12 från [https://svn.spraakdata.gu.se/sb-arkiv/pub/frekvens/stats BLOGGMIX2014.txt](https://svn.spraakdata.gu.se/sb-arkiv/pub/frekvens/stats_BLOGGMIX2014.txt)
- Wiman, M. (Red.). (2007). *Nordstedts Stora Engelsk-Svenska Ordbok*. Norge: NordBook

## Appendix

### Appendix 1 – English SC-IAT target words and Swedish translation

<i>Positive</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Translation</i>
beautiful	vacker	angry	arg
celebrating	fira	brutal	brutal
cheerful	gladlynt	destroy	förstöra
excellent	utmärkt	dirty	smutsig
excitement	iver	disaster	förödelse
fabulous	sagolik	disgusting	motbjudande
friendly	trevlig	dislike	ogilla
glad	nöjd	evil	ond
glee	munter	gross	grov
happy	glad	horrible	hemsak
laughing	skratta	humiliate	förödmjuka
likable	tilltalande	nasty	vidrig
loving	kärleksfull	noxious	illamående
marvelous	fantastisk	painful	smärtsam
pleasure	njutning	revolting	revolterande
smiling	ler	sickening	vidrig
splendid	toppen	terrible	förskräcklig
superb	superb	tragic	tragisk
paradise	paradis	ugly	ful
triumph	triumf	unpleasant	otrevlig
wonderful	underbar	yucky	äcklig

## Appendix 2 - Complete list of words used in the pilot study's SC-IAT

### *Positiva*

utmärkt

glad

sagolik

trevlig

tilltalande

fantastisk

superb

kärleksfull

njutbar

toppen

god

underbar

### *Negativa*

smutsig

förödelse

motbjudande

ogilla

ond

hemsk

vidrig

illamående

otrevlig

förskräcklig

ful

äcklig

### Appendix 3 - Explicit self-assessment forms for the pilot study (SWE)

*English translation can be found in Appendix 8*

1. Uppskatta hur väl du känner till produkten Kivik, Pärondryck? Ringa in ditt svar

*0= Jag har aldrig hört talas om produkten. 10= Jag känner till märket och produkten väl.*

0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

2. Uppskatta hur mycket du tycker du om Kivik, pärondryck? Ringa in ditt svar

*0= Jag avskyr produkten 10= Jag älskar produkten.*

0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

## **Appendix 4 - Information and consent document in Swedish**

*English translation can be found in Appendix 9*

Studie om marknadsföringsprincipers påverkan på Implicita Associationer

### **INFORMATION och SAMTYCKE**

Var vänlig och läs noggrant detta samtycke innan du bestämmer dig för att delta i denna studie.

**Bakgrund och Syfte.** Denna undersökning ligger till grund för vår C-uppsats. Syftet med den aktuella studien är att undersöka Implicita Associationer gentemot en produkt genom olika typer av marknadsföringsprinciper. Genom att göra så hoppas vi kunna se vilken av metoderna som har störst påverkan på människors implicita associationer.

**Hur går studien till?** För att delta i studien kommer du att bli ombedd att genomföra två IAT (Implicit Association Test) via dator. Mitt emellan testen kommer vi hålla en kort paus där du kommer att presenteras för en produkt. Hela studien kommer att ta ca 15 minuter.

**Vad finns det för eventuella risker och vinster?** Implicit Association Test är helt säkra och medför inte någon risk för skada. De som deltar i experimentet kommer få en tia-lott.

**Hantering av data och sekretess.** Dina svar och resultat kommer att lagras under en anonym ID-kod. Studiens resultat presenteras gruppvis, inga individuella mönster kommer beskrivas eller vara identifierbara. Inga personliga uppgifter kommer att sparas.

**Huvudansvarig forskare** för den aktuella studien vid Lunds Universitet är Docent och Legitimerad Psykolog Elia Psouni; elia.psouni@med.lu.se, 0462-228503.

Har du frågor angående studien eller är intresserad av dess resultat kan du kontakta Erica Jostrup; psy12ej2@student.lu.se, 0739-221870, eller Emina Salic; psy12es6@student.lu.se, 0736-897170.

**Frivillighet.** Din medverkan i projektet är helt frivillig. Du kan hoppa över de uppgifter du inte vill genomföra i studien. Du kan avböja din medverkan eller när som helst avbryta ditt

deltagande utan att ange några skäl och utan att detta får några negativa konsekvenser för dig.

**Samtycke** (Behåll denna kopia!)

Jag har läst formuläret och har fått tillfälle att ställa frågor och fått dem besvarade samt fått information om studiens innehåll och syfte, Jag samtycker till deltagande i studien:

Signatur

Datum

---

---

Namnförtydligande

---

---

Samtycke (Lämnas till testledaren)

Jag har läst formuläret och har fått tillfälle att ställa frågor och fått dem besvarade samt fått information om studiens innehåll och syfte, Jag samtycker till deltagande i studien:

Signatur

Datum

---

---

Namnförtydligande

---

## Appendix 5 – Word frequency and number of mistakes

Word	Bloggmix (Frequency per milion)	No mistake (Corr. No. mistakes)	Mistake frequency (%)
<i>Ogilla</i>	1.36	8 (10)	13%
<i>Motbjudande</i>	0.51	7 (7)	9%
<i>Superb</i>	0.56	6 (6)	8%
<i>Tilltalande</i>	2.2	5 (6.25)	8%
<i>Vidrig</i>	2.85	5 (6.25)	8%
<i>Förödelse</i>	1.73	4 (5)	6%
<i>Förskräcklig</i>	0.37	4 (4)	5%
<i>Otrevlig</i>	4.21	4 (4)	5%
<i>Smutsig</i>	4.72	4 (4)	5%
<i>Ond</i>	5.94	4 (4)	5%
<i>Äcklig</i>	6.39	4 (4)	5%
<i>Utmärkt</i>	29.36	3 (3.75)	5%
<i>Trevlig</i>	81.39	3 (3.75)	5%
<i>Underbar</i>	96.91	3 (3)	4%
<i>Njutbar</i>	0.51	2 (2.5)	3%
<i>Hemsk</i>	13.6	2 (2.5)	3%
<i>Ful</i>	15.9	2 (2.5)	3%
<i>Fantastisk</i>	87.42	2 (2.5)	3%
<i>God</i>	255.03	2 (2)	3%
<i>Glad</i>	342.31	2 (2)	3%
<i>Illamående</i>	12.44	1 (1.25)	2%
<i>Toppen</i>	58.58	1 (1)	1%
<i>Sagolik</i>	0.47	0 (0)	0%
<i>Kärleksfull</i>	4.39	0 (0)	0%

## Appendix 6 - Explicit measure during the experiment (SWE)

English translation can be found in Appendix 10

Kiviks Musteri tillverkar frukt- och bärprodukter på deras musterier i södra delen av Kivik, Skåne.

Hur väl känner Du till Kiviks Musteri och deras frukt- och bärdrycker?  
Markera ett nummer mellan 0 och 6, där 0 innebär att Du inte känner till varumärket alls och 6 innebär att Du känner till varumärket mycket väl.

*Känner inte till*    0    1    2    3    4    5    6    *Känner till mycket*

Ringa in det nummer mellan -3 och 3 som Du tycker stämmer bäst in på Din bild av varumärket Kiviks Musteri och deras frukt- och bärdrycker. Ringa in noll om de beskrivande adjektiven är irrelevanta för konceptet.

<i>Dålig</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>Bra</i>
<i>Äcklig</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>God</i>
<i>Obehaglig</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>Behaglig</i>
<i>Oärlig</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>Ärlig</i>
<i>Ohälsosam</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>Hälsosam</i>
<i>Ovänlig</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>Vänlig</i>

Hur positivt eller negativt känner Du inför varumärket Kiviks Musteri? Markera ett nummer på skalan under, där 0 innebär extremt negativt och 10 innebär extremt positivt.

*Negativt*    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10    *Positivt*

Hur väl håller Du med om följande påståenden?

Markera ett nummer mellan 0 och 6.

Där 0 innebär att Du inte alls håller med och 6 innebär att Du håller med till fullo.

“Jag tycker om att dricka Kiviks frukt- och bärdrycker”

0            1            2            3            4            5            6

“Kiviks frukt- och bärdrycker tillfredsställer min törst”

0            1            2            3            4            5            6

## **Appendix 7 - Semi-structured script (SWE)**

*English translation can be found in Appendix 11*

### **Innan experimentet:**

“Välkommen till vårt experiment!

Du kan slå dig ner här borta och börja med att läsa igenom och skriva under samtyckesblanketten som ligger på bordet.

Som du vet efter att ha läst och fyllt i samtyckesblanketten har du möjlighet att dra dig ur experimentet när du än vill utan att detta ger några konsekvenser. Har du några frågor innan vi kör igång?

Nu kommer du först att få fylla i ett formulär och sedan kommer du bli placerad vid en dator där du kommer att få genomföra två Implicita Associations Test, med fyra delar i varje test. I mitten av dessa test kommer vi ta en kort paus.

Här är formuläret som du kan börja med att fylla i. *När klar: Tack!*

Nu kan du sätta dig vid denna datorn. Följ bara instruktionerna som står på skärmen för att sätta igång. Instruktionerna för de olika deltesten skiljer sig åt, så läs dem noggrant. Om du har några frågor eller vill avbryta kommer jag finnas här borta.”

### **I pausen:**

“Bra jobbat! Hur känns det än så länge? (*paus för svar*) -Kul!

Vad studerar du för något? (*prata trevligt med deltagare*)

*Free:* Vårt projekt har blivit sponsrat med Kiviks produkter, och som du märkt tar vi upp dem i vårt test. Skulle du vilja ha en juice? (*Svarskategorier: ja, nej*).

*Om ja:* Vad kul, jag ställer den här så länge så får du den när vi är klara med del två av testet.

*Om nej:* Okej, då fortsätter vi med del två av testet direkt.

*PWYW:* Vårt projekt har blivit sponsrat med Kiviks produkter, och som du märkt tar vi upp dem i vårt test. Efter experimentet kommer du ha möjlighet att köpa en av deras produkter, nämligen denna (visa produkt), till det pris som du själv bestämmer. Hade du kunnat tänka dig att köpa den? (*Svarskategorier: ja, nej*)

*Om nej:* (Pusha lite grann, påpeka att det är en bra deal - kanske de inte förstått?) *Men du får själv avgöra PRECIS hur mycket du vill betala?* Om fortfarande nej, gör klart testet.

*Om ja:* Hur mycket vill du betala för den i så fall? (*kom ihåg svar!!*)

Utmärkt, då gör vi del två av testet nu.

**Efter experimentet:**

“Det gick ju jättebra! Tusen tack för din hjälp.

Här får du din tia-lott som tack för hjälpen.

*Free:* Här har du din juice också. Ha det så bra!

*PWYW:* Så klart behöver du inte betala något för juicen, du får den gratis av oss. Ha det så bra!” *PWYW2:* (*om tackat nej till produkten, ge produkt ändå*)

## Appendix 8 – Explicit self-assessment forms for the pilot study

*English translation*

1. Estimate how well you know the product Kivik, Pear juice? Circle your answer

*0= I have never heard of the product. 10= I know the brand and the product well.*

0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

2. Estimate how much you think you like Kivik, Pear juice? Circle your answer

*0= I detest the product. 10= I adore the product.*

0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

## **Appendix 9 - Information and consent document**

*English translation*

### Study on marketing principles' influence on Implicit Associations INFORMATION and CONSENT

Please read this agreement carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

**Background and Purpose.** This survey is conducted for our BS thesis. The aim of the study is to investigate Implicit Associations towards a product through different types of marketing principles. By doing so, we hope to see which of the methods has the greatest impact on people's implicit associations.

**How does the study work?** To participate in the study you will be asked to conduct two IAT (Implicit Association Test) via the computer. A short break will be made between the tests. The entire study will take about 15 minutes.

**What are the possible risks and benefits?** The IAT is completely safe and presents no risk of injury. Participation will be rewarded with a lottery ticket.

**Handling of data and confidentiality.** Your answers and results will be registered under an anonymous ID-code. The study's results will be presented in a group level, no individual pattern will be described or be identifiable. No personal information will be saved.

**Principal researcher** the current study at Lund University is Associate Professor and Registered Psychologist Elia Psouni; elia.psouni@med.lu.se, 0462-228503.

Do you have any questions regarding the study or are interested in its results, you may contact Erica Jostrup; psy12ej2@student.lu.se, 0739-221870, or Emina Salic; psy12es6@student.lu.se, 0736-897170.

**Voluntarism.** Your participation in this project is completely voluntary. You may skip the tasks you do not want to do in the study. You may refuse your participation or at any time

cancel your participation without giving any reason and without this having any negative consequences for you.

**Consent (Keep this copy!)**

I have read the form and have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered, and received information about the study's content and purpose, I agree to participate in the study:

Signature

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Printed name

\_\_\_\_\_

-----

**Consent (Is given to the test leader)**

I have read the form and have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered, and received information about the study's content and purpose, I agree to participate in the study:

Signature

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Printed name

\_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix 10 - Explicit measure during the experiment

### English translation

Kivik's Musteri produces fruit and berry products in their cider factories in the south of Kivik, Skåne.

How well do You know of Kiviks Musteri and their fruit and berry juices?

Estimate a number between 0 and 6, where 0 means you do not know the brand at all and 6 means that you know the brand very well.

*Do not know*    0    1    2    3    4    5    6    *Know very well of*

Circle a number between -3 and 3 that You think best describes Your image of the brand Kiviks Musteri and their fruit and berry juices. Circle the zero if the descriptive adjectives are irrelevant to the concept.

<i>Bad</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>Good</i>
<i>Disgusting</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>Tasty</i>
<i>Unattractive</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>Attractive</i>
<i>Dishonest</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>Honest</i>
<i>Unhealthy</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>Healthy</i>
<i>Unfriendly</i>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<i>Friendly</i>

How positively or negatively do you feel towards the brand Kivik? Circle a number on the scale below, where 0 means extremely negative and 10 means extremely positive.

*Negative*    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10    *Positive*

How well do You agree with the following statements?

Mark a number between 0 and 6. Where 0 means you absolutely disagree and 6 means you absolutely agree.

“I like to drink Kivik’s fruit and berry juices”

0            1            2            3            4            5            6

“Kivik’s fruit and berry juices satisfy my thirst”

0            1            2            3            4            5            6

## **Appendix 11 - Semi-structured script**

### *English translation*

#### **Before the experiment:**

"Welcome to our experiment!

You may sit down over here and start reading and signing the consent form on the table.

As you know, after reading and completing the consent form you are able to withdraw from the experiment whenever you want without any consequences. Do you have any questions before we get going?

Now, you will first be asked to complete a form and then you will be placed at a computer where you will be able to conduct two Implicit Association Test, with four parts in each test. In the middle of these tests, we will take a short break.

This is the form that you can start to fill in. (When finished:) Thanks!

Now you may sit at this computer. Just follow the instructions that are on the screen to get started. The instructions for the various subtests are different, so read them carefully. If you have any questions or wish to cancel, I will be over here."

During the break:

"Good job! How does it feel so far? (Pause for answer) -Great!

What are you studying? (Talk with participant)

FREE: Our project has been sponsored with Kivik's products, and as you may have noticed, we have them in our test. Would you like to have a juice? (Response categories: yes, no).

If yes: Great (hand over the juice by putting it on the table for participant to take later).

If no: Okay, how about we continue with part two of the test?

PWYW: Our project has been sponsored with Kivik's products, and as you may have noticed, we have them in our test. After the experiment, you will have the opportunity of buy one of their products, this one in particular (view product), BUT, at whatever price you set yourself.

Are you interested in the offer? (Response categories: yes, no)

*If no:* (Put some friendly pressure, point out that it is a great deal and that the participant may pay exactly any amount – perhaps they haven't understood the offer?) *But you may decide EXACTLY any price you wish?* If still no, finish the test.

*If yes:* How much would you like to pay for it? (Record the answer when the subject does not see)

Great, let's do the final part of the test.

**After the experiment:**

This went great!

*Free:* Don't forget your juice!

*PWYW:* You are not paying for the juice – it was a part of the experiment! You will get it for free!

*PWYW2:* (if the offer was declined, offer the product for free anyways)

Give debriefing.

Thank you for your participation, here's your lottery ticket and juice!"