THE DOOR-IN-THE-FACE: USING THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOR TO EXPLAIN SEQUENTIAL REQUESTS

by

BRIAN J HOUSEHOLDER

(Under the Direction of Jerold L. Hale)

Various explanations have been offered for the success of the Door-In-The-Face (DITF) sequential request strategy. This document provides a synthesis of the DITF findings and argues that the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) provides a theoretical framework for explaining DITF findings. To explore that possibility, participants (N=492) were asked to respond to a questionnaire assessing TPB constructs regarding a variety of social organizations. Two weeks later, participants received a phone call from one of the organizations (a local homeless shelter) soliciting donations. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three DITF conditions of varying request sizes or a target request-only condition. Results indicated significant differences in verbal and actual compliance based on request size. Moreover, the results indicated the importance of perceived behavioral control in DITF contexts. Limitations and directions for future DITF study are discussed.

INDEX WORDS: Door-In-The-Face, Theory of Planned Behavior, Donations, Guilt, Sequential request strategies, Compliance gaining, Self-efficacy, Prosocialness
THE DOOR-IN-THE-FACE: USING THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOR TO
EXPLAIN SEQUENTIAL REQUEST EFFECTS.

by

BRIAN J HOUSEHOLDER

B.A., Humboldt State University, 1998

M.A., Wake Forest University, 2000

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University if Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2005
THE DOOR-IN-THE-FACE: USING THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOR TO
EXPLAIN SEQUENTIAL REQUEST EFFECTS.

by

BRIAN J HOUSEHOLDER

Major Professor:       Jerold Hale
Committee:               Tina Harris
                          Jennifer Monahan
                          Jennifer Samp
                          David Shaffer

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2005
DEDICATION

This is dedicated to my Grandfather Philip Munowitch and Holocaust survivors like him. Your will to live and to overcome hardship has been passed on. We will never forget. We will never give up. Your silent inspiration will carry on into the future.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are so many people who have made this dissertation possible. I hope that I can give everyone proper recognition in these brief few pages.

First, I would like to express my gratitude towards the people who helped on the technical construction of this document. Dr. Jerold Hale, it is because of you and our serendipitous meeting that I came to UGA; I will never forget that day in Chicago at the Door-In-The-Face panel. Over the last four years our relationship has developed into one of the most special in my life. More than just a mentor, I consider you a great friend. Dr. Hale, you are one of the best human beings I have ever met. Dr. Jennifer Monahan, you never failed to ask the important questions and you provided me with a balance of confidence and doubt. You made me feel good about my ideas and pushed me to think hard about how I was going to get at the questions I had. I can not think of anyone I would rather do research with or have as a colleague. Dr. Tina Harris, it was a pleasure to work with you. The summer we spent working on qualitative research and your media class helped me grow as a teacher, scholar, and as a person. Dr. Jennifer Samp, my biggest regret is not having more time to work with you and develop a closer relationship. I want to thank you for asking the tough questions and for making me extend myself as scholar. I needed that. Dr. David Shaffer, your perspective provided this thesis with a better, broader scope. It is great to see what Humboldt State alumni can do. Your class on attitudes provided me with a strong foundation for my future in academe. Finally, I want to thank Ms. Jenny Welsh and the Athens Area Homeless Shelter for allowing me to focus the applied emphasis of my dissertation on the shelter.
Additionally, I would like to thank the faculty and staff of the UGA Department of Speech Communication. They made my academic and working experience at UGA fulfilling. Most importantly, Dr. Kenzie Cameron, Dr. Vicki Freimuth, and Dr. John Hocking, I thank you for your wonderful course instruction.

I would also wish to thank some important people from my academic past. I wish to thank Mr. Chandler and the speech and debate program of George Washington High School. He provided the vehicle for me to find my love for communication. I wish to warmly thank the faculty of the communication program at Humboldt State University: Greg Young, Dr. Julie Yingling, Dr. Herschel Mack, and Dr. Jay Verlinden.

Warm thanks are insufficient to describe my regard for the people and department at Wake Forest University. With people like Beth Hutchinson, Dr. Steve Giles, Dr. Micheal Hyde, Dr. Allan Louden, Dr. Jill McMillian, Dr. Ananda Mitra, Dr. Randy Rogan, and Dr. Eric Watts; I cannot think of a place I would rather be or a place I would rather send a student to get an MA.

My whole academic experience would not have been bearable if it were not for the friendships I’ve made. Dr. Rebecca Meisenbach (Becky), it was great having you as a touchstone to Wake. Norman Wong, you are the research Yin to my Yang. Norm, we are a great team and we will continue to do great things together in the lab and on the golf course. Norman, thanks for helping make a few of the phone calls on the study, it was a big help.

Last, I wish to thank my family. Irene Munowitch (Mom) and Sandra (Emuna) Householder (Sisterhead), you have always been the most important people in my life. I missed you both a great deal during my journey but I felt you where always close. Ann Munowitch (Auntie Annie), you have been the biggest supporter of my academic pursuits and your love of knowledge help cultivate my desire to learn. Gertrude Munowitch (Bubby), it felt so good
knowing how much you cared about me. David Householder (Dad) thanks for trying to make our relationship better. I really feel like things are getting better and will continue to improve. Danny Barak, you have been a great friend for the last fourteen years and I have missed spending time with you. Eric Richman, you provided me with the breaks from work I needed and you kept me grounded to what was real.

Taunya Peters, words cannot say how much you mean to me. I love you. Having you in my life and having your love have been so important to my time at UGA and my growth as a person. I cannot imagine doing this without “snuggle time.”

Henry Shishmanian, none of this would have been possible without your support and love. It is incredible what people can accomplish when they feel they have support and how far out on the ledge one can go when that person has a safety net. You made me feel safe. You made me feel I could afford to take the risks I have. To anyone else I might have forgotten, thank you for your support. This process has been a wonderful life experience and I would not trade my years hear at UGA for anything.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS......................................................................................................................v

LISTS OF TABLES............................................................................................................................ix

LIST OF FIGURES ............................................................................................................................x

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION & REVIEW OF LITERATURE.................................................................1

2 METHODS...............................................................................................................................24

3 RESULTS...............................................................................................................................32

4 DISCUSSION...........................................................................................................................40

REFERENCES ..............................................................................................................................50

APPENDICES ............................................................................................................................56

A ORGANIZATION ATTITUDE CONCENT FORM .........................................................56

B PIOLET QUESTIONNAIRE ..........................................................................................58

C WAVE ONE QUESTIONNAIRE ................................................................................59

D WAVE TWO QUESTIONNAIRE ................................................................................72

E WAVE THREE QUESTIONNAIRE ..............................................................................73

F DEBRIEFING......................................................................................................................74
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.1</td>
<td>Measure Descriptive Data</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.2</td>
<td>One-way Analysis of Variance: Verbal Intention to Comply by Condition</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.3</td>
<td>One-way Analysis of Variance: Actual Donating Behavior by Condition</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.4</td>
<td>Significant Forward Regression Analyses by Group and Exogenous Factor</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.5</td>
<td>One-way Analysis of Variance: Perceived Behavioral Control Time Two by Condition</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 The Theory of Planned Behavior ................................................................. 18
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION & REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Most research on persuasive message strategies tests the effects of a single message presented to a large audience. These studies have explored the impact of source credibility, argument strength, narrative versus statistical evidence, one-sided versus two-sided arguments and a host of additional factors on persuasive outcomes. In applied settings, persuasive attempts frequently involve the presentation of multiple persuasive messages, sometimes in a planned order or sequence. The foot-in-the-door strategy (Freedman & Fraser, 1966), pregiving strategy (Marwell & Schmitt, 1967), even-a-penny strategy (Cialdini & Schroeder, 1976), and lowballing strategy (Cialdini, Cacioppo, Basset, & Miller, 1978) are a few of the important sequential persuasive message strategies that have been used in applied settings and tested by social influence scholars. Another important sequential persuasive message strategy is the door-in-the-face (DITF) (Cialdini et al, 1975). A DITF sequence occurs when a large initial request is rejected and followed by a smaller target request. Compliance with the target request is the goal of the source of the attempt. As a result of using this sequence of requests, compliance should be greater than when the target request is made alone.

Over the last twenty-five years, various explanations for the success of the DITF have been tested. Specifically, a reciprocal concessions explanation (Cialdini et al., 1975), a perceptual contrast explanation (Miller et al., 1976), a self-presentation explanation (Pendleton & Batson, 1979), a prosocialness of request explanation (Dillard, Hunter, & Burgoon, 1984; Dillard & Hale, 1992), and a guilt-based explanation (O’Keefe & Figge, 1997) have been advanced to
explain DITF. While varying degrees of support have been found for each explanation, none of
them seems to fully capture the cognitive and the social processes that influence the effectiveness
of the DITF. DITF research has focused on simple decision rules for success or failure. This
study proposes a more complex explanation for how the DITF works. Specifically, this study
argues that constructs from the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB; Ajzen, 1985) provide a
reasonable account of the DITF.

Additionally, the study looks at the DITF in an applied context. Every year in the United
States, 3.5 million people will experience homelessness (Armour, 2003). This research solicits
monetary donations for the Athens Area Homeless Shelter. Non-profit social service
organizations like the Athens Area Homeless Shelter can benefit from a better understanding of
the factors influencing decisions to volunteer time or donate money. Hence, this investigation
tests the relationship between TPB constructs and compliance in an applied DITF context. To
better explicate this investigation, a review of both the DITF and TPB are offered.

Door-In-The-Face Overview

A DITF message sequence is typically comprised of two requests. The initial request is
quite large and is nearly always rejected by the target of the request. The second request is
smaller and constitutes the target request, that is, the request with which the source hopes to gain
compliance. For example, a representative of the March of Dimes might make an initial request
for a donation of $100 from a potential donor. When the initial request is rejected by the donor,
the March of Dimes representative then makes a request for a smaller donation, say of $20. The
smaller request constitutes the target request, or the request to which the source seeks
compliance.
Most DITF studies compare rates of compliance resulting from a DITF message sequence to rates of compliance from making only the target request. Occasionally, the focus of DITF research is one or more factors that influence compliance with the DITF sequence and the target-only condition, which operates as a sort of control condition, is omitted (e.g., Bell, Abrahams, Clark, & Schlatter, 1996).

Cialdini et al. (1975) conducted the initial studies of the DITF. In their studies, a large initial request was proposed to the influence target in the form of donating hundreds of hours of time working as a counselor for __________. That request was designed to be rejected and followed by the target request. The target request in their studies was a request for the target of influence to agree to chaperone a group of juvenile delinquents on a trip to the local zoo. The initial studies found significantly higher compliance with the target request as a result of a DITF sequence than when the target request was made alone.

Meta-analyses of the DITF (Dillard et al., 1984; Fern, Monroe, & Avila, 1986; O’Keefe & Hale, 1998) suggest that the DITF is a more effective means of gaining compliance than making a direct request. Dillard and colleagues (1984) reported in their meta-analysis that under optimal conditions, the mean correlation between request type (target-only request or DITF) and compliance was $r = .15$. To tease out the conditions under which the DITF functions the best, Dillard et al. (1984) conducted further analyses. Their study showed that the length of the delay between the first and second requests influenced the effectiveness of the DITF. As the delay between requests increased in the meta-analyzed studies, the correlation between request type and compliance became more negative $r = -.53$. The DITF was more effective when there was no delay between the initial request and the target request. Dillard et al., (1984) also found a positive correlation between the prosocialness of the request and compliance. In their meta-
analysis a prosocial request was one made on behalf of a non-profit organization or group. Requests made on behalf of profit making organizations or groups were not prosocial. The correlation between request type and compliance became more strongly positive as the prosocialness increased, $r = .15$. A DITF sequence was effective when used on behalf of a prosocial organization but not when used on behalf of a for-profit group.

Fern et al. (1986) tested the impact of three different variables on the success of DITF requests: the magnitude of concession made in the target request, the time delay between requests, and whether the requests were made by the same or different persons. The relationship between the magnitude of the concession and compliance was not statistically significant, $r = -.11$. More importantly, Fern et al. found that the DITF was significantly more effective when there was no delay between requests, $r = .30$, and when the requests were made by the same requestor instead of different requestors, $r = .19$.

O’Keefe and Hale’s (1998) meta-analysis of the DITF used an odds based ratio to assess the effect sizes in DITF contexts since the dependent variable of compliance in the DITF is primarily dichotomous. In their odds ratio analysis, if the odds ratio is greater than 1, the experimental condition is having greater influence and if it is less than 1, the control group is having greater influence. Their findings identified five variables that strengthen the effects of DITF. First, they found that the DITF is more effective when little or no time elapses between requests (odds ratio = 1.56, $p < .01$). Second, they reported that the DITF is more effective when requests are made on behalf of prosocial organizations than when made on behalf of those that are not prosocial (odds ratio = 1.62, $p < .01$). Third, DITF requests are more effective if each request has the same beneficiary (odds ratio = 1.60, $p < .01$). Fourth, the DITF produces greater compliance when each request is made by the same person than when different people make the
initial and target requests (odds ratio = 1.59, p < .01). Fifth, the DITF produces greater compliance when the requests are made face-to-face compared to instances where one or more of the requests are not made face-to-face (odds ratio = 1.61, p < .01). Not surprisingly, the effectiveness of the DITF is optimized when each of the conditions discussed previously is present (odds ratio = 1.86, p < .01).

Across the three meta-analyses, two consistent findings emerged. DITF sequences are more effective when the delay between the initial request and the target request is minimized, and when the sequence is used to gain compliance in support of a prosocial organization or group. The variety of explanations that have been offered for the success of the DITF will be discussed in the next section.

Reciprocal Concessions

Cialdini et al., (1975) offered a reciprocal concessions explanation of the DITF. The explanation is based loosely on an analogy to the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), which generally holds that “you should give benefits to those who give you benefits” (p. 170). Cialdini et al., proposed a reciprocal concessions corollary to the norm of reciprocity. The corollary, based on literature related to bargaining and negotiation, generally held that “you should make concessions to those who make concessions to you” (p. 206). When the target of an influence attempt rejects the initial large request, the source follows the rejection by making a second smaller request. Cialdini et al., reasoned that the second request is seen by the target as a concession by the source. The reciprocal concessions explanation suggests the target will match the source’s concession with one of his/her own, and will comply with the smaller request.

To test the reciprocal concessions explanation Cialdini et al. (1975) conducted three experiments. The first experiment included three conditions. In the DITF condition, participants
were asked to donate hundreds of hours of time working as a counselor. When that request was refused, participants were asked to chaperone delinquents on a trip to the zoo. In an “exposure control” condition, participants were presented with both options for volunteering, i.e., counseling or chaperoning the trip to the zoo, and were told they could select either option. The third condition was a target request-only condition where participants were asked to chaperone the trip to the zoo. Compliance with the target request was 50% in the DITF condition, 25% in the exposure control condition, and 16.7% in the target request only condition.

To further test the reciprocal concessions explanation, a second experiment was conducted. It altered the procedure from the first experiment in an important way, i.e., the exposure control condition was removed and a two-requester condition was included where different individuals made the first and second requests. Cialdini et al. contended that the target would not view the second request as a concession if the first and second requests were made by different persons. The results of the second study supported that contention. Compliance was 55.5% in the DITF condition, 10.5% in the two-requestor condition, and 31.5% in the target request-only condition. Cialdini et al. (1975) argued that the results provided strong support of a concessions-based explanation, because the need for a reciprocal concession is only activated if the same person makes both requests.

It was possible that compliance to DITF requests was simply the result of the persistence of the source. To rule out that alternative explanation, Cialdini et al. (1975) conducted a third experiment. It included a DITF condition, a target request-only condition, and an “equivalent requests control group” condition. In the equivalent requests control group condition, the target request was preceded by a request of equal magnitude, but for a different activity, i.e., chaperoning a trip to a museum. The results indicated that rate of compliance for the equivalent
requests control group was equal to compliance in the target only request group (33.3%). The rate of compliance in the DITF group was significantly higher (54.1%).

The reciprocal concession explanation has been vigorously criticized (O’Keefe & Figge, 1997; 1999, O’Keefe & Hale, 1998). While several other explanations for the DITF have been proposed, the work by Cialdini and his colleagues has had tremendous heuristic value and has provided an important starting point for exploring the DITF. Additional explanations of the DITF will be examined next.

*Perceptual Contrast and the Door-in-The-Face*

The perceptual contrast explanation holds that when compared to the first large request, the target request seems small and easier with which to comply. Consider a perceptual analogy, whereas a five-story building in a small town might be considered big, in a metropolitan area surrounded by skyscrapers it would be perceived as miniscule. When applied to the DITF, the perceptual contrast explanation would posit that a great difference between the large initial request and the target or goal request should produce great compliance. The perceptual contrast is thought to induce compliance. However, to date there is no evidence to support the notion that perceptual contrast effects influence differential rates of compliance when comparing a DITF sequence to a target request made by itself.

Cialdini et al. (1975) in their seminal DITF study ruled out perceptual contrasts as an explanation and held to a reciprocal concessions explanation. Their reason for ruling out the perceptual contracts explanation is interesting. In their study, to rule out the contrast effect participants were exposed to the large request and then the small request and then asked to pick which they would like to do. In that part of the study, no participants agreed to the large request and the ratio of participants that agreed to partake in the small request was no different than in
conditions when the small request only was made. Yet, Cialdini (2001) argued that contrast effects explain a variety of compliance behaviors, including ones ranging from clothing sales to major social and political events like the Watergate Scandal. When applied to the DITF, empirical support for contrast effects is scant and highly criticized (Abrahams & Bell, 1994). Continually, studies have not found support for perceptual contrast effects (Abrahams & Bell, 1994; Cantrill & Seibold, 1986; Cialdini et al, 1975, and Goldman et al, 1984). Yet, even with the lack of empirical support, this explanation persists because of its intuitive appeal.

Hale and Laliker (1999) offered a compelling argument for the absence of a relationship between magnitude of concession and request size, i.e., a perceptual contrast. They contend that DITF studies have looked for a linear relationship between magnitude of concession and request size, and that the relationship between these factors may be non-linear. The crux of their argument is that the variable relevant to compliance is the size of the initial request. In other words, for DITF to work, the initial request need not only be large and rejected, but it must also be perceived as reasonable. Additionally, Hale and Laliker (1999) pointed out that the result of making the unreasonable request might lead to defensive reactions or negative attitudes towards the requesting organization. To date, these arguments have not been empirically tested.

*Self-Presentation and the Door-In-The-Face*

Another explanation of the DITF is the self-presentation explanation. This explanation holds that people worry about how they will be judged by the source of the request if they reject both requests in a DITF sequence. Pendleton and Batson (1979) posited that participants in DITF studies complied with the target request in a DITF sequence because they believed not doing so would make them appear to be less friendly, less concerned, and less helpful than if they did comply. Pendleton and Batson had participants reject a large initial request or a moderate initial
request. After the request was rejected, participants responded to a questionnaire assessing what they thought an observer would think of them for rejecting the smaller second request. Their findings indicated that participants who rejected the moderate first request felt observers would see them as less friendly, less helpful, and less concerned than participants who rejected the very large first request. It was Pendleton and Batson’s (1979) contention that compliance with the second request in the DITF sequence served as a way to save face.

Millar (2002) provided additional support for the self-presentation explanation of the DITF. He predicted that participants would have greater face concerns and higher compliance with the target request in a DITF sequence when face concerns were presented, and if a friend made the DITF request rather than if the request was made by a stranger, higher face concerns would be found. To support this prediction, Millar found that when confederates used the DITF on friends versus on strangers both the person doing the requesting and responding to the request had greater concerns about what the other person thought of them as a person. Additionally, Millar found that self-presentation concerns were significantly associated with both verbal and behavioral compliance in the DITF context ($r = .39$ and $r = .36$ respectively).

The data related to self-presentation and DITF are inconsistent. Reeves et al. (1991) tried on three occasions and were unable to replicate the Pendleton and Batson (1979) findings. The replications by Reeves et al. found no difference for friendliness, helpfulness, or concern based on whether the initial request was large or moderate.

In another self-presentation study, after making the initial large request, Patch and Hoang (1997) either followed the traditional DITF sequence, or asked participants to think about whether or not the requests pressured them or made them feel uncomfortable. They found no
difference between the normal DITF sequence and the DITF sequence that demonstrated face concerns for the participants.

*Prosocialness of Request and the Door-In-The-Face*

One explanation for the DITF that has had considerable support is the prosocialness of request explanation. Prosocialness of request is operationally defined by assessing whether the group making the DITF request is a for profit organization (not prosocial), or a non-profit organization (prosocial). Meta-analyses of the DITF literature by Dillard et al. (1984) and O’Keefe (1998, 2001) have indicated the DITF is only effective when the request is made on behalf of a prosocial organization. Hale and Laliker (1999) argued that one major shortcoming of these analyses was that no manipulation checks were done to assess if participants considered the prosocialness of the organizations making the requests.

Dillard et al. (1984) were the first to address the issue of prosocialness issue. In a meta-analysis of DITF literature, they discovered heterogeneity of variance in DITF effect sizes. The heterogeneity could be accounted for by the prosocialness of the requesting organization. The DITF was effective when requests were made on behalf of prosocial organizations and was generally ineffective when made on behalf of profit making groups. Dillard and Hale (1992) controlled prosocialness (Low, Moderate, High) and message type (DITF versus target request only). The results were at odds with the meta-analytic findings. Dillard and Hale found significant main effects for prosocialness and request type. As prosocialness of the request increased so did compliance regardless of the request type. The DITF message sequence produced higher compliance than did the target request only. There was not a significant prosocialness by request type interaction.
The prosocialness effect suggests that people respond to persuasive appeals in an attempt to help others. Indeed, Tusing and Dillard (2000) found that both friends and strangers perceived the DITF interaction to be helping and not bargaining. Tusing and Dillard argued that the findings supported a social responsibility perspective related to the DITF. They reasoned that participants complied with the target request in a DITF sequence to help prosocial groups or organizations. Indeed, the DITF has proven successful in a few applied prosocial contexts (AIDS organization fundraising, Bell et al. 1996; Bell & Cholerton, 1994; Health Behaviors, Millar, 2001).

Guilt and the Door-In-The-Face

O’Keefe and Figge (1997) offered a guilt-based explanation of the DITF. They argued that rejection of the first request in a DITF sequence elicits feelings of guilt, and compliance with the target request served as the vehicle to reduce guilt. To test the guilt-based explanation, O’Keefe and Figge (1999) conducted three experiments.

The first experiment investigated differences in guilt created by a prosocial request versus a non-prosocial request. Participants (N=62) were approached at a mall and asked, either by a student or a major exercise company representative both doing research on heart disease, to comply with a request for research participation. The large request asked participants to volunteer for ten hours of exercise. O’Keefe and Figge found that rejecting the large request created substantially more guilt for those in the prosocial condition than for those in the non-prosocial condition. This was not a test of the DITF per se, but rather a test of guilt level aroused by rejecting a large compliance gaining request. The study did not assess compliance with a second smaller request.
In the second experiment of the three, O’Keefe and Figge (1997) investigated whether participants receiving a DITF sequence experience less guilt if they accepted the second-request than a person who rejected the second request. Participants were approached on a college campus and asked to volunteer on behalf of the local Boys and Girls club. Participants were asked to volunteer for 15 hours a week for the semester, or for one afternoon. The study found that participants who complied with either request felt less guilt than those who rejected either request. There was no difference in the level of guilt for those who accepted the second request in the DITF condition or those participants in the DIFT or target-only conditions that rejected the request.

Finally, O’Keefe and Figge (1997) looked at whether the lack of support for a guilt-based explanation was a result of post decision cognitive processing. In other words, it is possible that people report not feeling guilt as a way of reducing post decisional dissonance after rejecting the request. O’Keefe and Figge argued that measuring anticipated guilt might provide a better test of the guilt-based explanation than measuring post decisional reports of guilt. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions. The first condition had subjects read a hypothetical scenario where a prosocial organization made a large request. The participants were asked to envision themselves declining the large request. The second condition was the same as the first, except that participants were instructed to envision themselves rejecting both requests in a DITF sequence. The final condition of the research had participants envision themselves rejecting the initial request, but complying with the target request in a DITF sequence. Participants in each condition were asked to assess their anticipated levels of guilt. Participants who envisioned declining both requests in a DITF sequence reported significantly higher anticipated guilt than did participants who complied with the target request after rejecting the large request.
There seems to be mixed support for O’Keefe and Figge’s (1997) guilt-based explanation for DITF effects. Findings indicated rejecting a prosocial request creates more guilt than rejecting a non-prosocial request. Results also indicated people complying with a DITF target request anticipate feeling less guilt than either those who do not comply with the target request or who reject a single large request. Nevertheless, there was no difference in anticipated or reported guilt between persons who complied with a DITF target request or those who rejected both requests in a DITF sequence (O’Keefe & Figge, 1999).

**What is The Best Explanation for Door-In-The-Face Effects?**

Primary studies of each explanation for DITF effects have produced inconsistent findings. Three meta-analyses (Dillard et al., 1984; Fern et al., 1986; & O’Keefe, 2001) on the DITF provided consistent findings on some issues, but not on others. The meta-analyses concluded that DITF effects, without considering the impact of moderating variables, range from \( r = .15 \) to \( r = .25 \) (Dillard, 1991). With regard to moderating variables, the meta-analyses generally provide little agreement except that no relationship is found in these studies between concession size or request size, and DITF effectiveness.

The perceptual contrast explanation seems to have the least empirical validity but considerable face validity. Recall that Hale and Laliker (1999) posited that the relationship between magnitude of the concession and compliance would be non-linear. Tusing and Dillard (2000) were able to replicate the findings related to a social responsibility explanation for DITF. In their analysis, participants where asked to link terms (helping, bargaining) with a DITF context. Participants reported that the DITF was more of a helping situation, than a bargaining situation. In that analysis, Tusing and Dillard (2000) make an elegant argument that the guilt explanation (O’Keefe and Figge, 1997) and the social responsibility explanation are “two parts
of the same puzzle” (p.9). Basically, a person would only feel guilt if he/she rejected a prosocial request. Yet, there is still some support for elements of a reciprocal concessions explanation. The meta-analytic data (Dillard et al., 1984; Fern et al., 1986; & O’Keefe, 2001) and other studies (Burger et al., 1997) clearly indicated the importance of the same requester making the requests within a limited time period. If the DITF effects were only the result of helping or prosocialness, then the time between requests in a DITF sequence, or the use of same versus different requesters should not be as important as they appear to be in influencing compliance. To address the concerns presented in the preceding review I offer the following predictions:

**General DITF Effects**

Hypothesis 1: A Door-In-The-Face Sequence will produce significantly more verbal compliance with the target request than when the target request is made alone.

Hypothesis 2: A Door-In-The-Face Sequence will produce significantly more behavioral compliance with the target request than when the target request is made alone.

Hypothesis 3: There is a nonlinear relationship between the size of the initial request and verbal intention to comply when the DITF is used. Specifically, a moderate concession magnitude will produce more verbal compliance than either a large or small concession magnitude.

Like the predictions above, prior attempts at explaining the underpinnings of the DITF have been centered on an approach that seems to maximize parsimony at the expense of capturing an adequate representation of the DITF phenomenon. The simplicity of the DITF strategy seems to obfuscate a more complex model that may offer a better explanation of DITF
effects. The elements of the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) may provide a better explanation for DITF effects than the explanations reviewed above. To better explicate this contention, a review of the TPB and related findings will follow.

An Overview of the Theory of Planned Behavior

The TPB (Ajzen, 1985) is an extension of the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). TRA proposed that human behaviors are mainly the result of the rational and systematic use of information. The core of the TRA is the notion that the immediate determination of behavior or action is a person’s intention to behave or act. According to the TRA, a person’s intention to behave is a function of two constructs, attitude towards performing the behavior and perceived social approval or subjective norms (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Moreover, the TRA posits that most relevant social behavior is under a person’s volitional control. Thus, behavioral intention or planning to act a certain way is the most important predictor of actual behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975).

The TRA has been tested with a wide variety of volitional behaviors or behaviors that a person can do voluntarily. Those behaviors include but are not limited to, reporting alien abduction (Patry & Pelletier, 2001), condom use (Greene, Hale, & Rubin, 1997) and dieting (Sejwacz, Ajzen, & Fishbein, 1980). At least six meta-analyses assessing the relationship of the TRA constructs of behavioral intentions and behaviors have been published (Hale, Householder, & Greene, 2002). The meta-analyses indicated that the antecedent elements of the TRA account for between 19% and 38% of the variance in volitional behaviors (Hale et. al, 2002). There is disagreement about the implications of the effect sizes. For example, Marks (1996) contended that the TRA has little utility in health contexts when judged against a standard of accounting for
100% of the variance. Conversely, Conner and Armitage (1998), and Sutton (1998), argued that in relation to conventional variances accounted for in social science research, behavioral intentions predict volitional behaviors satisfactorily.

*The Impact of Attitudes and Subjective Norms on Behavioral Intentions.* The TRA holds that both attitudes and subjective norms influence behavioral intentions. A host of studies have reviewed research linking both of these factors and the factors dual or combined impact on behavioral intentions. For example, Kim and Hunter (1993) examined 92 studies where the behavioral intentions and attitudes components were measured. They found that when corrected for dichotomization and measurement error, the strength of relationship between attitude and behavioral intentions was .82. Additional meta-analyses of these constructs by Sheeran and Taylor (1999) and Godin and Kok (1996) provided uncorrected correlations of .45 and .46 respectively. Additionally, there was only minimal overlap between the studies examined by Sheeran and Taylor (1999) and those examined by Godin and Kok (1996).

The meta-analyses by Sheeran and Taylor (1999) and Godin and Kok (1996) also examined the relationship between subjective norms and behavioral intentions. Subjective norms are comprised of two concepts. First, subjective norms are influenced by perceptions of how valued others might feel about a volitional behavior. For example, a person might value her relationships with her parents, friends, pastor, and others. With those relationships in mind, he/she might know that those valued others would approve of her volunteering her time to a local charity. Second, subjective norms are also influenced by a person’s motivation to comply with the desires of valued others. In other words, is it important for him/ her to behave in a way that valued others expected. For example, after having a fight with his/her parents a young person is no longer motivated to comply with the wishes of his/her parents. The meta-analyses (Godin &
Kok; 1996; Sheeran & Taylor, 1999) both provided strong support for the relationship between subjective norms and behavioral intentions.

TRA skeptics have criticized the reported combined effects of subjective norms and attitudes on behavioral intentions. Yet, the multiple correlations ($R$) values have ranged from a low of .63 to a high of .71, and $R^2$ values from a low of .40 to a high of .50 (Hale et al., 2002). Proponents of the TRA contend these data indicate that subjective norms, attitudes, and the combination of the two constructs predict behavioral intentions and subsequent volitional behaviors very well.

_The Theory of Planned Behavior: An Extension of the Theory of Reasoned Action._ One of the major shortcomings of the TRA was the theory’s inability to predict and explain non-volitional behaviors. Liska (1985) notes that the TRA excludes from its scope, behaviors that might require cooperation, special skills, lack of perceived opportunity, and/or lack of resources. People might want to perform a behavior, have strong subjective norms and attitudes towards a behavior, and still not engage in the behavior. For example, if one were asked to donate $50 to a charity, but had only $10, then the action of donating $50 is not volitional. To address the concerns of the limited scope of TRA, Ajzen (1985) offered the TPB (Figure 1.1.) to predict and explain behaviors that were not completely under an individual’s volitional control.

The TPB reflects the TRA with one major difference; the addition of a perceived behavioral control component. Perceived behavioral control is how easy or demanding a person perceives an action to be (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). Ajzen (1991) related perceived behavioral control to the construct of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982). Self-efficacy research has shown that perceived self-efficacy influences the behaviors people engage in, effort in preparing for those behaviors, and effort level during the behaviors (Bandura, 1982; 1991). In the TPB model,
perceived behavioral control is a function of control beliefs and perceived power. Control beliefs are comprised of a person’s beliefs about having the resources and opportunity to perform a behavior. Perceived power is the perceived ability to facilitate the performance of a behavior. For example, a student might not have the opportunity to work five hours at a homeless shelter because s/he is overwhelmed studying for finals. Or, a student may not have the resources to donate $10 to a charity because those resources were applied to the purchase of textbooks. Thus, students in those situations would have low control beliefs. For example, if a student has the $10 and has the time, does he/she feel able to perform the desired behavior? Perceived power tends to be measured on a bipolar, easy-difficult scale (Ajzen, 1991; Terry, Gallois, & McCarnish, 1993).

Many of the findings related to TRA can be applied to TPB. Yet, it is important to examine the impact of perceived behavioral control on behavioral intentions, and the role perceived behavioral control plays when combined with subjective norms and attitudes. Some meta-analyses have examined the relationship between perceived behavioral control and
intentions. The meta-analyses have examined exercise-related behaviors (Hausenblas, Carron, & Mack, 1997), condom use (Sheeran & Taylor, 1999), a wide range of health-related behaviors (Godin & Kok, 1996), and one where no content area was specified (Ajzen, 1991). These studies reported a mean correlation between perceived behavioral control and behavioral intentions ranging from .35 to .53. Additionally, the studies demonstrated a correlation between perceived behavioral control and behavior; ranging from .39 to .45. Ajzen (1985, 1987) indicated that perceived behavioral control would have both a direct impact on behavior and be mediated by intentions.

The ability of the TPB to predict intentions can best be seen when attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control are examined together. According to the meta-analyses of the TPB (Ajzen, 1991; Godin & Kok, 1996; Sheeran & Taylor, 1999), attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control account for between 40% and 50% of the variance in behavioral intentions. Additionally, Hausenblas et al. (1997) reported that TPB was significantly better than the TRA when predicting exercise intentions and behavior. Moreover, Sheeran and Taylor (1999) found that TPB explained 5% more of the variance in condom use than TRA.

Overall, both TRA and TPB have considerable evidence demonstrating their ability to predict and explain both volitional behaviors and behaviors that are less than volitional (in a variety of contexts). From a TRA and TPB perspective, persuasive appeals can attempt to change belief strength, belief evaluation, normative beliefs, motivation to comply, control beliefs, and perceived power. The portion of the chapter that follows provides the rationale for the relationship between the TPB and the DITF. Additionally, specific hypotheses and research questions are discussed.

*Linking the Theory of Planned Behavior and the Door-In-The-Face*
There are a number of arguments for why elements of the TPB may be useful for explaining DITF effects. The first is based on the outcome measurement of most DITF studies. In most DITF studies, the outcome measure is a written or oral statement of a person’s intention to comply, not actual behavioral compliance. For example, in the seminal study by Cialdini et al. (1975) the target request was “will you chaperone a group of juvenile delinquents to the zoo for a single two-hour trip?” No participants actually engaged in the chaperoning behavior. As Dillard et al. (1984) noted in their meta-analysis of the DITF literature:

The most common dependent variable in sequential message strategy research is verbal compliance, that is, verbal agreement or disagreement to perform the second request. While some studies have measured the extent to which people actual do what they say they will, the preponderance of studies have relied on a single item measure of verbal compliance. (p.470)

The traditional operational definition of compliance in DITF studies is more closely akin to the behavioral intention construct from the TPB than it is to behavioral compliance. In a study by Miller et al. (1976), participants who agreed to donate blood as a result of the DITF were 35% more likely to actually comply, than those who agreed to the target request only. Although TPB and TRA studies indicate that behavioral intentions are a strong predictor of behavior, the correlation is not a perfect one (Hale et al., 2002). As a result, it would seem wise to examine how behavioral intentions and behavior correlate, particularly in DITF contexts.

A second reason the TPB seems consistent with DITF effects is the similarity of the prosocialness effect to Tusing and Dillard’s (2000) suggestion that social responsibility may motivate compliance with the DITF. Meta-analyses of DITF indicate that DITF is only effective when the requests come from prosocial or charitable organizations. When the requests come
from for-profit entities, the effective size drops to zero (Dillard et al., 1984; O'Keefe & Hale, 1998). Dillard and Hale (1992) did not find a prosocialness x request type interaction effect, but instead found that prosocialness operated independent of request type to influence compliance. Regardless of what relationship between prosocialness and request type is the true one, it is clear that social norms influence compliance with influence attempts.

A third reason elements of the TPB ought to explain DITF effects is that attitudes toward the requesting organization are likely to influence compliance with DITF effects. Hale and Laliker (1999) pointed out that in most research testing prosocialness and the DITF, prosocialness is confounded with attitudes toward the requesting organization. Indeed, Dillard and Hale (1992) used semantic differential scales to measure prosocialness that included bi-polar adjectives typically used to assess the attitude construct. In several bodies of social influence literature, the target or receiver’s attitude toward an issue, organization, or message source influences his or her response to the persuasive message or compliance seeking strategy.

One important question to address at this juncture is why the current study will apply the TPB, and not the TRA, to the DITF. The cornerstone of the DITF is making a large request, which is rejected. Tusing and Dillard (2000) pointed out, “individuals can reasonably reject even a prosocial first request because they lack the ability to meet a request of that size” (p.9). In other words, the DITF technique places the target in a context of non-volitional behavior and forces him or her to “reasonably” reject the first request. By making the large initial request, the DITF diminishes perceived behavioral control of the target. Conversely, the smaller target request should activate a higher sense of behavioral control. Additionally, in situations where participants still reject the second request in the DITF, the smaller second request could still be seen as non-volitional or beyond a participant’s resources and abilities. Given the nature of DITF
situations, the TPB seems more appropriate than the TRA for explaining and predicting compliance in DITF contexts. Thus, to examine the relationship between the TPB the following hypotheses are proposed:

**Attitudes and Compliance**

Hypothesis 4: As attitudes toward the requesting organization become more positive, verbal compliance will increase.

Hypothesis 5: As attitudes toward the requesting organization become more positive, behavioral compliance will increase.

**Subjective Norms and Compliance**

Hypothesis 6: As subjective norms related to the compliance-seeking attempt become more positive verbal compliance will increase.

Hypothesis 7: As subjective norms related to the compliance-seeking attempt become more positive behavioral compliance will increase.

**Perceived Behavioral Control and Compliance**

Hypothesis 8: As perceived behavioral control related to the compliance-seeking attempt increases, verbal compliance will increase.

Hypothesis 9: As perceived behavioral control related to the compliance-seeking attempt increases, behavioral compliance will increase.

The final issue this study explores is the relationship between DITF condition and perceived behavioral control after a participant indicates intention to donate. Specifically, Research Question 1: Do differences in DITF request size cause significant differences in perceived behavioral control?
This question addresses the notion that something happens as a result of a success DITF attempt that induces a perceptual contrast effect.

To test these hypotheses and my research question a field experiment was conducted. The nature of the experiment is described in the following pages.
CHAPTER 2

METHODS

Participants

Four hundred ninety-two \((N = 492)\) students from speech communication courses at the University of Georgia participated in the study. Participants were predominantly female \((57.3\%)\) and European American in descent \((84.3\%)\). The age of participants ranged from 18 to 36 years of age \((M = 19.78; SD = 2.56)\). Participants were volunteers and fulfilled course research requirements and/or received extra course credit for their participation. As per the guidelines of the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, participants were informed of options other than participation in the study to fulfill their course research requirements.

Design

A 1 x 4 factorial design was employed. The factor controlled in the experiment was the type of compliance-seeking request. Participants were exposed to one of four request types: a DITF sequence with a small concession, a DITF sequence with a moderate concession, a DITF sequence with a large concession, or a target request only.

Pilot Study

To determine what the three request sizes would be, a small pilot study was conducted \((N = 42)\) prior to the main study. Individuals that took part in the pilot study were part of the large subject pool and had demographic characteristics identical to the large sample. Upon completion of a consent form (Appendix A), participants were given a questionnaire with three open-ended items and demographic questions (Appendix B). Specifically, they were asked to indicate, if
asked by Athens Area Homeless Shelter, what would they consider a small amount that they would reject? Next, they were asked what would be a medium sized amount that they would reject. Finally, they were asked to indicate what was a large amount that they would reject? Simple descriptive statistics were used to analyze the pilot data. For the small request the $M = 18.7\ (SD = 3.75)$, for the medium request the $M = 46.7\ (SD = 6.53)$, and the large request the $M = 92.7\ (SD = 14.2)$. Based on the pilot scores and what on face seemed externally valid, values of $20,\ 50\ and\ 100$ were selected to represent the small, medium, and large initial DITF requests. In all four conditions the same $10$ target request was made. The nature of the DITF requests is discussed below. Participants were randomly assigned to these conditions.

*Procedures*

Data were collected in three waves. The following subsections will describe the nature of the observations made in each wave of the study.

*Wave One: Theory of Planned Behavior and Demographic Observations.* The initial wave of observations was made in a laboratory setting. In the initial wave (Wave One), participants were given an informed consent form (Appendix A). They were asked to carefully read the form and to complete it if they wished to participate in the study. The consent form asked the participants to list their local telephone number and email address. The consent forms, which were also read aloud by a researcher, informed students that some information about their participation may be withheld until after their participation in the study is completed. It also communicated to participants that they might be contacted and asked to provide additional information related to the study.

Students who agreed to participate in the study were then given a questionnaire to assess their subjective norms, attitudes, perceived behavioral control and perceptions of prosocialness
related to performing behaviors on behalf of various charitable organizations. The questionnaire asked a series of demographic questions (See Appendix C). When participants completed the first wave, they were not given a written debriefing and were told that a full debriefing would be made available at the completion of the study. They were thanked for their participation and excused from the laboratory.

Wave Two: Responding to a Compliance-Seeking Message. Three weeks after completing the first wave of the study, participants were contacted via telephone. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four message request conditions. They were told over the telephone that they were being contacted by a representative for the Athens Area Homeless Shelter. The phone call was made by the principle investigator or a graduate research assistant. The principle investigator was always present to observe that the script was followed. The scripts used by the telephone interviewers appear below.

Target only. Hello, may I speak to (participant’s name)? We are calling UGA student on behalf of the Athens Area Homeless Shelter, a non-profit shelter located on Barber Street. We are conducting a research project to raise money so that homeless children can attend Summer Spree, a Summer Camp for disadvantaged kids. We are asking students to donate $10. One hundred percent of your donation will be used to send a child to camp. May we count on you for a $10 donation?

Small Concession DITF. Hello, may I speak to (participant’s name). We are calling UGA student on behalf of the Athens Area Homeless Shelter, a non-profit shelter located on Barber Street. We are conducting a research project to raise money so that homeless children can attend Summer Spree, a Summer Camp for disadvantaged kids. We are asking students to donate $20. One hundred percent of your donation will be used to send a child to camp. May we
count on you for a $20 donation? (Solicitors paused to allow response. If no). A $10 dollar donation would be very helpful. May we count on you for a $10 donation?

*Moderate Concession DITF.* Hello, may I speak to (participant’s name). We are calling UGA student on behalf of the Athens Area Homeless Shelter, a non-profit shelter located on Barber Street. We are conducting a research project to raise money so that homeless children can attend Summer Spree, a Summer Camp for disadvantaged kids. We are asking students to donate $50. One hundred percent of your donation will be used to send a child to camp. May we count on you for a $50 donation? (Solicitors paused to allow response. If no). A $10 dollar donation would be very helpful. May we count on you for a $10 donation?

*Large Concession DITF.* Hello, may I speak to (participant’s name). We are calling UGA student on behalf of the Athens Area Homeless Shelter, a non-profit shelter located on Barber Street. We are conducting a research project to raise money so that homeless children can attend Summer Spree, a Summer Camp for disadvantaged kids. We are asking students to donate $100. One hundred percent of your donation will be used to send a child to camp. May we count on you for a $100 donation? (Solicitors paused to allow response. If no). A $10 dollar donation would be very helpful. May we count on you for a $10 donation?

Participants who agreed to make a donation were asked to provide an address so that a postage paid, donation envelope, could be mailed to them. The donation envelope was mailed no more than three days after the phone interview was completed (Appendix D contains the script and data collection form for all four conditions)

*Wave Three: Follow-up Interview.* The final wave of the study consisted of a follow-up interview. The interviewer contacted the participant by telephone posing as a project supervisor in the nonprofit organization. The supervisor made it clear he was not soliciting funds, but was
concerned with seeking information about the first interview to assess the fundraising campaign. Participants were asked if they are willing to respond a brief series of questions about the initial telephone interview. When the participant agreed to answer the follow-up questions, the interviewer proceeded with the interview schedule shown in Appendix E. These questions assessed behavioral intentions, perceived behavioral control, and a manipulation check to determine if participants thought the questions were coming from the Athens Area Homeless Shelter or the university researcher.

Upon the completion of wave three, a postage paid, pre-addressed envelope was immediately sent to participants who agreed to donate. The donation envelope reminded and thanked participants for their donation pledge of $10. All of the participants that complied only returned the $10 amount pleaded and no other amount. Two weeks were allowed for participants to mail in their donation. Donation envelopes were coded so that individual participants could be identified. Coding consisted of adding the participant’s number to the end of the return address Zip-Code. For example, if the return zip was 30601, participant number one’s envelope would have a zip-code of 30601-00001. After the two week period had elapsed, all participants were emailed a full debriefing explaining the study completely (APPENDIX F). All of the procedures were conducted by the principle investigator or a graduate student assistant under the direct supervision of the principle investigator. This was done to maintain consistency in the procedures.

*Measures*

The following measures were used to assess TPB constructs.
**Subjective norms.** 18 items were adapted from Warburton and Terry (2000) and Ajzen (2002) to assess the extent to which participants perceived family, friends and others important to them thought they should engage in donation behavior. For each of the three groups individually, participants were asked “______(My family, My friends, and others important to me) thinks donating money to Athens Area Homeless Shelter is:” Important-unimportant; necessary-unnecessary; right-wrong; worthless-valuable*; good-bad; harmful-helpful. A seven interval Likert response scale was used where higher scores indicated greater support for donations. A star (*) next to the item indicates that it was reverse coded in the final measure construction.

Additionally, to assess subjective norms, another concept was measured, motivation to comply. According to Ajzen (1991), subjective norms are not just the product of the attitude of those other individuals in an individual’s life, but of how much the individual tends to do what those others in his/her life think he/she should do. To tap this concept, participants were asked to respond to the following 3 items: “Generally speaking, how much do you want to do what your family thinks you should do?”; “Generally speaking, how much do you want to do what your friends think you should do?”; and “Generally speaking, how much do you want to do what others important to you think you should do?” These items were measures on a seven point Likert type scale; with one pole of the measure being anchored by “not at all” and the other “very much.” Higher scores equal greater motivation to comply. In the final analysis, motivation to comply is combined with subjective norms to create the final measure of subjective norms.

**Attitudes.** Nine items were used to determine attitudes towards donating to the Athens Area Homeless Shelter. Seven interval semantic differential scales were used to assess attitudes toward donation (Ajzen, 1991). Respondents assessed the statement “Donating money to Athens
Area homeless shelter is” with the following bi-polar scale anchors: *important-unimportant; necessary-unnecessary; right-wrong; worthless-valuable*; good-bad; harmful-helpful*; enjoyable-unenjoyable; useless-useful*; positive-negative. Higher scores indicated more positive attitudes. An asterisk (*) next to the item indicates that it was reverse coded in the final measure construction.

Perceived behavioral control. Six items were adapted from Ajzen and Madden (1986) to measure the perceived ease or difficulty of donating. Respondents assessed the statement “Donating money to Athens Area homeless shelter is” with the following bi-polar scale anchors: difficult-easy; impossible-possible; problematic-straightforward; simple-complex*; do able-not do able*; effortless-effortful*. A seven interval Likert response scale was used for each item so that higher scores indicated more perceived behavioral control.

The perceived behavior control measure in Wave 3 used a different format. Since those items were assessed over the telephone the measure was limited to five-point Likert type scales and the measure only consisted of four items. Each item’s pole was either strongly agree or strongly disagree. These items assess the perceived difficulty of the target request. Specifically: *It would be very difficult for me to donate $10 to Athens Area Homeless Shelter.*; It would be no problem for me to donate $10 to Athens Area Homeless Shelter.; $10 is too large a donate request for me.*; The $10 donate request would be easy for me to manage. Higher scores indicate *more perceived behavior control in Wave 3.*

Behavioral intentions. Intentions to donate to the Athens Area Homeless Shelter were measured with a single item. Ideally, this concept would be measure with three five interval Likert type items (Ajzen & Madden, 1986; Warburton & Terry, 2000): (a) “I will donate to Athens Area Homeless Shelter”; (b) “I do not intend to donate to Athens Area Homeless
Shelter”; and (c) “I am determined to donate to Athens Area homeless shelter.” Higher scores indicated greater intentions to donate. In the case of this study, for the purpose of external validity it is my belief that those items would be repetitive and would seem unrealistic in an actual phone donation context. We asked participants directly, “Can we count on you for a donation?” This item was measured by a dichotomous yes or no response. No was assigned a score of zero and yes assigned a score of one. The higher score indicated higher intention.

Additionally, the means for this measure indicate proportions. For example, if the study had one hundred participants and 37 agreed to donate, the mean value reported would be .37 or 37%.

**Behavior.** Like intentions, behavior was also measured with a dichotomous yes or no response. Not donating in wave 3 was assigned a score of zero and donating assigned a score of one. Like the intentions measure, the means for this measure indicate proportions of compliance.

**Perceived prosocialness.** Two Likert items were created to measure the perceived prosocialness of the organization: (a) “This is a charitable organization”; and (b) “This is a nonprofit organization.” The items used seven interval responses scales where higher scores indicated greater perceived prosocialness.

**Manipulation check.** A final single item was used to evaluate if participants believed the questions were really being asked by the nonprofit organization: (a) “This research is being conducted by the Athens Area Homeless shelter.” The item was scaled using a five interval Likert format where higher scores indicated greater agreement with the statement.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Chapter 1 provided a detailed review of literature on DIFT and TPB. Chapter 2 provided insight into the participants, measures, and procedures used in the study. This chapter offers detailed data analyses of hypotheses offered at the conclusion of Chapter 1. All of the analyses done in this study were done with the assistance of two computer programs, LIMSTAT and SPSS 11.0.

Measures

Confirmatory factor analyses were done with the aid of LIMSTAT to assess the internal consistency, parallelism, and flatness of all TPB constructs. These analyses where completed to assure that measures were unidimensional, reliable and valid. For example, if an item deviated more than sampling error for internal-consistency, or if according to the parallelism test the item correlated with items from another measure in ways dissimilar to other items from the scale, then the item would be removed from the final measure. Some of the items from the original measures were the source of consistent and significant errors and were removed for the final measures. Reported below are the number of items retained in a measure and the Cronbach’s alpha for each measure. For each measure, the retained items are identified in the appropriate appendices with highlighting.

Attitude

Five items were retained from the original attitude measure. The Cronbach’s alpha for the final attitude measure was .85.
Subjective Norms

Seven items measuring subjective norms were retained from the original measure. The Cronbach’s alpha for the seven item measure was .92. All three items from the motivation-to-comply construct were retained. The Cronbach’s alpha for those items was .76.

Perceived Behavioral Control

Perceived behavioral control was measured at two times in the study. Once in Wave One and again in Wave Three. Two different measures were used in the study. The first measure consisted of five items (PBC 1). The Cronbach’s alpha for the five item scale was .83. The second measure of perceived behavioral control (PBC 2) was comprised of all four original items with a Cronbach’s alpha of .85. Means and standard deviations for all the measures are reported in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Measure Descriptive Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norms</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Comply</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC 1</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC 2</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manipulation Check

The final question in the study assessed if participants believed the request for donation was being made by the Athens Area Homeless shelter. All the participants that participated in
Wave 3 in the study either strongly agreed or agreed that the solicitations and follow-up questions were being conducted by the shelter ($M = 4.78; SD = .65$).

**Tests of Hypotheses**

*Hypothesis 1*

Hypothesis one posited significantly greater verbal compliance from a DITF sequence than from the target request presented alone. To test for a DITF effect, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted where proportions or participants who agreed to donate served as the condition’s means. There was a significant difference in verbal intentions to donate across request type conditions ($F (3, 293) = 3.72; p < .05; \eta^2 = .04; \text{power} = .80$). Bonferoni post hoc tests were used to compare mean verbal compliance across groups because the technique adjusts the Type I error rate. The results indicated that only the Large Concession DITF and Moderate Concession DITF conditions were significantly different from one another. The results failed to reject the null hypothesis and failed to replicate a DITF effect. The results are summarized in table 3.2.

Table 3.2 One-way Analysis of Variance: Proportion of Verbal Intention to Comply by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target only</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small DITF</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate DITF</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large DITF</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Matching subscripts denotes a significant difference between the groups. $p < .05$, means are the percentage of participants that indicated an intention to donate.*
Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis two posited a DITF effect for monetary donations so that DITF conditions were predicted to elicit greater compliance than the target request only condition. The hypothesis was tested using a one-way analysis of variance where proportions served as the condition means. There was a significant effect for monetary donations \( (F, 3, 86 = 2.74; \ p < .05; \ \eta^2 = .09; \ \text{power} = .65) \). Bonferoni post hoc contrasts tests comparing donations across groups indicated that only the Small Concession DITF differed significantly from both the target request and the large Concession DITF condition. The results are summarized in table 3.3, and based upon them, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 3.3 One-way Analysis of Variance: Proportion of Actual Donating Behavior and Mean Donation Amount Per Person by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target only</td>
<td>.15\ a*/ $1.48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small DITF</td>
<td>.37\ a\b*/ $3.75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate DITF</td>
<td>.14\ a* $1.42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large DITF</td>
<td>.08\ b*/ $ .80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Matching subscripts denotes a significant difference between the groups. \( *p < .05 \), Proportion means are the percentage of participants that donated per condition and average dollar amount donated per participant in a group.

The result of the analysis provided limited support for hypothesis two. The small DITF condition produced a significantly greater proportion of actual donations than the target request only condition. The other DITF conditions failed to differ significantly from the target request-only condition.
Hypothesis 3

This hypothesis predicted that an inverted-U shaped distribution would be present for the relationship between DITF request size amount and both intention to donate and actual donation behavior. The results summarized in table 3.2 indicate the opposite relationship (U Shaped) for intention to donate. I predicted the highest intention to donate would be in the moderate DITF group and it was the group with the lowest intention to donate. Additionally, the results summarized in table 3.3 indicate a negative linear relationship for DITF request size and actual donation behavior. As the size of DITF request increased, actual donation decreased.

Hypotheses 4-9

Hypothesis 4-9 predicted that first, attitudes, perceived behavioral control, and subjective norms would predict behavioral intentions. To test this set of predictions a forward regression was conducted. For the forward regression analysis intention to donate was the dependent variable. The criterion for inclusion in the regression model was an F probability of .05 or less. When the analysis was run, no significant exogenous factors were entered in the model. As a result, the null hypotheses for Hypotheses 4, 6, and 8 were not rejected.

To assess the predictions offered in Hypotheses 5, 7, and 9 a forward regression was conducted. In this forward regression run, the dependent variable was actual donation behavior and the exogenous factors to be entered in the regression model were attitude, subjective norm, perceived behavioral control and intention to donate. Like the previous analysis, the criterion for inclusion in the regression model was an F probability of .05 or less. In this analysis, only the perceived behavioral control factor met the criterion for entry \( (F(1, 86) = 3.74; p < .05) \) \( \beta = .205 \) \( (t = 1.94, p = .025; R^2 = .042) \). Of the predictions offered in hypotheses 5, 7, and 9, only the null hypothesis can be rejected for Hypothesis 9.
To further assess the predictions in hypotheses 4-9 and to more directly address the difference that may be occurring as a result of experimental condition, a series of forward regressions was conducted for each of the DITF conditions. For each of the three DITF conditions (excluding the control group), I examined independently the linear relationship of the exogenous TPB factors on both intention to donate and actual donation. In these forward regression runs, only factors were entered in the model that met the criterion of having a significant beta weight (p < .05).

For the small DITF condition, when examining all of the exogenous TPB factors on intention to donate, no model was produced. This result indicates that for the small DITF condition, none of the exogenous TPB constructs have significant beta weights. For the small DITF condition another forward regression was conducted for all the TPB factors on actual donation behavior. A significant regression model was produced for actual donation in the small DITF condition. In the model, only perceived behavioral control met the criterion for entry ($F (1, 19) = 8.06; p < .05$), $\beta = .546 (t = 2.84, p = .05 R^2 = .30)$. Additionally, perceived behavioral control accounted for 30% of the variance in actual donation behavior.

For the moderate DITF condition, when examining all of the exogenous TPB factors on intention to donate, a significant model was produced. In the model, only subjective norms met the criterion for entry ($F (1, 75) = 9.92; p < .01$) $\beta = - .342 (t = -3.10, p = .00 R^2 = .11)$. Subjective norms accounted for 11% of the variance in actual donation behavior. The relationship produced between subjective norms and intention to donate was a negative relationship. In other words, as important people in one’s life felt it was important to donate, donation intentions decreased.

No significant regressions were found for the large DITF group for intentions to donate.
For both the moderate and the large DITF conditions additional regressions were not conducted due to sample attrition. In both the moderate and the large DITF groups only 2 of participants actually engaged in donation behavior. The results of all the significant regressions are summarized in table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Significant Forward Regression Analyses by Group and Exogenous Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group and Variables (df)</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus PBC1 on Behavior (1,86)</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small DITF PBC1 on Behavior (1,19)</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate DITF Norms on Intentions (1,75)</td>
<td>-.342</td>
<td>-3.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1

Research question 1 enquired if there was significant difference in the second perceived behavioral control measure based on experimental condition. To test for that, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted. There was a significant difference in the second perceived behavioral control based on experimental condition ($F(2, 144) = 2.87; p = .05; R^2 = .04; \text{power} = .56$). Bonferoni post hoc multiple comparisons were used to compare means across the three experimental groups because the technique adjusts the Type I error rate. The results indicated that the Small Concession DITF induced significantly more perceived behavioral control than both the Moderate Concession DITF conditions and the Large Concession DITF. The results are summarized in table 3.5.
Table 3.5 One-way Analysis of Variance: Perceived Behavioral Control Time Two by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small DITF</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate DITF</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large DITF</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Matching subscripts denotes a significant difference between the groups. *$p < .05$*

In the next chapter, the implications of these findings on the DITF and TPB are discussed.
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

People are confronted daily with a wide variety of persuasive messages from an equally diverse set of sources. Available literature suggests that the sequence in which persuasive messages are presented may influence persuasive outcomes. This study looked to apply the TPB model to DITF persuasion requests. The following chapter briefly reviews the research findings and discusses the implications of those findings in relation to DITF and the TPB. Additionally, this section provides insight into various explanations for the findings. Finally, limitations to the current study and directions for future DITF and TPB research are discussed. The overarching goals of this study were to apply a theoretical framework to the DITF and to determine the role concession size played in compliance to DITF requests.

General DITF Findings

This study produced a host of noteworthy findings. The first set of hypotheses related to replicating robust DITF effects (Dillard et al., 1984; Fern, Monroe, & Avila, 1986; & O’Keefe & Hale, 1998). The first two hypotheses predicted that DITF message sequences would produce more compliance, verbal and behavioral, than a target request only. The only significant difference between groups for verbal compliance, or intention to donate, was found between the large DITF request and the Moderate DITF request. Of those in the large DITF group, 40% indicated a verbal commitment to donate, compared to only 17% in the moderate DITF group. None of the DITF request conditions produced significantly higher verbal compliance than the target request only condition. Put differently, this research failed to replicate the robust DITF
effects reported in three meta-analyses. Overall, the request condition explained only 4% of the variance in intentions to donate.

The results for behavioral compliance varied considerably to those for verbal compliance or intentions. The Small Concession DITF sequence produced greater behavioral compliance (37%) than the target request only (15%). Neither, the Moderate Concession DITF sequence or Large Concession DITF sequence groups were different than the target request. So, only partial support was found for the second hypothesis. It is also noteworthy that the Small Concession DITF group induced significantly greater behavioral compliance than the Large Concession DITF group (8%). Overall, request condition explained 9% of the variance in actual donations.

Hypothesis 3 was also related to general DITF effects. Based on analysis related to the perceptual contrast explanation of the DITF, hypothesis 3 predicted a curvilinear relationship between the magnitude of the concession in DITF sequences and compliance, so that a moderate concession would produce the most compliance. The data were inconsistent with that prediction. Specifically the least compliance occurred in the Moderate Concession DITF condition and not in the Small Concession or Large Concession DITF conditions. Moreover, there were nonsignificant differences between rates of compliance in most of the DITF conditions.

The behavioral compliance data produced a different pattern of findings, but one that was still inconsistent with the predicted inverted U-shaped relationship between concession magnitude and compliance. The planned contrasts for actual donations indicated that as concession size increased donations decreased. That finding is at odds with both the predicted perceptual contrast effect and the linear positive relationship originally predicted by advocates of perceptual contrasts as an explanation for the DITF effects.
Overall, the general DITF findings were very interesting. Three general findings stand out. First, DITF effects were not consistent across DITF conditions. Put another way, the size of initial request does influence compliance to DITF requests. Second, compliance was different when the dependent measure was verbal compliance, or an intention measure, compared to a behavioral measure. Intentions to donate were considerably higher across conditions than actual donations. That finding is consistent with research by Miller, Seigman, Clark, and Bush (1976). When examining the ratio of indented donation to actual donation in the current study, there are some interesting nonsignificant comparison results. For the target request only group, 36% of the participants agreed to donate and of that proportion only 15% did donate. For the target only group, that data represents a 58% decrease in proportion. For the moderate DITF group, 17% of the participants agreed to donate and of that proportion 14% did donate. For the moderate DITF group, that data represents an 18% decrease in proportion. For the large DITF group, 40% of the participants agreed to donate and of that proportion only 8% did donate. For the large DITF group, that data represents an 80% decrease in proportion. For the small DITF group the results are very different. For the small DITF group, 29% of the participants agreed to donate and of that proportion only 37% did donate. For the small DITF group, that data represents a 28% increase in proportion. Clearly, there are meaningful differences between intentions to donate and actual donation behavior based on request size.

The findings related to the magnitude of the concession also have important implications. The highest proportion of donation behavior occurred in the small concession condition. In that condition the initial request asked participants if they would donate $20 dollars to the Athens Area Homeless Shelter. When the initial request was refused, the target request for a $10 donation was made. The finding that participants in the small concession DITF condition would
have a higher likelihood of donating money than participants in other DITF conditions has important theoretical implications. That finding is at odds with the perceptual contrast explanation of the DITF. The perceptual contrast explanation posits that the DITF is effective because the concession appears large and induces compliance with the target request in DITF conditions, but when a single request is made no such perceptual contrast is available. The implication of the explanation is that larger concessions should produce more compliance because the perceptual contrast is larger. That did not occur for these data.

O’Keefe and his associates (O’Keefe & Figge, 1997; O’Keefe & Hale, 1998) would also argue that greater compliance in the small concession DITF condition is at odds with the reciprocal concessions explanation of DITF. They argued that implicit pressure to reciprocate should increase as the magnitude of the concession increases. That increased pressure to reciprocate should produce greater rates of compliance in conditions where the concession made in the target request was larger.

Hale and Laliker (1999) posited that the relationship between magnitude of the request of the concession and compliance might be non-linear so that a moderate concession would produce the most compliance. These data are also inconsistent with that condition because the small concession participants complied with requests to donate money in higher proportions than did those in the moderate concession condition.

General TPB Findings

A second group of hypotheses (4-9) were related to constructs from the TPB and the DITF. A series of linear regressions were conducted to test the impact of attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control on intentions to donate and actual donations to the Athens Area Homeless Shelter. The results related to those predictions were mixed. The
attitude-intention relationship was statistically nonsignificant in the present study. That relationship is often the strongest among the TRA or TPB constructs (Hale, Householder, & Greene, 2003). Except for the impact of attitude on intentions and compliance, the results for the TPB constructs follow a more consistent pattern. Both subjective norms and perceived behavioral control had nonsignificant impacts on intentions to donate, but were significantly related to actual donation behavior. The nonsignificant impact of norms and perceived behavioral control on intentions was mostly due to the fact that a large quantity of participants pledged to donate but did not.

Theoretical Implications Related to TPB

Based on the findings of this study it is difficult to argue conclusively TPB is properly suited to explain DITF effects, or if TPB is an ill-suited fit for DITF. The shortcomings of the link between TPB and DITF could be the result of several factors. First, this research failed to replicate a robust DITF. That failure may have influenced the application of TPB constructs to the social influence process.

Second, the behavioral intentions construct is a key element to the TRA and TPB. Its inclusion was the result of weak or inconsistent relationships in research between attitudes and behaviors. Three exogenous variables--attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control-- are predicted to be related to behavioral intentions. In the current study, none of the exogenous variables from the TPB were correlated with the measure of behavioral intentions. Moreover, the measure of behavioral intentions, i.e., a pledge to donate, was not significantly related to actual donation behavior.

Third, some of the TPB elements were significantly related to the behavior measure. Both subjective norms and perceived behavioral control predicted actual donation behavior. As
subjective norms grew stronger, the likelihood of donations increased. In the same way, as perceived behavioral control increased so did the likelihood of donating. However, the TPB posits that the impact of subjective norms and perceived behavioral control will be mediated by behavioral intentions. That was not the case for this study.

Fourth, the DITF may have been an ill suited candidate for TPB effects. A compelling case could be made for matching the DITF to the TPB. The “compliance” measures in most DITF studies are essentially measures of behavioral intention. In addition, a compelling argument can be made that prosocialness effects in DITF studies are attitude effects since prosocialness and attitudes are confounded in most studies. It is also reasonable to expect that normative influences might affect charitable giving, or that a simple heuristic akin to perceived behavioral control might do likewise. Nevertheless, the argument has been made that TPB and TRA are applicable to those instances where thoughtful and careful consideration of issues and communications occur (Ajzen, 1991; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). In most instances, DITF requests are simple and do not involve the presentation of arguments. Responses to compliance gaining attempts occur relatively quickly, without time for considerable thought.

The effects of perceived behavioral control and normative influence on donations are important ones. Social influence literature is rife with examples of individuals using heuristics, i.e., simple decision rules, to respond to persuasive messages or compliance gaining attempts (see e.g., Cialdini, 2001; Chaiken, 1987). The finding that perceived behavioral control and subjective norms influence concrete behavior without the mediating effects of intentions seems to indicate that the variables operate as heuristics and trigger simple decision rules. The decision rules may be “I should help if I am able to do so,” or “I should do what my family and friends think is important.” Indeed, the latter heuristic may trigger a self presentational concern that is
different than the one typically evoked as an explanation for the DITF. The self presentation explanation for the DITF ordinarily suggests that the target complies with the second request to avoid appearing unfriendly or uncaring. Given the relationship between subjective norms and donations, the self presentation concern may be one of behaving in ways that are consistent with family or friendship definitions.

The role of family and friends are also important to consider with respect to the PBC construct. In this study, when participants were contacted for donation they often indicated that their parents or significant other dealt with donations. It seems important for TPB research to examine notion that PBC could include the forfeiting of control. It might not be that a participant lacks the ability or knowledge or skills to engage in the volitional donation behavior (or any behavior), but the individual just doesn’t see that as his/her job. For example, I might have a high level of PBC with regards to cleaning my house, but I have no intention to engage in the behavior because my housekeeper does it.

Additionally, DITF research should not be so quick to dismiss the TPB as an explanation for DITF effects. The methods of this study deviated significantly from typical TPB studies in various ways. First, in typical TPB studies intentions and behaviors are not measured dichotomously. In order to get significant results with a dichotomous measure the results must be stronger than with a scaled measure because responses have a truncated range. Second, there is typically little or no time delay between the measurement of exogenous TPB factors and intentions. In this study, the lag between those measures was one month. Finally, this study is constrained by the fact that I could not follow-up with participants who indicated no intention to comply. Due to an Institutional Review Board ruling, I was not allowed to mail donation requests to people with no intention to donate. The Review Board felt that the third wave of the
follow-up was overly intrusive. As a result, the sample size was severely diminished at wave three. It may be that some persons who indicated no intention to donate may have done so if given the chance to do so.

Limitations of the Research and Directions for Future Research

This research was not without its limitations. First, the participants for the study were college students. The use of a college student sample raises questions regarding whether the results would generalize to a broader population. However, other DITF effects have been shown to be robust across diverse samples and populations. For example, the meta-analyses on DITF effects include a large quantity of primary studies. The samples for those primary studies are diverse and include college student and non-college student adults. So while the sample for this research was comprised of college students, that may not diminish the results reported here.

Second, the use of a college student sample and the timing of the study may have been problematic. The study was conducted near the end of the academic term. The majority of the participants offered the excuse over the phone that, “I am broke at the end of the semester.” The prior response seems to make the TPB an invalid frame of examining this behavior since the behavior was not under the participants volitional control or is behavioral control displayed by the yielding of responsibility for behaviors one can efficaciously do? Moreover, the lag time between the pilot data collection and the field experiment might have significantly impacted the perceptions of the moderate requests condition. For example, the pilot data were collected early in the semester. Students often receive their financial aid disbursement at that time. A $50 request might seem moderate at that juncture, but in May when those funds are diminished a $50 request might seem more substantial. Another common response was, “I don’t handle donations. My mom and dad do that at church.” Given the strong positive attitudes toward
helping the homeless held by most of the participants, and the lack of variance on the attitude measure, it makes sense that this type of request was novel to this sample. Many students might have limited control over their finances and discretionary incomes. Future research might yield different results if willingness to volunteer time was used as the measure of compliance instead of the willingness to donate money. These steps could allow for greater variance in the dependent variables in the study. Moreover, the use of time and not money for a student sample would be more consistent with the procedures of prior DITF studies.

Third, since the study was a field experiment, another major limitation was the lack of control over the research environment. The telephone numbers given by participants during wave one of the project were often cell phones. The follow-up phone calls made during second and third waves of the study were made during weekend afternoons. Participants were frequently at parties or social gatherings, crowded restaurants, and other locations that were not conducive to receiving and considering requests for charitable donations. The varied locations and distractions may have had an adverse impact on participants’ ability and/or willingness to consider the solicitation. Future studies should consider ways to control for such factors while still maintaining an applied approach to the topic to heighten the externally validity. In relation to numerous other TPB studies the approach in this study on its face has more ecological validly and raises questions about the intention relationship with exogenous TPB constructs.

Fourth, it is entirely possible that social desirability influenced participants’ response in wave one of the research. In an environment where the participant was in the immediate presence of the experimenter, the socially desirable response may have been to declare an intention to donate. In wave two of the research, where actual donations occurred, the pressure to engage in a socially desirable manner would not have been as strong as in wave one. The
difference in pressures to engage in socially desirable responses may explain why participants
had very positive attitudes toward helping the homeless shelter and why they pledged support,
but failed to subsequently fulfill the pledge.

Overall, this study demonstrates that the DITF is still very much a fertile area for
researchers in diverse research areas. This research also has shown the complexity of the
relationships between factors in DITF compliance gaining attempts and that request size seems
more important than previous research has shown. Most importantly, this study takes and uses
an experiential design in an applied and realistic way. Beyond the theoretical implications, this
study has had actual implications on people’s lives by raising $190.00 for the Athens Area
Homeless Shelter. It is one thing to do research that informs practices that have an impact and
quite another to do research that actually has an impact. Scholars should be encouraged to
engage in research that connects the academy and the community in ways that make a difference.
The process of engaging in these types of studies is difficult, but the intrinsic rewards are
definitely worthwhile.
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APPENDIX A

Organization Attitudes CONSENT FORM

I agree to participate in the research study titled “Organization attitudes” conducted by Brian Householder (Under the direction of Dr. Jerold L. Hale 706-542-4893) in the Department of Speech Communication at The University of Georgia. I understand that I do not have to participate if I do not want to. I am aware that there are other non-research projects I can do to earn course credit. I can withdraw my consent to participate at anytime without giving any reason, and without penalty. I can ask to have all of the information; to the extent it can be identified as mine, removed from the research records or destroyed.

The reason for this study is to gain a better understanding of people attitudes towards a variety of organization.

I will benefit by earning research participation credit (only for members of the communication research pool) and I will be gaining a better understanding of my attitudes toward organizations.

If I volunteer to take part in this study, I will be asked to do the following things:
1) Fill out a questionnaire about my feelings and attitudes towards social organizations
2) Respond to demographic questions

This research normally takes no more than thirty minutes.

There are no anticipated risks to participation in this research.

My participation is confidential. My information will be kept in a locked file. Only the researches will have access to this information. After two years, all data will be destroyed.

In order to make this study a valid one, some information about my participation will be withheld until after the study.
The investigator will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project (706-583-0952).

I understand that by signing this form: I am agreeing to take part in this research project, I am over 18 years of age, and understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form for my personal records.

Researcher might contact you at a later date to conduct follow-up interviews.

__________________________                                  __________________________
Signature of Investigator     Date                                   Signature of Participant      Date
Brianhouse@aol.com
706-583-0952
Brian J Householder
Name of Investigator

__________________________                                   __________________________
Print the name of your instructor                                   Print your name
& the course you are doing this for                                (Johnson-SPCM1100)
__________________________                                                    __________________________
Print your Email Address
Print your Local Telephone Number
APPENDIX B

PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE

If donating to Athens Area Homeless Shelter:

1) What would you consider a small amount that you would reject? __________

2) What would be a medium sized amount that you would reject? __________

3) What would a large amount that you would reject? __________

Demographics questions

1) I am:   Female   Male

2) I am ______ years of age.

3) I am a:   Freshman   Sophomore   Junior   Senior   Other __________

4) I would describe my racial/ethnic background as (if you have a multicultural background please feel free to circle more than one choice listed):

American Indian or Alaska Native

Asian

Black or African American

Hispanic or Latino

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

White
APPENDIX C

Wave One Questionnaire

(Highlighted items were used to construct the final measure for hypothesis testing)

**Directions:** This whole process should take about 25 minutes. Please fill in all the items. If you have questions ask the researcher directly. Evaluate the following organizations using the scales listed below. For example, if you were asked to rate a statement; As in the example below **, you would put a check in the far left position on the scale if you think that this is a very bad idea. If you think this is a very good idea, you would put a check in the far right position on the scale. If you held a neutral position, you would mark the middle position on the scale, and so on. ** Example: BAD ___ X ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___ 6 ___ 7 GOOD

Organization 1: Atlanta Habitat for Humanity: Builds homes for low-income families in the metro-Atlanta area.

Donating money to Atlanta Habitat for Humanity is:

| Important   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Unimportant |
| ----------- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |            |
| Necessary  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Unnecessary |
| Right      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Wrong       |
| Worthless  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Valuable    |
| Good       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Bad         |
| Harmful    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Helpful     |
| Enjoyable  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Unenjoyable |
| Useless    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Useful      |
| Positive   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Negative    |
Organization 1 continued: Atlanta Habitat for Humanity

Donating money to Atlanta Habitat for Humanity is:

- Difficult: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Easy
- Impossible: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Possible
- Problematic: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Straightforward
- Simple: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Complex
- Doable: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Not doable
- Effortless: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Effortful

When it comes to donating money to Atlanta Habitat for Humanity I have:

- No control: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Complete control
- Power: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 No Power
- Capability: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 No Capability

My family thinks donating money to Atlanta Habitat for Humanity is:

- Important: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Unimportant
- Necessary: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Unnecessary
- Right: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Wrong
- Worthless: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Valuable
- Good: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Bad
- Harmful: _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Helpful
My family would:
Not support  _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Support me if I donated money to this organization.

My family would:
Want _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Not want me to donate money to this organization.

My family would:
Not Prefer _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Prefer me to donate money to this organization.

My friends think donating money to Atlanta habitat for humanity is:
Important _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Unimportant

Necessary _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Unnecessary

Right _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Wrong

Worthless _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Valuable

Good _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Bad

Harmful _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Helpful

My friends would:
Not support _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Support me if I donated money to this organization.

My friends would:
Want _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Not want me to donate money to this organization.

My friends would:
Not Prefer _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Prefer me to donate money to this organization.
Others Important to me think donating to Atlanta Habitat for Humanity is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>_____1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td>_____1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7</td>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>_____1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7</td>
<td>Wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td>_____1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>_____1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful</td>
<td>_____1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others important to me would:
Not support | _____1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7 | Support me if I donated money to this organization.

Others important to me would:
Want | _____1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7 | Not want me to donate money to this organization.

Others important to me would:
Not Prefer | _____1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7 | Prefer me to donate money to this organization.
Organization #2 Section
Please respond to the following questions that address the organization below.

Organization 2: Athens Area Homeless shelter: Provides temporary shelter to homeless women and children.

Donating money to Athens Area Homeless shelter is:

Important _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Unimportant
Necessary _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Unnecessary
Right _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Wrong
Worthless _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Valuable
Good _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Bad
Harmful _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Helpful
Enjoyable _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Unenjoyable
Useless _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Useful
Positive _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Negative

Donating money to Athens Area Homeless Shelter is:

Difficult _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Easy
Impossible _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Possible
Problematic _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Straightforward
Simple _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Complex
Do able _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Not do able
Effortless _______ 1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5 _______ 6 _______ 7 Effortful
When it comes to donating to Athens Area Homeless Shelter I have:

No control____1____2____3_____4____5____6____7 Complete control
Power ____1____2____3____4____5_____6____7 No Power
Capability____1____2____3_____4____5____6____7 No Capability

My family thinks donating money to Athens Area Homeless Shelter is:

Important____1____2____3_____4____5____6____7 Unimportant
Necessary____1____2____3_____4____5____6____7 Unnecessary
Right ____1____2____3_____4____5____6____7 Wrong
Worthless____1____2____3_____4____5____6____7 Valuable
Good ____1____2____3_____4____5____6____7 Bad
Harmful____1____2____3_____4____5____6____7 Helpful

My family would:
Not support____1____2____3_____4____5____6____7 Support
me if I donated money to this organization.

My family would:
Want ____1____2____3_____4____5____6____7 Not want
me to donate money to this organization.

My family would:
Not Prefer _______1____2____3____4____5____6____7 Prefer
me to donate money to this organization.
Organization 2 continued: Athens Area Homeless Shelter

My friends think donating money to Athens Area Homeless Shelter is:
Important _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_____7 Unimportant
Necessary _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_____7 Unnecessary
Right ______1______2______3________4________5_______6_____7 Wrong
Worthless _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_____7 Valuable
Good _______1______2______3________4________5_______6_____7 Bad
Harmful _______1______2______3________4________5_______6_____7 Helpful

My friends would:
Not support _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_____7 Support
me if I donated money to this organization.

My friends would:
Want _______1______2______3________4________5_______6_____7 Not want
me to donate money to this organization.

My friends would:
Not Prefer _______1______2______3________4________5_______6_____7 Prefer
me to donate money to this organization.

Others important to me think donating money to Athens Area Homeless Shelter is:
Important _____1______2______3________4________5_____6_______7 Unimportant
Necessary _____1______2______3________4________5_____6_______7 Unnecessary
Right _______1______2______3________4________5_____6_______7 Wrong
Worthless _______1______2______3________4________5_____6_______7 Valuable
Good _______1______2______3________4________5_____6_______7 Bad
### Organization #3 Section

Please respond to the following questions that address the organization below.

**Organization 3:** Athens Canine Rescue: Finds homes for abandoned dogs to keep them from being euthanized.

Donating money to Athens Canine Rescue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>Unenjoyable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless</td>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others important to me would:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not support</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>me if I donated money to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others important to me would:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Not want</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>me to donate money to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others important to me would:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Prefer</th>
<th>Prefer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>me to donate money to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organization 3 continued: Athens Canine Rescue

**Donating money to Athens Canine Rescue is:**

- Difficult _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Easy
- Impossible _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Possible
- Problematic _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Straightforward
- Simple _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Complex
- Do able _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Not do able
- Effortless _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Effortful

**When it comes to donating money to Athens Canine Rescue I have:**

- No control _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Complete control
- Power _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 No Power
- Capability _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 No Capability

Organization 3 continued: Athens Canine Rescue

**My family thinks donating money to Athens Canine Rescue is:**

- Important _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Unimportant
- Necessary _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Unnecessary
- Right _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Wrong
- Worthless _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Valuable
- Good _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Bad
- Harmful _____1______2______3________4________5_______6_______7 Helpful
My family would:
Not support 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Support me if I donated money to this organization.

My family would:
Want 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not want me to donate money to this organization.

My family would:
Not Prefer 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Prefer me to donate money to this organization.

Organization 3 continued: Athens Canine Rescue

My friends think donating money to Athens Canine Rescue is:
Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant
Necessary 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unnecessary
Right 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Wrong
Worthless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Valuable
Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
Harmful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Helpful

My family would:
Not support 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Support me if I donated money to this organization.

My family would:
Want 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not want me to donate money to this organization.

My family would:
Not Prefer 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Prefer me to donate money to this organization.
Organization 3 continued: Athens Canine Rescue

Others important to me think donating money to Athens Canine Rescue:

Important____1____2____3____4____5____6____7  Unimportant

Necessary____1____2____3____4____5____6____7  Unnecessary

Right ______1____2____3____4____5____6____7  Wrong

Worthless___1____2____3____4____5____6____7  Valuable

Good ___1___2___3____4____5____6____7  Bad

Harmful ___1____2____3____4____5____6____7  Helpful

Others important to me would:
Not support ______1____2____3____4____5____6____7  Support
me if I donated money to this organization.

Others important to me would:
Want _____1____2____3____4____5____6____7  Not want
me to donate money to this organization.

Others important to me would:
Not Prefer ______1____2____3____4____5____6____7  Prefer
me to donate money to this organization.

Generally speaking, how much do you want to do what your family thinks you should do?
Not at all____1____2____3____4____5____6____7  Very Much

Generally speaking, how much do you want to do what your friends think you should do?
Not at all____1____2____3____4____5____6____7  Very Much

Generally speaking, how much do you want to do what others important to you think you should do?
Not at all____1____2____3____4____5____6____7  Very Much
Circle the item that best represents your feeling about the statements
1) Atlanta Habitat for Humanity is a nonprofit organization.
   Strongly Disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly Agree

2) Atlanta Habitat for Humanity is a charitable organization.
   Strongly Disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly Agree

3) Athens Area Homeless Shelter is a nonprofit organization.
   Strongly Disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly Agree

4) Athens Area Homeless Shelter is a charitable organization.
   Strongly Disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly Agree

5) Athens Canine Rescue is a nonprofit organization.
   Strongly Disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly Agree

6) Athens Canine Rescue is a charitable organization.
   Strongly Disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly Agree
Demographics questions

1) I am: Female Male

2) I am ______ years of age.

3) I am a: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Other __________

4) I would describe my racial/ethnic background as (if you have a multicultural background please feel free to circle more that one choice listed):

   American Indian or Alaska Native
   Asian
   Black or African American
   Hispanic or Latino
   Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   White
APPENDIX D

WAVE TWO QUESTIONNAIRE

Hello, may I speak to (participant’s name). We are calling UGA student on behalf of the Athens Area Homeless Shelter, a non-profit shelter located on Barber Street. We are conducting a research project to raise money so that homeless children can attend Summer Spree, a Summer Camp for disadvantaged kids. We are asking students to donate $10/20/50/100. One hundred percent of your donation will be used to send a child to camp. May we count on you for a $10/20/50/100 donation? (Solicitors paused to allow response. If no). A $10 dollar donation would be very helpful. May we count on you for a $10 donation?

If No after 2nd request or 1st in the control condition: Thank you for you time and we hope you would consider us for any future community service or donations.

If YES: Thank you for agreeing to contribute. Can I please get your local address so we can mail you a pre-paid envelope to facilitate your donation:
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________

Thanks again, our mailer will provide you with some additional information about the Athens Area Homeless Shelter and how your funds help the children.

1)) Participant was in___________ condition. (target only-control, small initial, Medium initial, or large initial)

2) Participant agreed to initial request: Yes/ no

3) Participant agreed to target request: Yes/ no

4) Participant hung up before sequence was completed: Yes/ no
Hello, may I please speak with (Participants name). My name is (researchers name). I am a Donations supervisor at Athens Area Homeless Shelter. First, I want to make it clear this is not a solicitation and at no point will I ask you for any money. We would like a few moments of your time to participant in some research we are doing to assess our donation strategy. Would you be willing to answer a few questions about our recent attempts to get you to donate? (Pause for consent)

If no: Sorry to bother you and please consider us in the future.

If yes: I am going to ask you 5 (5) questions. I will say a question number and read you a statement. After the statement you will be asked to indicate if you: Strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree with the statement. For example one statement would be: I like apples: Do you strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree with that statement?

Here is question number 1:

1) It would be very difficult for me to donate $10 to Athens Area homeless shelter.
   SD        D    N          A                  SA

2) If I wanted to, it would be no problem for me to donate $10 to Athens Area homeless shelter
   SD        D    N          A                  SA

3) $10 is too large a donation request for me.
   SD        D    N          A                  SA

4) The $10 donation request would be easy for me to manage.
   SD        D    N          A                  SA

5) This research is being conducted by the Athens Area Homeless shelter.
   SD        D    N          A                  SA

Hung up before questions were completed. Yes/no
APPENDIX F

Donation Attitudes Debriefing

This study looked at attitudes and the impact of donation size and donation request order on compliance. Most studies in this area have not looked at actual donation but rather just ones intention to donate. Additionally, those studies failed measure ones attitudes towards the requesting organization prior to the request. Particularly, this study used a request strategy where a large initial request (which should be rejected) is followed by the 2nd request or target request.

This study looks at four conditions. We examined small, medium, and large discrepancies between the large initial request and the target request. In all groups the target request was a $10 donation. Also, there was a target request only control condition. Participants were randomly assigned to one of these four groups.

The study took place in three waves. Wave one had participants respond to attitude measures concerning a variety of social organization. Participants were excused from that portion study. Wave two commenced a few weeks later. Participants were call by a researcher who was working in association with the Athens Area Homeless shelter and exposed to one of the four request conditions. Participants were deceived in that they were not expressly told that there was a connection between any parts of the study. In some cases, it was possible that participants believed the study was concluded after Wave one. This was desirable for the study because researcher wanted participants to believe the request for donation was coming form the organization and not the research. All the procedures used in the study are part of normal phone solicitations. Past study have found that if participants feel the request is coming for a research and there is class credit evolved in the study, participants agree in an abnormal high rate of agreement with the request. To properly test the theory, this deception was vital.

In Wave three, a researcher, again working in coordination with Athens Area Homeless Shelter conducted a follow-up interview to assess attitudes and guilt level caused by the requesting sequence.

Participants who agreed to donate funds were mailed a postage paid envelope and directions to submit their donation. All funds collected when directly to Athens Area Homeless Shelter and were added to their general fund. The organization is thankful for being a part of the study and hopes you consider them for future community service and donation.

The information gathered in this study sheds light on the underlying processes of donation to nonprofit organization. It is this studies hope to find a way to better make donation requests on the part of these prosocial organization.

Again, we are sorry if this process caused you any stress or concern. If you have any more questions about the study or the final findings call Brian Householder (706-583-0952).