**Social Influence Experiment[[1]](#footnote-1)**

Individually approach three people you do not know while carrying with you your Red Cross collection envelope. If anyone you approach wishes to speak with me about this activity, please invite them to call me on my cell phone (413-597-2695).

Because our campus is small, please try to approach single individuals or individuals outside of campus during the break. When you're done, ask your participant if (s)he had been approached for this experiment before. If YES, replace them with a new participant.
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**Persuasion Strategies.** To keep the procedures consistent, we're going to cycle through a series of established persuasion strategies. The strategies appear in Column 1. I will explain how to implement each strategy before we begin our data collection, but here is a brief description of each and the "scripts" we will use for the experiment.

|  |
| --- |
| Control Condition |

**Say**: "Hi there! Can you please contribute to the Red Cross's disaster relief efforts in the wake of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_?" Record the answer.

|  |
| --- |
| Foot-in-the-Door Strategy |

**First, say:** "Hi there! Can you please contribute **10 cents** to the Red Cross's disaster relief efforts in the wake of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_?” [The person will likely say yes.].

**Then, say:** “Actually, would you be able to give $1.00?" [Record amount donated below.]

|  |
| --- |
| Door-in-the-Face Strategy |

**First, say:** "Hi there! Can you please contribute **$20** to the Red Cross's disaster relief efforts in the wake of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_?” [The person will likely say no.].

**Then, say:** “Well then, would you be able to give $1.00?" [Record amount donated below.]

**Donation.** Record the total amount of money donated by participant(s) you approached using each strategy. For example, if you approach a group of 3 with the control condition and each person donates $1, you should write $3 under Column 2.

**Campus.** Because you will be conducting this experiment potentially over thanksgiving break, you may have the opportunity to approach participants not affiliated with Williams. Recording the location (in Column 3) where you used each technique can suggest to us whether any differences we might observe (or not observe) might be associated with the experimental setting.
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Data Collection Sheet

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategy** | **Amount donated** | **On Campus?** |
| *Control* | $ | YES NO |
| *Foot-in-door* | $ | YES NO |
| *Door-in-face* | $ | YES NO |

Finally, don’t forget to submit your results via Qualtrics! Click here: [**bit.ly/101\_exp**](https://bit.ly/101_exp)

**Note to 101 team:**

These questions will only be displayed on Qualtrics after data have been collected:

1. Which strategy led to the most donations? If the control strategy was the most effective, explain why the compliance strategies may not have been as effective. (Apply specific ideas discussed in lectures 1 and 2; also see p. 532 – 542).

Answers should apply any of the following ideas:

* Norm of reciprocity – participant may have felt that they should repay the students’ concession (from $20 to $1) in kind by agreeing to the smaller donation request
* Normative influence – e.g., participant saw someone else donate and believed that donating was the appropriate response
* self-presentation/self-perception motives – e.g., participant may have wanted to appear like a generous, caring person
* systemic vs. heuristic persuasion – e.g., person indicated knowing about X disaster (systemic) or feeling very sympathetic to the cause (heuristic)
* cognitive dissonance – participant may have positive attitudes about helping X disaster victims and wanted to avoid discomfort of not having their behaviors align with their attitudes (if they are willing to donate $0.10 they should be willing to donate another $0.90).
* status – participants did not view me (student experimenter) as a person of authority, if I had been a higher-status person they may have donated more

1. As he was about to enter the Paresky, Nate was approached by someone and asked to wear a small purple ribbon on his shirt to show his support for the “Save the Squirrels” campaign. Nate wasn’t quite sure that squirrels were actually endangered, but he agreed to wear the ribbon. A week later, Nate was approached again and asked to contribute $10 to help save the squirrels. Though he would have rather spent her money elsewhere, he agreed. Nate has been the victim of the \_\_\_\_ technique.
   1. lowballing
   2. **foot-in-the-door**
   3. door-in-the-face
   4. reciprocal altruism

1. This activity has been adapted from Kassin, Fein, & Markus (2017) and Debra Mashek (2006). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)