

1 CHAPTER 1

2 Six Degrees of Bob Cialdini and Five
3 Principles of Scientific Influence4 MARK SCHALLER, DOUGLAS T. KENRICK,
5 AND STEVEN L. NEUBERG

7 **Y**ou know the Kevin Bacon game. If you were in a movie with Kevin
8 Bacon, your Bacon number is one; if you were in a movie with some-
9 one else who was in a movie with Kevin Bacon, your Bacon number is 2;
10 and so on. Here's an example: Kevin Bacon was in "A Few Good Men" with
11 Tom Cruise; Cruise was in "The Last Samurai" with Chad Lindberg;
12 Lindberg was in "My Big Break" with Mark Schaller. Ergo: Schaller has a
13 Bacon number of 3. Being egocentric, Schaller prefers to think that Kevin
14 Bacon has a Schaller number of 3.

15 The Erdős game is the math nerd's version. Paul Erdős co-authored
16 nearly 1,500 articles with over 500 collaborators, who themselves
17 co-authored many articles with many others, and so forth. Just as anyone
18 with a single screen credit can be linked to Kevin Bacon through a series of
19 joint-movie-appearance links, almost any mathematician can be linked to
20 Erdős through a series of co-authorship links. Although he's no mathemati-
21 cian, Schaller has an Erdős number of 6. Or, we could say that Erdős has
22 a Schaller number of 6. So does Albert Einstein. (Kenrick and Neuberg
23 both have Schaller numbers of 1 and so, by this idiotic index, are more suc-
24 cessful than either Albert Einstein or Kevin Bacon.)

25 What do these tenuous connections to Erdős and Bacon have to do with
26 Bob Cialdini and his widespread influence on fields as diverse as psycho-
27 logy, business, political science, and economics? Lurking beneath the silly
28 surface of the Schaller number are some fundamental truths about human

1 nature and the scientific enterprise required to reveal it. These truths are
 2 lessons learned from Cialdini himself uniquely illuminated within his
 3 body of work.

4 LESSON NUMBER ONE: CONNECTIONS MATTER

5 Among Cialdini's many prominent contributions is a line of research on
 6 basking in reflected glory ("BIRGing"). This research illuminates the ways
 7 in which people strategically advertise even minimal connections to suc-
 8 cessful others (Cialdini, Borden, Thorne, Walker, Freeman, & Sloan, 1976;
 9 Cialdini & Richardson, 1980). Here's an example: Shortly after Schaller
 10 uncovered his Bacon and Erdős numbers, about 30 other people (pretty
 11 much everybody he encountered over the next 2 days) found out as well.
 12 Cialdini's BIRGing research is typically mentioned to illustrate the subtle
 13 ways that people strategically manufacture positive public images. If you
 14 dig a little deeper, though, these studies illustrate even more profound
 15 truths about the human condition.

16 Why does Schaller find it gratifying to declare that Kevin Bacon has
 17 a Schaller number of 3? If you guessed it has to do with the self-serving
 18 consequences of symbolically associating with the winners in the world,
 19 you would be partially correct; but there's more to it than that. O.J. Simpson
 20 and Charles Manson have Schaller numbers of 3 and 4, respectively, and
 21 Schaller was just as quick to tell us about those connections too. Simpson
 22 and Manson don't exactly trigger a cascade of warm and friendly feelings.
 23 So, why would Schaller publicly announce these unsettling (and hardly self-
 24 serving) connections?

25 Because connections matter, that's why. In the 1970s, psychologists
 26 talked a lot about self-serving motives. It's not surprising, then, that self-
 27 esteem provided the motivational oomph emphasized in the BIRGing
 28 literature. Since then, our motivational horizons have expanded consider-
 29 ably (e.g., Kenrick, Griskevicius, Neuberg, & Schaller, 2010). There is now
 30 an enormous body of evidence pointing to a fundamental human need for
 31 interpersonal connection, and to its important consequences for human
 32 behavior (MacDonald & Leary, 2005; Maner, DeWall, Baumeister, &
 33 Schaller, 2007). When folks talk about this need, they don't usually think of
 34 Cialdini's BIRGing studies. They should. Long before it was fashionable,
 35 Cialdini's studies showed—in a novel and scientifically sexy way—that
 36 even tenuous social connections really matter.

37 Mere interpersonal connection is a powerful force, not just psychologi-
 38 cally but sociologically too (Barabási, 2002; Granovetter, 1973; Watts, 2003).
 39 Psychologists haven't typically participated in scientific conversations about

[4] *Six Degrees of Social Influence*

1 the sociological implications of interpersonal connections, but there are
 2 a few exceptions (e.g., Travers & Milgram, 1969). Of particular note is recent
 3 work by Bibb Latané and his colleagues on *dynamic social impact theory*
 4 (Latané, 1996, 1997; Nowak, Szamrej, & Latané, 1990; see also Harton &
 5 Bourgeois, 2004).

6 Dynamic social impact theory articulates the mechanisms through which
 7 local acts of interpersonal influence shape and reshape the attitudes and
 8 opinions of entire populations. This happens only because, within any human
 9 population, everyone is connected through a series of interpersonal links to
 10 everyone else. Because of these Baconesque links, individual actions rever-
 11 berate through entire populations to exert global consequences. Because of
 12 the power of connection, individual psychology creates human culture.

13 There are further consequences too. After attending one of Latané's
 14 famous Nags Head conferences, Kenrick integrated the dynamic social
 15 impact framework with an evolutionary perspective on individual decision-
 16 making. The result was a set of novel insights about simple evolved biases
 17 that contribute to the emergence of different group geometries and differ-
 18 ent cultural norms, depending on the specific goals that individuals seek
 19 to achieve when interacting with one another (Kenrick, Li, & Butner,
 20 2003). Individuals' decisions—whether focused on self-protection, mating,
 21 status, or familial relations—are rarely made with any awareness of the
 22 fact that, collectively, these decisions can exert a societal impact. And yet,
 23 because of the power of mere interpersonal connection, they do.

24 The power of connection is on display in the mathematical study
 25 of social networks, in the fundamental human need for belongingness,
 26 and in Cialdini's BIRGING studies. It's arguably the single most important
 27 reason why the psychology of social influence—and the science of social
 28 psychology—matters on a global scale.

29 LESSON NUMBER TWO: REAL LIFE IS SCIENCE'S NATURAL DOMAIN

30 More than perhaps any contemporary social psychologist, Bob Cialdini
 31 has profitably indulged his inner anthropologist. Approximately 95% of
 32 published psychological studies are stimulated by previous publications.
 33 And probably 95% of those studies have no enduring impact. (OK, We're
 34 making up those numbers, but we bet they're not that far off). In contrast,
 35 Cialdini's research has often been stimulated by his canny observations of
 36 real people doing real things in their real lives; and—no coincidence—this
 37 research has been especially influential.

38 Some of Cialdini's forays into the anthropology of ordinary life were
 39 expertly planned. He spent one sabbatical going “undercover” to observe

1 actual influence professionals (waiters, car dealers, pyramid scammers)
 2 engaging in acts of professional influence. His observations led to many
 3 classic experiments on compliance techniques and the psychological pro-
 4 cesses that they exploit (Cialdini, 2008). Other lines of research reflect
 5 a scientific mind acutely prepared to take advantage of interesting accidents.
 6 The BIRGing studies, for example, were inspired by a football game. Cialdini
 7 had been poring over some underwhelming results from an experiment
 8 on attitude change, frustrated by an insufficiently substantial mean differ-
 9 ence on a standard 7-point scale, when he wandered out of his office and
 10 into a football stadium at game time:

11 The crowd was suddenly up and shouting, and yelling encouragement to their favorites
 12 below. Arcs of tissue paper crossed overhead. The university fight song was being
 13 sung. A large group of fans repeatedly roared “We’re number one!” while thrusting index
 14 fingers upward. I recall quite clearly looking up from thoughts of that additional half
 15 unit of movement on a 7-point scale and realizing the power of the tumult around
 16 me. “Cialdini,” I said to myself, “I think you’re studying the *wrong* thing.” (Cialdini, 1980,
 17 p. 22; emphasis in original)

18 For most of us, that experience would have been a distraction rather
 19 than a scientific stimulant. If it was someone else in Cialdini’s shoes that
 20 day, we might not have the pleasure of talking about BIRGing at all.

21 Here’s the point: Cialdini doesn’t just read academic articles or engage
 22 in arid exercises in logical deduction to arrive at research hypotheses—
 23 he also pays attention to real life.

24 That seems simple, but it’s not. Most of us have had only sporadic
 25 success in doing so. When we’ve been able to, it’s paid off. Kenrick was
 26 once asked to lecture on attraction to a single’s group. Afterwards, several
 27 middle-aged women asked if there was any scientific reason why middle-
 28 aged men were so interested in younger women. They handed him a pile of
 29 singles newspapers, which inspired an intensive study of singles ads from
 30 the Netherlands, Germany, and India, and then of marriages from around
 31 the world and from different historical periods. One of the resulting publi-
 32 cations (which shows that sex differences in age preferences are a human
 33 universal; Kenrick & Keefe, 1992) has become Kenrick’s most-cited empiri-
 34 cal paper ever.

35 Neuberg too has discovered the value of making an occasional field trip
 36 outside of his university office. He once published an article showing
 37 that, contrary to popular belief, Valentine’s Day tends to be *bad* for most
 38 romantic relationships (Morse & Neuberg, 2004). The study was inspired
 39 by an out-of-the-blue conversation with a woman upset by her personal
 40 Valentine’s Day massacre.

[6] *Six Degrees of Social Influence*

1 And here's one more story: Years ago, stimulated by a brief encounter
 2 with a movie star in a Montana health food store, Schaller started a research
 3 project on the psychological consequences of fame, which culminated in
 4 a weird little one-off article in the *Journal of Personality* (Schaller, 1997).
 5 Because that article somehow came to the attention of a filmmaker, Schaller's
 6 talking head now occupies about 30 seconds in the documentary film "My
 7 Big Break"—enough time for his name to appear in screen credits alongside
 8 those of actual actors, like Chad Lindberg. Thus, Schaller owes his Bacon
 9 number entirely to the fact that once, in a very modest way, he did what
 10 Cialdini does brilliantly all the time: Recognize potentially interesting and
 11 understudied psychological phenomena lurking within the great blooming,
 12 buzzing confusion of everyday life.

13 Unlike our own stumbling visits into the real world, Cialdini's thought-
 14 ful approach represents an underappreciated form of scientific genius.
 15 It's a genius that applies not merely to scientific *inspiration*, but to scientific
 16 *explanation* as well. A piece of research inspired merely by previous empiri-
 17 cal findings is most likely doomed to do little more than explain those find-
 18 ings in greater detail. A line of research inspired by real human behavior
 19 observed in real life is much more likely to apply to, and explain, real human
 20 behavior in real life, too.

21 LESSON NUMBER THREE: ANYTHING GOES

22 Although Schaller's article on the psychology of fame has had almost no
 23 scientific impact, Schaller is unusually fond of it anyway. The reason is not
 24 just because of its connection to his Bacon number, but also because the
 25 study itself employed methods that are messy and weird and even laughably
 26 unrigorous. Schaller's other personal favorites (several of which include
 27 things other than individual people as the units of analysis; Schaller,
 28 Conway, & Tanchuk, 2002; Schaller & Murray, 2008) don't exactly fit the
 29 prototypical profile of rigorous experimental social psychology either.

30 The same applies to Kenrick. His publications include many whose meth-
 31 ods might be characterized as wacky and weird—a species apart from stan-
 32 dard laboratory-based experimental social psychology. We've already noted
 33 that one of his most cited articles included data obtained not from research
 34 participants but from personal ads ("SWF, 34, attractive, seeks . . ."; Kenrick
 35 & Keefe, 1992). Another of his favorites is a paper reporting results gener-
 36 ated not by actual people, but by computer simulations (Kenrick et al., 2003).
 37 And, although Kenrick can't bask in the reflected glory of Kevin Bacon, he
 38 did proudly publish a study employing Farrah Fawcett and the rest of
 39 "Charlie's Angels" as a methodological device (Kenrick & Gutierrez, 1980).

1 Both Schaller and Kenrick were trained as experimental social psycho-
 2 logists; they received that training from a man—Bob Cialdini—who has
 3 received numerous awards for his exceptional abilities to deploy, and teach,
 4 the methods of experimental social psychology. So, did they forget the
 5 lessons learned from the master of experimental methods? Have their
 6 heads gone soft? Were they childishly rebelling against a father figure who
 7 they'd have been much wiser to emulate? At the risk of sounding defen-
 8 sive, we think that, rather than reflecting forgetfulness, soft-headedness,
 9 or psychoanalytic cliché, both Kenrick and Schaller have been attracted
 10 to “alternative” empirical methodologies because they learned to appreci-
 11 ate a deeper methodological and epistemological lesson lurking within
 12 Cialdini's approach to social psychological research. The philosopher Paul
 13 Feyerabend stated the lesson like this:

14 Science is an essentially anarchistic enterprise: theoretical anarchism is more humani-
 15 tarian and more likely to encourage progress than its law-and-order alternatives. . . .
 16 The only principle that does not inhibit progress is: *anything goes*. (Feyerabend, 1975,
 17 p. 23, emphasis in original)

18 No one would characterize Bob Cialdini as an anarchist exactly.
 19 Nevertheless, Cialdini's body of research exemplifies the Feyerabendian
 20 philosophy. On the one hand, Cialdini has pursued many empirical inves-
 21 tigations employing standard experimental methods within ordinary
 22 psychological laboratories. (An example is his influential program of
 23 research on helping behavior; Cialdini, Brown, Lewis, Luce, & Neuberg,
 24 1997; Cialdini & Kenrick, 1976; Cialdini, Schaller, Houlihan, Arps, Fultz,
 25 & Beaman, 1987). But, on the other hand, many of Cialdini's studies
 26 have been conducted on sidewalks, stairwells, parking lots, or in national
 27 parks and hotel bathrooms. And the participants were real people going
 28 about their real lives, thoughtlessly tossing a bit of trash onto the side-
 29 walk or stealthily pocketing a chunk of petrified wood from a national
 30 monument.

31 Field studies aren't easy to do. They impose considerable constraints
 32 on what one can manipulate, measure, and control. They force method-
 33 ological compromises. Consequently, the conclusions they yield are rarely
 34 as inferentially airtight as those emerging from the lab. In a discipline that
 35 values variables measured in milliseconds and voxels, most social psycholo-
 36 gists don't even consider leaving the lab. But while everyone else is parking
 37 their participants in front of computer screens or sliding them into multi-
 38 million-dollar fMRI machines, Cialdini is counting dirty towels in hotel
 39 bathrooms—and publishing interesting articles about them (Goldstein,
 40 Cialdini, & Griskevicius, 2008).

[8] *Six Degrees of Social Influence*

1 Cialdini's affection for field studies attests not only to his interest in
 2 testing hypotheses on real people in their real lives, but also to his deeper
 3 commitment to methodological diversity. He has demonstrated the same
 4 open-minded attitude to conceptual sources, deriving ideas from not only
 5 from a variety of social psychological theories, but also from cognitive
 6 psychology, sociology, and the human evolutionary sciences (e.g., Cialdini
 7 & Kenrick, 1976; Cialdini, Kalgren, & Reno, 1991; Griskevicius, Cialdini,
 8 & Kenrick, 2006). In all aspects of his science, Cialdini has masterfully—
 9 and influentially—demonstrated the benefits of Feyerabend's motto:
 10 Anything goes.

11 LESSON NUMBER FOUR: BE A FOX

12 Most researchers apply their talents to very specific areas of inquiry: person
 13 perception, say, or attitude change or close interpersonal relationships.
 14 Or, they apply a single theoretical perspective to everything. They are
 15 like the hedgehog in the classic aphorism (commonly attributed to
 16 Archilochus) that "The fox knows many things, but the hedgehog knows
 17 one big thing." This hedgehog-like focus is pragmatic at a personal level.
 18 (It takes time and effort to develop expertise in any single domain of inquiry;
 19 if one pursues research across very different domains, one runs the risk of
 20 being a dilettante.) But it limits the scope of one's potential influence.

21 Happily, being a hedgehog has not been Cialdini's style. He is a fox:
 22 He knows many things. The analogy breaks down a bit, perhaps, because
 23 Cialdini's foxiness involves knowing many *big* things. Still, Cialdini's foxi-
 24 ness is integral to his considerable scientific impact.

25 Cialdini's impact results not simply from his seminal contributions
 26 to the study of basking in reflected glory, or mood and helping behavior,
 27 or the psychology of social norms, or the many other psychological pro-
 28 cesses affecting behavioral compliance, attitude change, persuasion, and
 29 social influence more broadly. Nor does his impact result simply from the
 30 many ways in which he has applied fundamental conceptual insights to
 31 improve human welfare and resolve social problems (e.g., littering, pollu-
 32 tion, and environmental degradation in general; Cialdini, 2003). Nope.
 33 In addition to all the things Cialdini has *done*, his impact results from what
 34 he has *been*: An example of a highly flourishing fox. He's shown that, even
 35 within an academic culture that encourages hedgehogger, one can still
 36 foxily follow one's whims all over the intellectual map—and do so without
 37 succumbing to dilettantism and with extraordinary scholarly success.

38 Whether intentional or not, Cialdini's fox-like approach to scholarship
 39 exerts a beneficial influence on his graduate students and collaborators.

1 Among other adventures, Neuberg has conducted research on impression
 2 formation, prejudice, stigma, self-fulfilling prophecies, physical attraction,
 3 relationships, prosocial behavior, religion, economic decision-making,
 4 and stereotype threat. He has employed cognitive, motivational, anthro-
 5 pological, and evolutionary perspectives in doing so. Kenrick too has
 6 employed—and attempted to integrate—a wide range of meta-theoretical
 7 perspectives in his studies on personality, kinship, romantic attraction,
 8 anticonformity, creativity, contrast effects, religious behaviors, one-night
 9 stands, mate preferences, memory, homicidal fantasies, visual attention,
 10 and consumer behavior. Schaller has as well. And, in addition to collaborat-
 11 ing with Neuberg and Kenrick on some of the projects listed above, Schaller
 12 has also conducted research on such diverse topics as the psychologi-
 13 cal consequences of fame, the popularity of folktales, and the effects
 14 of pathogen prevalence on personality. Even within his allegedly more
 15 programmatic interest in stereotypes and prejudices, Schaller has flirted
 16 with a hard-core information-processing approach, had a love affair with
 17 a hotter, wetter approach informed by principles of evolutionary biology,
 18 and enjoyed a dalliance with the dynamic consequences of interpersonal
 19 communication.

20 It was that dalliance with dynamical systems that led to a collaboration
 21 between Schaller and Bibb Latané (Schaller & Latané, 1996). And because
 22 Latané has co-authored articles with actual mathematicians (Lewenstein,
 23 Nowak, & Latané, 1990), that dalliance therefore accounts for Schaller's
 24 acquisition of a misleadingly low Erdős number. Thus, the fact that Schaller
 25 has both a Bacon number and an Erdős number is emblematic of Cialdini's
 26 tacit encouragement to avoid any temptation to know just one big thing,
 27 and instead to be a fox.

28 LESSON NUMBER FIVE: MARKETING MATTERS

29 Schaller's Erdős number, though meaningless, is at least based on some
 30 sort of scientific product. The Bacon number, though, has no scientific cur-
 31 rency at all. One could argue that the hours Schaller spent being filmed for
 32 "My Big Break" would have been more sensibly devoted to actual scholarly
 33 work. From this perspective, Schaller's Bacon number isn't just a laughable
 34 bit of trivia, it's an index of wasted time.

35 The same might be said any time any of us chats with a journalist or
 36 appears on television. Sometimes these interactions lead to the dissemina-
 37 tion of serious scientific information, but often not. Neuberg had the
 38 unhappy experience of witnessing carefully articulated conclusions from his
 39 evolutionarily informed research on prejudice (Cottrell & Neuberg 2005)

[10] *Six Degrees of Social Influence*

1 become distorted into grossly misleading headlines (“Prejudice Is Hard-
 2 Wired into the Human Brain, Says ASU Study”). And Kenrick, whose
 3 empirical research on sex and mating is catnip for television talk shows,
 4 has seen plenty of potentially productive time disappear when media
 5 appearances turned out to focus more on sensationalism than serious sci-
 6 ence. (He once filmed an interview about evolution and mate choice for
 7 a BBC documentary, only to have his answers interspliced with semi-
 8 pornographic scenes from a nudist camp called Naked City).

9 But there’s a more positive perspective on media attention. Even if that
 10 coverage fails to promote scientific knowledge, it is emblematic of some-
 11 thing scientifically good: When newspaper writers and television produc-
 12 ers come calling, it suggests that we have produced scientific products that,
 13 for whatever reason, people have noticed.

14 Science is a cumulative enterprise. No scientific theory or empirical
 15 finding can hope to have an impact on that cumulative enterprise unless
 16 noticed by others. Before it can be noticed, of course, it has to be published;
 17 and when top journals have rejection rates of 90%, that’s not easy. But
 18 publication alone isn’t enough. Publication doesn’t guarantee attention.
 19 Thousands of psychology articles are published every year, and only a tiny
 20 percentage of those get noticed in any meaningful way. By one estimate,
 21 only 10% of published articles ever get cited even once—a statistic that
 22 prompted one philosopher of science to observe that “publishing a paper is
 23 roughly equivalent to throwing it away” (Hull, 1988, p. 360).

24 And so, even in science, marketing matters. Scientists must not only
 25 deploy the conceptual and methodological skills to produce novel scien-
 26 tific products, they must also package that product in a way that penetrates
 27 the competitive scientific marketplace. Here again, we bow before Bob
 28 Cialdini—who has a masterful knack for selling science.

29 We suspect that Cialdini’s considerable scientific influence has been
 30 abetted, in part, from his skill in sculpting scientific articles that tell com-
 31 pelling stories. Many scientists fail to do that; they just pile on the results.
 32 This is short-sighted. To actually compete successfully in the hypercom-
 33 petitive scientific marketplace, results need to be packaged and presented
 34 so that their story (the specific reason why they make a meaningful contri-
 35 bution to science) is clear, memorable, and sufficiently interesting to
 36 demand to be retold to others. Daryl Bem (1987, p. 173) advises psycho-
 37 logical scientists to “Think of your data as a jewel. Your task is to cut and
 38 polish it, to select the facets to highlight, and to craft the best setting for it.”
 39 Cialdini is a master jeweler.

40 It helps to build some “hooks” into the story too. Given the vast number
 41 of scientific products that glut the market, readers aren’t likely to read an
 42 article unless something about it reaches out and demands their attention.

1 Superficial details matter. For instance, it helps enormously to provide
 2 readers with a mnemonic device that captures the essence of the phenom-
 3 enon (e.g., “door in the face,” “social proof,” “spyglass self”; Cialdini, 2008;
 4 Cialdini, Vincent, Lewis, Catalan, Wheeler, & Darby, 1975; Goldstein &
 5 Cialdini, 2007). Imagine if Cialdini had described a subtle strategy of public
 6 image management as, say, “a subtle strategy of public image management.”
 7 Would it have had such an impact? Probably not. Smartly, he called it “bask-
 8 ing in reflected glory,” which is a lot more memorable.

9 An article’s title also matters a lot. People rarely read an article—or even
 10 its abstract—if they don’t first find something interesting in its title. Poetic
 11 devices and clever wordplay increase the number of readers who read on.
 12 “Peacocks, Picasso, and parental investment . . .”; “Going along versus going
 13 alone . . .”; “A room with a viewpoint . . .”: These and other phrases like them
 14 appear in titles above Cialdini’s name (Goldstein et al., 2008; Griskevicius,
 15 Cialdini, & Kenrick, 2006; Griskevicius, Goldstein, Mortensen, Cialdini, &
 16 Kenrick, 2006). None is necessary to describe the findings reported within.
 17 But all are linguistically entertaining and help to reel the reader in.

18 The purist may argue that science should be above this sort of linguistic
 19 frivolity and marketing. We disagree. Scientific progress depends on com-
 20 munication and dissemination of scientific findings. To the extent that scien-
 21 tists can—like Cialdini—find ways to make their work more communicable,
 22 so that it is noticed and used by others, they are doing their job.

23 LESSON NUMBER ONE REVISITED: CONNECTIONS MATTER

24 The Kevin Bacon Game works because movie-making is an intensely
 25 collaborative enterprise. So is science. Successful research depends on
 26 researchers and research assistants, on research participants, and on rooms
 27 full of people behind the scenes (e.g., grant review panels, Institutional
 28 Review Boards, etc.). The connections between these people are instru-
 29 mental to scientific progress.

30 Some kinds of interpersonal connection matter more than others.
 31 Intellectual collaborations indicated by co-authorship are especially impor-
 32 tant. Sometimes the connections arise almost by chance, such as when
 33 Kenrick (who at the time was a first-year graduate student in clinical
 34 psychology) took a required course in social psychology from someone
 35 he’d never heard of before—a new assistant professor named Cialdini.
 36 Sometimes the connections emerge in a more planful way, such as when
 37 Schaller applied to graduate school with the specific intention of work-
 38 ing with Cialdini, or when Neuberg accepted a job offer with the happy
 39 knowledge that Cialdini would be his colleague. These immediate academic

[12] *Six Degrees of Social Influence*

1 connections have stimulated many fruitful collaborations between Cialdini
2 and Kenrick and Schaller and Neuberg (in varying subsets), and between
3 many more of Cialdini's students and colleagues too. The impact of these
4 connections—and thus the impact of Cialdini's scientific influence—
5 doesn't end there. It extends outward to the many hundreds of additional
6 students and collaborators in each of our immediate academic orbits;
7 and it then extends further still to touch many thousands—perhaps even
8 millions—of additional scholars in a complex web of interconnection.

9 The inescapable point is that interpersonal connections have a pervasive
10 guiding influence on the research projects that shape any scientific field.
11 These connections shape careers, too. It is for that reason that we—Schaller
12 and Kenrick and Neuberg—each feel very glad, and lucky, to have a Cialdini
13 number of 1.