

Malgorzata Gamian-Wilk

University of Lower Silesia

Kinga Lachowicz-Tabaczek

Wroclaw University

Pre-print of an article:

Gamian-Wilk, M. & Lachowicz-Tabaczek, K. (2009). Beliefs in having fixed or malleable traits and willingness to help: Implicit theories and sequential social influence techniques. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 40, 1-16.

Beliefs in having fixed or malleable traits and willingness to help: Implicit theories and sequential social influence techniques

Corresponding addresses:

Malgorzata Gamian-Wilk, PhD., University of Lower Silesia, ul. Strzegomska 55, 53-611

Wroclaw, Poland, e-mail: m.gamian@wp.pl

Kinga Lachowicz-Tabaczek, PhD., Institute of Psychology, University of Wroclaw, ul.

Dawida 1, 50-527 Wroclaw, Poland, e-mail: kla@dawid.uni.wroc.pl

Key words: compliance, social influence, social influence techniques, foot-in-the-door, door-in-the-face, implicit theories, interaction dynamics

Abstract

Two sequential social influence techniques, the foot-in-the-door and the door-in-the-face, seem to be symmetric, but there are different moderators and quite different mechanisms underlying each of the strategies. What links both techniques is the social interaction between the person presenting the sequence of requests and the interlocutor. The techniques' effectiveness depends on the course and perception of the interaction and the difficulty of the requests in the sequence. The aim of this article was to verify various mechanisms of incremental (individuals who believe in malleable personality) and entity theorists (individuals who believe in fixed traits) in their compliance with the FITD and the DITF techniques. In a series of four studies it was shown that incremental theorists comply with the FITD technique to a greater extent especially when the sequence of requests meets their mastery-oriented style of behavior, i.e. an interesting challenge to undertake or an opportunity to deepen contact with a newly met person. Entity theorists are more prone to the DITF strategy as their helpless style of behavior and sense of guilt are triggered and thus a sequence of demands decreasing in magnitude is perceived as less threatening.

Beliefs in having fixed or malleable traits and willingness to help: Implicit theories and sequential social influence techniques

We wonder many times in real life situations how to pose a quite difficult request in such a way that the person agrees to fulfill it. There are circumstances in which we have to be more persuasive, for instance if we work in a bank or a shop and we want our clients to take advantage of our special offer. The way a request is posed depends on the request itself and on the person who is the target. Social influence practitioners have their own various methods of inducing compliance. They know that special tactics should be adopted depending on the client's profile. Some of these strategies are empirically verified and broadly described in the psychological literature. The studies presented here enlarge the knowledge about methods of using certain social influence techniques in different groups of people.

A social influence technique is a kind of method which helps increase the likelihood of a relatively difficult request being fulfilled. The person addressed most often does not realize that she or he is a target of manipulation (Dolinski, 2000). Of the great variety of social influence tactics we can distinguish a group of sequential social influence strategies. Their efficacy is based on asking some other favor before asking the target one, which in normal situations would be performed reluctantly (after Dolinski, 2000, 2005; Nawrat, 1989). The foot-in-the-door (FITD, Freedman and Fraser, 1966), door-in-the-face (DITF, Cialdini, Joyce, Vincent, Lewis, Catalan, Wheeler and Darby, 1975), and low-ball (Cialdini, Cacioppo, Basset and Miller, 1978) techniques are composed of a sequence of requests.

Two of these techniques, the FITD (the rate of compliance with a target request is raised by first asking a small favor which is willingly fulfilled) and the DITF (a target request is followed by a very difficult one, which is rejected) are well described and empirically verified. The FITD and the DITF techniques seem to be symmetric, but there are different

factors modifying them and different mechanisms responsible for their efficacy. The FITD phenomenon is based on the self-perception process (Bem, 1967, 1972). One infers one's inner state on the grounds of one's own recent behavior, here performing the first favor. Then the person acts consistently with this new self-description and agrees to perform the target request (Burger, 1999; Burger and Caldwell, 2003; Gamian-Wilk and Dolinski, in press). On the other hand, in order to explain the effectiveness of DITF, two mechanisms are often invoked: the reciprocity rule (Cialdini et al., 1975; Cialdini and Goldstein, 2004) and the sense of guilt (O'Keefe and Figge, 1997). After a person rejects a very large request, the interaction partner, here the experimenter, reduces his demands and proposes a smaller, target request. The person asked feels obliged to return this act of good will and agrees to fulfill the second request. The DITF is particularly efficient when the first demand is connected with a socially desirable but difficult to realize behavior; thus declining to perform such a favor causes a person to feel guilty and then more willing to agree to the target request (Dillard, 1991; O'Keefe and Figge, 1997; Patch, 1986, 1988).

The moderators of the FITD technique are connected mainly with the specifics of the self-perception process. As external rewards (Burger and Caldwell, 2003; DeJong and Funder, 1977; Furse, Stewart and Rados, 1981; Stimpson and Waranusuntikule, 1987; Zuckerman, Lazzaro and Waldgeir, 1979) or outside pressure (DeJong, 1981; DeJong and Mussili, 1982) linked with the performance of an initial request inhibit the self-perception process, these factors make the strategy ineffective. Those factors which facilitate self-inference from overt behavior, such as a positive label accompanying fulfillment of an initial request (Burger and Caldwell, 2003; Crano and Sivacek, 1982; Goldman, Kiyohara and Pfannensteil, 1984; Goldman, Seever and Seever, 1982; Gorassini and Olson, 1995; Sharkin, Mahalik and Claiborn, 1989; Stimpson and Waranusuntikule, 1987), the performance of several initial

favors (Goldman, Creason and McCall, 1981), or a significant involvement connected with fulfillment of the first favor (Burger, 1999; Freedman and Fraser, 1966), make the FITD more effective.

The above mentioned moderators are characteristic specific for the FITD phenomenon to be significant. The facilitators and limitations of the DITF technique are somewhat different, but in fact they all influence the FITD strategy as well. The time lapse between the first request and the second is a very important factor in both techniques. The DITF stops being effective if there is any time delay after a very large initial demand is rejected (Cann, Sherman and Elkes, 1975; Dillard, Hunter, and Burgoon, 1984). Moreover, the same person should pose both requests (Dillard, et al., 1984; Nawrat, 1989). The circumstance of a single person reducing his or her demands immediately after a negative response is perceived as doing a favor which should be reciprocated and is hence interpreted as opening a relation. With the FITD the problem is more complex. It has been claimed (Beaman, Cole, Preston, Klentz, and Steblay, 1983; Burger, 1999) that the no-delay FITD (second request is made immediately after performance of the first) is less effective than the time-delay condition (there is a time lapse between performing a small request and hearing a second one). The no-delay FITD backfires especially when both the small and the target requests are posed by the same experimenter (Chartrand, Pinckert and Burger, 1999). The rapid escalation of demands is seen as an infringement of the reciprocity rule and thus inhibits further interaction between the asked and asking person. When another person poses the second request or in the time-delay FITD situation, the effect is much more often significant. However, the single-person no-delay FITD tactic is sometimes effective. The target request should not be much different in size, form, and subject from the initial request (Gamian-Wilk and Dolinski, in press; see also Burger, 1999; Fennis, Janssen and Vohs, in press).

Another factor that influences the efficacy of DITF and the FITD is the topic of the requests. The results of a meta-analysis indicate that the effect of both the DITF and the FITD is stronger when the source has a prosocial character (e.g. organizations giving support to those in need) in contrast to sources focused on their own needs (e.g. market researchers) (Dillard et al., 1984; see also Dillard, 1991). These data were not verified in the case of the FITD technique (Paska, 2002; Patch, 1986, 1988). Otherwise, we can obtain greater compliance rates with the DITF when the requests are prosocial and the experimenter's intention is to do something for good purposes.

In general, both the FITD and the DITF are kinds of social interactions in which two people meet and try to reach an agreement, which is easier if the dialogue concerns important issues. During this short meeting the two get to know each other to the extent that one of them is prone to the other's demands. Hence sequential social influence techniques may be explained in terms of the dynamics of social interaction. Dolinski points out that both strategies are based on a meta-technique, i.e. dialogue involvement (Dolinski, Grzyb, Olejnik, Prusakowski and Urban, 2002; Dolinski, Nawrat and Rudak, 2001). Posing several questions (here, asking for a favor) and letting the other person answer results in greater compliance with a request than in a situation in which the same request is followed by a monologue. In numerous studies it has been shown that starting a discussion with a stranger means creating a relationship and this leads to greater compliance as people are more prone to agree with those whom they know (Dolinski, 2005). Thus even a short dialogue, such as posing a request and hearing the answer, makes two people acquainted. The more the sequence of requests resembles a typical course of interaction, the more these techniques are influential in raising compliance. These are situations in which the same person presents both demands in a short

period of time. These are conditions in which the DITF seems to be very fruitful. The FITD may be beneficial when both requests are similar and the target request is not too demanding.

The aim of this article is to point out the optimal circumstances of adopting different sequential social influence techniques according to different people's profiles. As different people prefer different types of interaction, the two techniques should be preferred by different groups of people. The literature lists some examples of individual differences in proneness to the FITD and the DITF. Wagener and Laird did not find the FITD effect successful among overweight people because this group has limited insight into their feelings and their self-perception process is often disturbed. Overweight people draw inferences from external stimuli, such as the sight of food, rather than from overt behavior. Burger and Guadagno (2003) investigated the role of individual differences in self-concept clarity in the FITD procedure. Self-concept clarity is an individual feature indicating the extent to which a person's self-concept is accessible. It was shown that only people with a clear self-concept succumbed to the FITD, in contrast to participants with low self-concept clarity.

There are results showing that dispositional differences do affect compliance with a relatively large request in both the FITD and the DITF technique. Cialdini, Trost, and Newsom (1995) found evidence for the influence of dispositional differences on the FITD strategy. They examined how the preference for consistency influences the effect. Using the Preference for Consistency Scale (PFC) the researchers showed that only those who scored high on the PFC scale were more likely to succumb to the FITD technique. A similar pattern of results was found by Guadagno, Asher, Demaine, and Cialdini (2001). Channouf and Sénémeaud (2000; Sénémeaud, 2003) found a symmetric pattern of results in the DITF strategy.

Previous studies have shown that another dispositional feature has impact on the effectiveness of both sequential influence techniques. Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2007, in press) have shown that incremental theorists and entity theorists are prone to the FITD and the DITF techniques which consist of requests of different magnitude in a sequence. The implicit theory concerning malleability versus stability of human traits is a lay theory which has been examined by Carol Dweck and collaborators (Chiu, Hong and Dweck, 1997; Dweck, 1996, 2000; Dweck and Leggett, 1988; Erdley and Dweck, 1993; Gervery et al., 1999; Hong, Chiu, Yeung and Tong, 1999). Dweck noted two types of behavior when faced with difficult tasks or obstacles. Incremental theorists increase effort after experiencing defeat. These people believe that an attribute is a dynamic malleable quality which is possible to change and improve. They are achievement oriented and seek opportunities to improve their skills. As they ascribe setbacks and difficulties to using wrong strategies, they try to overcome obstacles by altering their tactic (Zhao, Dweck and Mueller, 1998, after Dweck, 2000). They choose difficult and challenging tasks that allow them to enhance their abilities (Dweck and Leggett, 1988). Entity theorists, in contrast, claim that personality cannot be changed. They prefer easy tasks which guarantee success. By endorsing such a strategy, they decrease the risk of failure (Dweck and Leggett, 1988). In the field of task performance they exhibit a depressive pattern of behavior. They display anxiety and strong negative emotions and tend to decrease the level of performance after encountering failure. They lose hope of being successful in pursuing tasks and do not try to achieve goals (Zhao et al., 1998, after Dweck, 2000).

Moreover, Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2002, 2004) showed that implicit theories are endorsed as a reaction to possessing certain temperament traits and they play the role of an intensity regulator of emotional stimulation. Studies indicate that entity theorists are more

emotionally reactive and emotionally vulnerable and have less stamina than incremental theorists (Fura, 2001; Lachowicz – Tabaczek, 2002). Entity theorists are less active than incremental theorists. Such a pattern of temperamental features suggests that entity theorists should avoid stimulation. Therefore they fail in performing tasks when they are emotionally overloaded. The author treats implicit theories as a link between temperamental traits and behavior. The model presented by Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2002, 2004) suggests that entity theory is a component of an emotional-defensive style of regulation. Endorsing the entity theory results in avoiding situations which could expose one to experiencing negative emotions. This self-protective attitude means choosing only easy tasks which minimize the risk of failure. Incremental theory, in contrast, facilitates maintaining a rational-developmental style of regulation. Incremental theorists endorse an active attitude. They courageously undertake new challenges and choose difficult and risky tasks.

Moreover, incremental and entity theorists tend to perceive and judge people in quite different ways. People who believe in the malleability of human traits do not make judgments quickly before gathering trustworthy, important data about others. Entity theorists tend to form global ascriptions very quickly, even on the basis of a single behavior, or even facial features (Gervey et al., 1999; Hong, 1994, after Dweck, 2000). Erdley and Dweck (1993) and Goetz and Dweck (1980) showed that both groups of people set different goals in social-interaction situations. After feedback suggesting rejection by peers, entity theorists blamed themselves; ascribing negative features to themselves, they lost motivation and did not sufficiently try persuasion to be invited into a friend's club. Incremental theorists perceived the cause of their mistake in the effort they had made; therefore they were later still willing to improve their social skills and mobilized themselves to try harder to persuade others to be invited. Further findings (Erdley, Cain, Loomins, Dumas-Hines, Dweck, 1997) indicate that

incremental theorists choose situations which let them meet new people and gain experience in social interactions, while entity theorists prefer situations minimizing the possibility of being rejected (e.g. meeting a person who they were sure likes them).

Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2007, in press) have shown that as people who are constantly self-developing, searching for possibilities to acquire new skills, and setting themselves ambitious goals, incremental theorists comply with the FITD strategy when both requests in the sequence are relatively difficult and challenging. They are eager to fulfill fairly easy favors both when they are posed in a sequence and when they appear alone in a control condition. Entity theorists succumb to the FITD technique only in the case of relatively easy tasks. Effortless, unchallenging requests give a guarantee of proper performance. On the other hand, entity theorists are prone to the DITF strategy especially when both requests are fairly difficult. They seem to perceive a target request as easier and hence possible to cope with. Incremental theorists are reluctant to undertake tasks which do not forecast growing difficulties. Thus the DITF technique is not effective among incremental theorists especially when the sequence consists of requests high in magnitude as such a situation does not imply ambitious goals. In a follow-up study, Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2007) showed that entity and incremental theorists rate a request's difficulty and calculate the costs of giving help differently. Participants were to imagine they were asked a sequence of requests identical to those which appeared in the main experiments and to evaluate the difficulty of the tasks, estimate the probability of performing such requests, and evaluate the costs connected with fulfilling and the costs connected with rejecting the requests. The results showed that the entity theorists assessed particular requests as being more difficult to fulfill and the costs of performing them higher than the incremental theorists did.

A conclusion may be drawn suggesting that compliance with both strategies is regulated by the different styles of task functioning of people endorsing different naïve theories. The FITD situation activates incremental theorists' task functioning. This group of people complies with an escalating sequence of requests when the tasks are interesting and challenging, thus providing benefit. The greater compliance with the FITD observed among incremental theorists may be caused by their perception of the requests as relatively not costly or demanding. This strategy is ineffective among entity theorists. Their greater unwillingness to succumb to the FITD technique may stem from their evaluation of requests as more difficult and effortful. In the case of the DITF technique, entity theorists' task functioning is activated. Their self-defensive style of behavior, thus their fear of not managing the request, is reduced by the perceived contrast in the difficulty levels of the initial and target requests. The decreasing difficulty in the request sequence in the DITF strategy seems unchallenging and not meeting incremental theorists' developmental goals. As they do not perceive enough benefit in agreeing to a target request, they do not engage.

To sum up, requests are treated as tasks to fulfill. Faced with a sequence of demands, diverse behavior-regulation styles are triggered depending on the implicit theory of traits endorsed. Incremental theorists are more willing to comply with the FITD technique because of the perceived benefit connected with performing an interesting and ambitious escalating sequence of requests. Entity theorists are more vulnerable to the DITF strategy because of the perceived reduction in the costs of fulfilling the smaller request in a sequence of tasks decreasing in magnitude. On the basis of the obtained pattern of results, we can infer that in the FITD strategy, incremental theorists are drawn by a mastery orientation. In contrast, a helpless pattern of behavior and a self-defensive tendency is activated in the DITF technique

among entity theorists, which means they comply with a sequence of requests only when performing them guarantees success.

The aim of the series of studies presented in this article was a further verification of differences between entity and incremental theorists in task functioning in the FITD and the DITF paradigms. The first and second experiments are a direct continuation and replication of previous findings (Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek, 2007, in press). We investigated entity and incremental theorists' different styles of task functioning which are activated by sequences of requests of increasing or decreasing magnitude. The demands' difficulty level was enhanced here by introducing a social context. The enhanced social-interaction condition creates an additional challenge in the case of the escalating demands of the FITD procedure, thus providing greater benefit for incremental theorists. On the other hand, the necessity of increased social contact generates a greater contrast perceived by entity theorists in the case of the decreasing sequence of request difficulty in the DITF procedure; the costs connected with performing the target request are lower.

Findings gathered by Dweck (2000) and Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2004) suggest that entity and incremental theorists' different styles of task functioning are linked to various emotional reactions. People endorsing a belief in malleable traits choose challenging and ambitious tasks as they are driven by positive feelings. Entity theorists' task functioning is connected with the need to reduce negative emotions. In the third and fourth experiments, the asymmetry of positive vs. negative feelings experienced by the two groups was enhanced by introducing conditions activating a sense of guilt or a sense of engaging in a new relationship, and thus commitment and obligation to continue the dialogue. The target requests introduced here are connected with a prosocial source (helping children in an orphanage). Agreeing to or rejecting a favor in such a case causes strong feelings of obligation or guilt. We anticipated

that incremental theorists, driven by positive emotions, would feel committed (because of their need for new and challenging tasks) and would comply with the FITD strategy especially in the highlighted social context. The entity theorists, in contrast, would be caught up in negative emotions, i.e. their sense of guilt after refusing to help a person in need, and thus they would comply with the DITF technique, particularly in the case of the highlighted social conditions.

The two series of studies presented here verify the two mechanisms of incremental and entity theorists: compliance with the FITD and the DITF techniques. The first and second experiments investigated both groups' task functioning: faced with a sequence of demands of increasing or decreasing difficulty, the mastery or the helpless style of behavior regulation is triggered. The third and fourth experiments explore the mechanism connected with the incremental and entity theorists' asymmetry of experienced emotions: faced with a sequence of demands increasing or decreasing in difficulty, engaging in a relationship and feeling obliged to continue a dialogue or a sense of guilt is activated.

Experiment 1

Overview of the experiment

In the first study, entity and incremental theorists were presented a sequence of requests according to the FITD technique. Thus an initial request demanding interaction was used in both experimental conditions. Manipulation of the character of the requests was introduced. Target requests of the same difficulty level were presented as demanding much or little social interaction. It was anticipated that only incremental theorists would comply with the sequence of requests connected with a high level of social interaction. The experimental design was: 2 (entity vs. incremental theorists) \times 2 (social-interaction vs. no-social-interaction FITD), with two control (only the target request) conditions.

Procedure and participants

Two hundred and twenty-nine undergraduates (126 women, 103 men), aged 19-26 ($M=22.21$; $SD=1.99$), sitting in the Technical University of Wroclaw and Political Sciences canteen, served as the participants. The female experimenter approached randomly assigned students and asked them for help in doing research. In order to avoid conformist behavior, only students who were sitting alone or in couples were approached, as Rind and Benjamin's (1994) study showed that the presence of a colleague witnessing the act of making a request does not influence the FITD effect. Participants were randomly assigned to the experimental and control conditions. In the FITD condition the participants were first presented with a small request, which was to fill out a 300-adjective questionnaire (Gaugh and Heilbrun's adjective list was used) and a Polish adaptation of the Levy, Stroessner, and Dweck's (1998) scale, which measures entity versus incremental theories. The questionnaire consists of eight items, four of which diagnose entity theory and the other four incremental theory. Each item directly expresses a belief about the level of malleability or stability of traits. The participants expressed their attitude to each item on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("definitely disagree") to 5 ("definitely agree"). The reliability of the Polish version of the questionnaire was Cronbach's α =.72 (Lachowicz-Tabaczek, 2002). The total score for each participant was obtained by summing the scores from the subscale measuring entity theory and the opposite scores from the subscale measuring incremental theory. If a participant did not agree to fill out a long 300-adjective questionnaire, he or she was asked to complete only the measure of implicit theories.

In the social-interaction FITD, immediately after the first favor was performed the experimenter asked the participant to comply with a larger, target task, which was to sacrifice two hours to help conduct studies. Participants were to encourage other students to complete

the 300-adjective task and monitor their work. Thus fulfilling such a target request demanded initiating a number of social interactions, though the participants were accustomed with the task. Both demands were delivered by the same person, a young woman who introduced herself as a psychology student.

In the no-social-interaction FITD the participants were asked to spend two hours copying and preparing materials for the study the experimenter was conducting. This time the target request did not demand initiating new social interactions. The task had a purely technical character. In the control conditions the participants were asked to fulfill only the target requests: to sacrifice two hours encouraging peers to complete long questionnaires or preparing materials for the study being conducted. Whether a participant agreed to perform the target request or not, he or she was asked to complete the scale measuring implicit theories. The experimenter stressed that it was important to fill out. Such a strategy allowed measuring the implicit theories among all the participants.

Whenever a participant was willing to sacrifice two hours, regardless of the condition, the experimenter took his or her email address or telephone number and said she would contact them in a few days. The participants were contacted, thanked, and debriefed.

A pilot study was done for the first and the second experiments. The aim of the additional study was to check how participants perceive various aspects of particular tasks in the sequences introduced in the experiments. The participants ($n=57$, undergraduates of the Wrocław Faculty of the Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities and the University of Lower Silesia) were asked to imagine a situation similar to the one in the main experiments (while they are sitting in a school canteen, a young person approaches and asks favors). They were to complete the scale measuring implicit theories and a questionnaire with seven-point scales on which they were to evaluate the difficulty level and estimate the benefits and costs

of fulfilling and the costs of rejecting the presented requests. The participants were to evaluate two of the four requests introduced in the main experiment (the social-interaction FITD, no-social-interaction FITD, social-interaction DITF, or the no-social-interaction DITF request sequence).

Results

The initial analysis indicated that neither the participants' sex ($\chi^2 < 1$) nor school affiliation ($\chi^2 < 1$) had an impact on compliance with the target request. Therefore these factors were ignored in the further analysis.

The results of 13 participants were not included in the analysis because they left the canteen after performing the first favor. Thus 216 participants were presented with the target request and the results of these participants were included in the analysis. The first request in the FITD condition was performed by 94 out of 110 participants (85.5%). According to the criteria of the FITD paradigm, all of the participants (those who agreed and those who did not agree to the initial request) were posed the target request (Burger, 1999; DeJong, 1979; see also Freedman and Fraser, 1966).

In the social-interaction FITD condition, 33.3% of the participants (19 out of 57) agreed to sacrifice two hours encouraging peers to complete surveys, compared with the control condition in which 9.4% of the participants (5 out of 53) complied. The social-interaction FITD effect was significant ($\chi^2_{(1,110)} = 9.19$, $p = .002$, $\phi = .289$).

In the no-social-interaction FITD condition, 30.2% of the participants (16 out of 53) agreed to spend two hours preparing materials for the study, compared with the control condition in which 17% of the participants (9 out of 53) complied. The no-social-interaction FITD effect was insignificant ($\chi^2_{(1,106)} = 2.56$, $p = .11$, $\phi = .155$).

The participants' total scores in the questionnaire measuring implicit theories were selected on the basis of the median split, which was 22 ($SD=5.1$). Participants whose results were higher than 22 were classified as entity theorists ($n=103$) and those scoring lower than 22 incremental theorists ($n=104$). Nine people obtained a score which equaled the median and were excluded from further analysis.

Taking the individual differences (i.e. implicit theories) into account, the social-interaction FITD technique was significant only among the incremental theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,53)}=8.11$, $p=.004$, $\phi=.39$). The strategy was ineffective in the group of entity theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,55)}=1.8$, $p=.18$, $\phi=.18$). In case of the no-social-interaction FITD strategy, neither incremental theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,51)}=1.45$, $p=.27$, $\phi=.169$) nor entity theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,48)}=0.36$, $p=.55$, $\phi=.087$) were willing to comply (Tab. 1).

Moreover, in the pilot study it was shown that incremental theorists perceived the benefits of fulfilling the social-interaction target request as higher ($F_{(1,17)}=6.12$, $p=.02$, $\eta^2_p=.26$) than the entity theorists did, but only when it followed the initial request (in the social-interaction FITD sequence). They would perform this request especially out of pure kindness ($F_{(1,27)}=2.26$, $p=.08$, $\eta^2_p=.077$), regardless of the nature of the initial request. This pattern of results was absent in the no-social-interaction FITD sequence, in which the incremental theorists did not rate the request as more beneficial and worth fulfilling ($F<1$), but felt some negative emotions (they would agree to perform the request not to feel embarrassed, $F_{(1,20)}=4.55$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2_p=.19$) more than the entity theorists did.

Table 1

Percentage and number of participants complying with the target request demanding or not demanding social interaction according to the FITD technique among entity and incremental theorists (study 1)

Sequence of increasing request difficulty connected with social interaction		Control condition	Foot-in-the-door condition
Entity theorists	Complied	7.3% (4)	12.7% (7)
	Did not comply	47.3% (26)	32.7% (18)
Incremental theorists	Complied	1.9% (1)	22.6% (12)
	Did not comply	39.6% (21)	35.8% (19)
Sequence of increasing request difficulty connected without social interaction		Control condition	Foot-in-the-door condition
Entity theorists	Complied	10.4% (5)	20.8% (10)
	Did not comply	29.2% (14)	39.6% (19)
Incremental theorists	Complied	5.9% (3)	9.8% (5)
	Did not comply	51% (26)	33.3% (17)

Discussion

The results of the first experiment show that the FITD strategy is generally more effective with requests connected with initiating and maintaining social interactions in comparison with a situation in which the sequence consists of task-like requests. The clearest and most important finding indicates that only incremental theorists agreed to the social-interaction target request. This finding is consistent with previous results obtained by Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2007, in press). The FITD strategy activated

incremental theorists' task functioning. This group is generally more open to new, ambitious tasks. Social context seems to have constituted additional difficulty and challenge. The results of the pilot study clearly indicate that incremental theorists are drawn by potential benefits connected with performing a task when complying. It is also evident that incremental theorists concentrate on the partner of the interaction to a greater extent. Social factors, pure mutual kindness, seem to influence compliance. The FITD consisting of a sequence of requests which demand making acquaintances seems appropriate in the case of incremental theorists. The findings of the pilot study also indicate that the no-social-interaction FITD sequence is not challenging and beneficial enough for incremental theorists to comply. However, the negative emotions they felt when faced with a less interesting target demand did not influence compliance. This pattern of results is in line with Lachowicz-Tabaczek's (2002, 2004) model of behavior regulation style. Incremental theorists, as a result of endorsing an active attitude, tend to constant self-development. They undertake tasks which give them stimulation and allow them to be active.

In contrast, entity theorists, as a result of endorsing an emotional-defensive style of regulation, tend to avoid situations giving too much stimulation. Their unwillingness to comply with the FITD technique results from their perception of a lack of benefit connected with fulfilling a favor. Faced with social expectations, they withdraw because they are suppressed by their evaluation of the requests as difficult and effortful. Moreover, they are shy and afraid of new interactions, which means they have a need for constant self-examination and are thus under pressure. They are afraid of the possibility of being assessed badly, as they tend to perceive themselves and other people holistically and ascribe fixed global features quickly. Thus they withdraw from forthcoming social interaction especially if it means contacting lots of people. The FITD consisting of a sequence of growing requests

connected with intense social interaction seems to be inappropriate in the case of entity theorists. Unfortunately, the no-social-interaction FITD strategy also backfired in this group of people. Entity theorists seem to withdraw from a sequence of growing requests even if the second demand is completely nonsocial. Thus they rejected spending time preparing materials for a study because they generally avoid new, uncertain, or challenging tasks.

The no-time-delay FITD version introduced in the first experiment is hardly ever effective (Chartrand et al., 1999). Here it was successful only when the sequence of requests resembled a potentially developing social interaction. These results are consistent with the FITD explanation based on interaction dynamics (Dolinski, et al, 2001, 2002), which stresses that posing a first request opens a relationship and then it is easier to agree to a second favor heard from a known person. Furthermore, the initial request was quite social itself (demanding interaction with the partner). It was the same in both experimental conditions. That is probably why the FITD was not generally effective, as the no-time-delay FITD is effective only with target requests strictly connected with initial favors when a mindless self-perception process is activated (Gamian-Wilk and Dolinski, in press). The no-social-interaction target request connected with preparing materials for a study was quite different from the initial favor. Immediately after performing the first request (completing a 300-adjective questionnaire), new self-descriptions are formed which are narrow and concrete and mediate further compliance only if the target request is consistent with the new, self-inferred descriptions. Thus the no-social-interaction FITD could backfire while the two requests in the sequence were inconsistent.

Previous studies (Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek, 2007) have shown that while incremental theorists comply with the FITD when the request sequence is fairly difficult and challenging, entity theorists succumb to this strategy only when the sequence is quite

simple and risk-free. Other findings (Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek, in press) indicate the opposite effect when considering the DITD technique. Here, entity theorists were more prone to comply with the DITF especially when the sequence of requests seemed to be significantly reduced. It is interesting to know whether this pattern of results is true with a DITF sequence of requests connected with reducing social interaction or requests which are strictly task-like. The second study aimed at verifying DITF's efficacy with the same social-interaction and no-social-interaction target requests as those introduced for the FITD strategy in the first study.

Experiment 2

Overview of the experiment

In the second study, entity and incremental theorists were presented a sequence of requests according to the DITF technique. Thus a very large initial request demanding interaction was used in both experimental conditions. Similarly as in the previous experiment, manipulation of the character of the target request was introduced. Target requests of the same level of difficulty were presented demanding much or little social interaction. It was anticipated that this time the task-oriented incremental theorists would comply with the sequence of requests connected with a low level of social interaction, while entity theorists would be prone to comply with the DITF when the sequence of decreasing requests was connected with social interaction. The experimental design was: 2 (entity vs. incremental theorists) \times 2 (social-interaction vs. no-social-interaction DITF), with two control conditions in which only the target requests were introduced.

Procedure and participants

One hundred and twenty undergraduates (67 women, 53 men), aged 18-27 ($M=21$; $SD=1.78$), sitting in the Technical University of Wroclaw and Wroclaw University canteens,

served as the participants. One of three female experimenters approached randomly assigned students and asked them for help in doing research. In order to avoid conformist behavior, only students who were sitting alone or in couples were approached. The participants were randomly assigned to the experimental and control conditions. In the DITF conditions the participants were first presented with a very large request, which was to sacrifice two hours each day during the next two weeks on helping conduct a study. The participants' task would be to assist the experimenters in encouraging other students to fill out various surveys. The initial request proposed in such a way was most often rejected; only two students agreed to help. Regardless of whether the participants agreed to or rejected the first request, the target request was presented immediately after.

The target requests were identical to those of the first study in both the social-interaction and no-social-interaction DITF conditions. Thus in the social-interaction DITF procedure the participants were asked (if not two hours every day for two weeks) to sacrifice two hours only once in helping conduct studies. The participants were to encourage other students to complete 300-adjectives questionnaires and monitor their work. Both demands were delivered by the same person, a young woman who introduced herself as a psychology student. In the no-social-interaction DITF condition the participants were asked (if not two hours every day for two weeks) to spend two hours only once copying and preparing materials for the study the experimenter was conducting. In both experimental conditions the participants were additionally asked to fill out the measure of entity versus incremental theories.

In the control conditions the participants were asked to fulfill only the target requests: to sacrifice two hours encouraging peers to complete long questionnaires or preparing materials for the study being conducted. Whether or not a participant agreed to perform the

target request, he or she was asked to complete the scale measuring implicit theories. The experimenter stressed that it was important to fill it out. Such a strategy allowed measuring implicit theories among all the participants.

Whenever a participant was willing to sacrifice two hours, regardless of the condition the experimenter took his or her email address or telephone number and said she would contact them in a few days. The participants were later contacted, thanked, and debriefed.

Results

The initial analysis indicated that neither the participants' sex ($\chi^2 < 1$) nor school affiliation ($\chi^2 < 1$) had an impact on compliance with the target request. Moreover, there was no experimenter impact on the eagerness to spare two hours helping in the study ($\chi^2 < 1$). Therefore these factors were ignored in the further analysis.

In the social-interaction DITF condition, 35.3% of the participants (12 out of 34) agreed to spend two hours on helping doing research, compared with the control condition in which 15.4% of the participants (6 out of 39) complied. The social-interaction DITF effect was marginally significant ($\chi^2_{(1,73)} = 3.86$, $p = .06$, $\phi = .23$). In the no-social-interaction DITF condition, 41.5% of the participants (17 out of 41) were willing to spend two hours on copying materials for the study, compared with the control condition in which 14.6% of the participants (6 out of 41) complied. The no-social-interaction FITD effect was significant ($\chi^2_{(1,82)} = 5.57$, $p = .02$, $\phi = .29$).

The participants' total scores in the questionnaire measuring implicit theories were selected on the basis of the median split, which was 22 ($SD = 4.78$). The participants whose results were higher than 22 were classified as entity theorists ($n = 68$) and those scoring lower than 22 incremental theorists ($n = 82$). Four people obtained a score which equaled the median and were excluded from further analysis.

Taking individual differences into account, the social-interaction DITF technique was significant only among entity theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,36)}=6.7$, $p<.01$, $\phi=.43$). The strategy was ineffective in the group of incremental theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,35)}=0.2$, $p=.65$, $\phi=.076$). In the no-social-interaction DITF strategy, only incremental theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,37)}=4.37$, $p<.04$, $\phi=.344$) were willing to comply with the target request, while entity theorists were not ($\chi^2_{(1,40)}=1.01$, $p=.31$, $\phi=.158$) (Tab. 2).

The results of the pilot study additionally confirm our predictions as they indicate that entity theorists assessed the difficulty of the social target request significantly lower when it followed the initial DITF request than when it followed the initial FITD request ($F_{(1,13)}=5.85$, $p<.03$, $\eta^2_p=.31$). There was no such difference in evaluating the social-interaction target request among the incremental theorists. Entity theorists assessed the costs of denying the social-interaction target request ($F_{(1,27)}=3.83$, $p=.06$, $\eta^2_p=.12$) relatively higher than the incremental theorists did regardless of the kind of initial request. There was no difference between the incremental and entity theorists in the case of the no-social-interaction target request ($F<1$).

Table 2

Percentage and number of participants complying with the target request demanding or not demanding social interaction according to the DITF technique among entity and incremental theorists (study 2)

Sequence of decreasing request difficulty connected with social interaction			
		Control condition	Door-in-the-face condition
Entity theorists	Complied	2.8% (1)	19.4% (7)
	Did not comply	50% (18)	27.8% (10)
Incremental theorists	Complied	14.3% (5)	8.6% (3)
	Did not comply	42.9% (15)	34.3% (12)
Sequence of decreasing request difficulty connected without social interaction			
		Control condition	Door-in-the-face condition
Entity theorists	Complied	7.5% (3)	12.5% (5)
	Did not comply	50% (20)	30% (12)
Incremental theorists	Complied	8.1% (3)	29.7% (11)
	Did not comply	35.1% (13)	27% (10)

Discussion

As the target requests were the same in both the first and second experiments, the entity and incremental theorists' reactions to the FITD and the DITF techniques can be compared. Here the pattern of results is completely symmetric to that obtained in the first study. This time the influence of the dispositional difference is much clearer. In line with the predictions, entity theorists are vulnerable to the DITF technique when the sequence consists of requests reducing social demands and incremental theorists are more prone to the no-

interaction strategy version. The findings are consistent with those obtained earlier by Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2007) and Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek (in press). The DITF technique triggers entity theorists' task functioning. They comply with the DITF more willingly when the second task seems possible to carry out in comparison with the one previously heard, but only in the case of the social target request. Entity theorists seem to perceive a significant contrast between the initial and the target request when faced with a sequence of social demands decreasing in magnitude. They are afraid of further relationship development, and thus a request signifying a decrease in social demands seems bearable. The perceived reduction in social expectations results in lower anxiety and provides the possibility of becoming accustomed with a new task. Such a reaction is a sign of helpless task functioning. The tendency of self-protection results in withdrawing from tasks which give too much of stimulation. The fact that entity theorists did not agree with the no-social-interaction DITF procedure shows that only a perceived reduction in social expectations makes them more courageous. On the other hand, entity theorists perceived denying the social-interaction request as more emotionally costly than rejecting a technical demand.

Incremental theorists were more reluctant with the perceived withdrawal of social interaction and the social-interaction DITF technique was not effective in this group. The pilot study results indicate that they perceived the target request as beneficial and worth performing only in the case of the FITD sequence. In the DITF strategy it seems to be not ambitious enough or it might have been perceived as a sign of closing a relationship. In comparison with the initial request, which was too large but provided ample possibility of meeting new people and engaging in further relationship with the experimenter, the second demand meant withdrawal from social interaction and did not give enough stimulation. Thus the reduction in social demands was not interesting to them. Being more task-oriented, they chose the no-

social-interaction target request, which did not lead to relational development but which was, on the other hand, connected with acquiring new skills of preparing a study.

The DITF technique proved to be generally effective with both the social-interaction and no-social-interaction target requests. Such a pattern of results indicates that the reciprocity rule seems to explain the DITF phenomenon well, as reducing the magnitude of the first request led to compliance with the target favor, regardless of its topic. These findings are consistent with Cialdini's (Cialdini and Goldstein, 2004) line of explaining the technique's mechanism. On the other hand, O'Keefe and Figge's (1997) reasoning, suggesting that a sense of guilt appears after rejecting an initial demand and this leads to compliance, also seems possible. The first request introduced in the second experiment was very social itself (helping a student doing research is truly an act of kindness); therefore refusing it could have resulted in negative emotions which were enhanced by the similarity of the source and the participants. Moreover, the results can also be explained by a mechanism based on interaction dynamics; posing and rejecting a very large initial request initiates an interaction typical of the course of negotiations.

The next two experiments were conducted to investigate the asymmetry in the emotions experienced by entity and incremental theorists. As incremental theorists are driven by positive emotions, they should feel obliged to continue a new relationship and comply with the FITD strategy, especially in an enhanced social context. Entity theorists, however, driven by negative emotions, should have a sense of guilt after rejecting a social request and should thus comply with the DITF technique, particularly in the case of enhanced social conditions.

Experiment 3

Overview of the experiment

The third study is a replication of the first experiment. Here the FITD technique was introduced to entity and incremental theorists, but this time the target request was connected with deepening the relation with a newly met person. Thus the aspect of the interaction-dynamics basis of the FITD technique was strengthened. As in the first study it was anticipated that only incremental theorists would comply with the sequence of requests connected with continuing and deepening the relation. Entity theorists would avoid further contact. The experimental design was: 2 (entity vs. incremental theorists) \times 2 (relation-continuing vs. relation-ending FITD).

Procedure and participants

One hundred and sixty-six undergraduates (112 women, 54 men), aged 19-31 ($M=22$; $SD=2.87$), residents of Wroclaw Medical Academy and Wroclaw Agricultural University campus, participated in the study. One of three female experimenters visited students in their rooms. The rooms were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions. There were always one or two persons in each room. The experimenters presented themselves as Orphans' Association volunteers. In the FITD conditions the participants were first asked to fill out a short survey on the need to volunteer for various charity actions and to fill out the entity versus incremental theories measure. If a participant did not agree to fill out the survey, he or she was asked to complete only the implicit theories measure.

In the relation-continuing FITD condition, immediately after performing the initial request the participants were asked to comply with a larger, target task, which was to go to an orphanage and help a child with his or her homework. The experimenter added: "We could go there together, I would help you initiate contact with a child, and I would assist you if you

need”. This was a kind of a promise of continuing the interaction with the experimenter. Fulfilling such target request meant openness to deepen contact with a newly met person.

In the relation-ending FITD condition the participants were also asked to go to an orphanage and help a child with his or her homework, but this time the experimenter added: “I would email you the address of the orphanage and you would make an appointment with a child”. Such a target request was not connected with deepening the relation with the experimenter. Agreeing to this task actually ended the contact.

In the control conditions the participants were asked to fulfill only the target requests, i.e. to go to an orphanage and help a child with his or her homework with or without the experimenter’s promise of support and continuation of the relation. Whether a participant agreed to perform the target request or not, he or she was asked to complete the scale measuring implicit theories. The experimenter stressed that it was important to fill it out. Such a strategy allowed measuring implicit theories among all the participants.

A pilot study was done for the third and fourth experiments. The aim and the procedure of the additional study was the same as that of the pilot study for the first and second experiments. Here, participants ($n=57$, undergraduates of the Wrocław Faculty of the Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities and University of Lower Silesia) were asked to imagine a situation similar to the one in the main experiments (while they are in their rooms, a young person approaches and asks favors). They were to evaluate two of the four requests introduced in the main experiments (the relation-continuing FITD, the relation-ending FITD, the relation-continuing DITF, or the relation-ending DITF request sequence).

Results

The initial analysis indicated that neither the participants’ sex ($\chi^2 < 1$) nor school affiliation ($\chi^2 < 1$) had an impact on compliance with the target request. Moreover, there was no

experimenter impact on the eagerness to help children with their homework ($\chi^2 < 1$). Therefore these factors were ignored in the further analysis.

The first request in the FITD conditions was performed by 105 out of 116 participants (90.5%). All of the participants (those who agreed and those who disagreed to the initial request) were asked the target request.

In the relation-continuing FITD condition, 52.4% of the participants (22 out of 42) agreed to go to the orphanage with the experimenter, compared with the control condition in which 39% of the participants (16 out of 41) complied. The social-interaction FITD effect was not significant ($\chi^2_{(1,83)} = 1.49$, $p = .22$, $\phi = .134$).

In the relation-ending FITD condition, 68.3% of the participants (28 out of 41) agreed to go to the orphanage alone, compared with the control condition in which 47.6% of the participants (20 out of 42) complied. The relation-ending FITD effect was significant ($\chi^2_{(1,83)} = 3.64$, $p = .05$, $\phi = .21$).

The participants' total scores in the questionnaire measuring implicit theories were selected on the basis of the median split, which was 23 ($SD = 4.58$). The participants whose results were higher than 23 were classified as entity theorists ($n = 78$) and those scoring lower than 23 incremental theorists ($n = 81$). Seven people obtained a score which equaled the median and were excluded from further analysis.

Taking the individual differences into account, the relation-continuing FITD technique was almost significant only among the incremental theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,39)} = 3.17$, $p = .07$, $\phi = .285$). The strategy was ineffective in the group of entity theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,39)} = 0.3$, $p = .86$, $\phi = .088$, Tab. 3). In case of the relation-ending FITD strategy, neither the incremental theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,42)} = 0.86$, $p = .35$, $\phi = .14$) nor the entity theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,39)} = 2.51$, $p = .11$, $\phi = .254$) were willing to comply (Tab. 3).

This time the results of the pilot study showed no significant difference between entity and incremental theorists in evaluating the benefits of performing any of the target requests ($F < 1$). In the case of the FITD sequence, the incremental theorists rated the costs of performing the target request higher ($F_{(1,9)} = 12.57$, $p = .006$, $\eta^2_p = .58$) than the entity theorists did. Incremental theorists would, however, fulfill the target request out of pure kindness to a greater extent than entity theorists would ($F_{(1,15)} = 5.23$, $p = .04$, $\eta^2_p = .26$). This effect was marginally stronger for the relation-continuing than for the relation-ending target request ($F_{(1,8)} = 4.38$, $p = .07$, $\eta^2_p = .35$) only in the group of incremental theorists. There was no such difference among the entity theorists ($F < 1$).

Table 3

Compliance rates with the target request demanding or not demanding deepening a relationship according to the FITD technique among entity and incremental theorists (study 3)

Sequence of growing request difficulty connected with deepening a relationship			
		Control condition	Foot-in-the-door condition
Entity theorists	Complied	45% (9)	42.1% (8)
	Did not comply	55% (11)	57.9% (11)
Incremental theorists	Complied	31.6% (6)	60% (12)
	Did not comply	68.4% (13)	40% (8)

Sequence of growing request difficulty not connected with deepening a relationship			
		Control condition	Foot-in-the-door condition
Entity theorists	Complied	55% (11)	78.9% (15)
	Did not comply	44% (9)	21.1% (4)
Incremental theorists	Complied	42.9% (9)	57.1% (12)
	Did not comply	57.1% (12)	42.9% (9)

Discussion

The purpose of conducting the third study was to replicate and confirm the findings obtained in the first experiment. Generally, implementing different kinds of requests led to a consistent pattern of results. The present study indicates some limitations of the FITD technique. Surprisingly, the strategy was somehow more effective with sequences of requests which promised performing the task all alone. When the asking person guaranteed help and assistance, the technique was not fruitful. It is possible that such a situation was quite unusual, as it is customary to give children advice on their lessons on one's own, in face-to-face

contact. Thus assistance is not essential. As the target request seemed to be rather ambiguous and strange, the participants could have been generally more reluctant to comply with it. On the other hand, in the case of the relation-ending version, agreement to fulfill the target request could have been nothing but a declaration. Students may have been willing, but it was difficult for the experimenters to check if the participants really went to the orphanage. When the experimenter stressed that she would assist the participant's every step, the real behavior became more apparent and perhaps this made the strategy less effective.

Nevertheless, once again it was the incremental theorists who were more prone to succumb to the FITD procedure, but only when it meant deepening the relationship with the newly met person. Although the relation-continuing FITD technique was generally unsuccessful, the people who believed in malleable traits tended to comply. The findings of the pilot study indicate that factors connected with social interaction are very important for incremental theorists. They seem to be driven by an obligation to be kind. In spite of obvious difficulties and the costs of performing the relation-continuing target request, this group feels a duty to maintain a relationship. They succumb to their positive emotions and the necessity of being a nice person. They seem to be open to new acquaintances and are more curious about other people. They continue even a difficult relationship as they give their partner chances to change their behavior. Perhaps because they do not formulate general evaluations of other people, they need more time to get to know them. Moreover, they form more positive assumptions about people, which is helpful in long-term relationships (Dweck, 2000).

Entity theorists, once again, were tremendously reluctant to comply with the FITD procedure. This group tended to withdraw from both the relation-continuing and relation-ending sequences of requests, which is generally in line with the model presented by

Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2004). Entity theorists are motivated to self-protection; thus they withdraw from situations which are possibly difficult and do not guarantee success.

Experiment 4

Overview of the experiment

The fourth study is a replication of the second experiment and the manipulation introduced is similar to that of the third experiment. Here the DITF technique was used on entity and incremental theorists. Both the initial and the target requests were connected with deepening or ending the relation with a newly met person. Thus the aspect of the interaction-dynamics basis of the FITD and DITF techniques was strengthened. As in the second study, it was anticipated that only entity theorists would comply with a sequence of requests connected with reducing the amount of contact in a relation. Incremental theorists would avoid such situations. The experimental design was: 2 (entity vs. incremental theorists) \times 2 (relation-continuing vs. relation-ending DITF).

Procedure and participants

Two hundred and two undergraduates (128 women, 86 men), aged 19-24 ($M=22.29$; $SD=1.4$), residents of Technical University of Wroclaw University campus, participated in the study. One of five female experimenters visited students in their rooms. The rooms were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions. There were always one or two students in the rooms. The experimenters presented themselves as Orphans' Association volunteers. In the DITF condition the participants were first presented with a very large request, which was to help children with their homework four times a week during the next two weeks. The initial request proposed in such way was most often rejected; only five students agreed to help. Regardless of whether the participants agreed to or rejected the first request, the target request was presented immediately thereafter.

In the relation-continuation DITF condition, immediately after the first favor was rejected the participants were asked (if not four times weekly for two weeks) to go only once to the orphanage and help a child do homework. The experimenter added: “We could go there together, I would help you initiate contact with a child, I would assist you if you need”. The target request presented, in the context of the large initial task meant, a reduction in the intensity of contact with the newly met person, but on the other hand it was a promise of continuing the interaction.

In the relation-ending DITF condition, the participants were also asked to go to an orphanage and help a child with his or her homework only once, but this time the experimenter added: “I would email you the address of the orphanage and you would make an appointment with a child on your own”. Agreeing to perform such a target request meant further avoiding deepened contact with the newly met person and was connected with withdrawal from the relationship.

In the control conditions the participants were asked to fulfill only the target requests: to go to an orphanage and help a child with his or her homework with or without the experimenters' promise of support and continuation of the relation. In all four conditions, regardless of participant's reaction to the target request, he or she was asked to complete the scale measuring implicit theories. The experimenter stressed that it was important to fill it out. Such a strategy allowed measuring implicit theories among all the participants.

Results

The initial analysis indicated that neither the participants' sex ($\chi^2 < 1$) nor school affiliation ($\chi^2 < 1$) had an impact on compliance with the target request. Moreover, there was no experimenter impact on the eagerness to help children ($\chi^2 < 1$). Therefore these factors were ignored in the further analysis.

In the relation-continuing DITF condition, 68.8% of the participants (22 out of 32) agreed to help children with their homework with the experimenter's assistance, compared with the control condition in which 27% of the participants (10 out of 37) complied. The relation-continuing DITF effect was significant ($\chi^2_{(1,69)}=12.36$, $p<.001$, $\phi=.42$).

In the relation-ending DITF condition, 70.9% of the participants (22 out of 31) agreed to help a child with his homework without the experimenter's assistance, compared with the control condition in which 28.9% of participants (11 out of 38) complied. The relation-ending DITF effect was also significant ($\chi^2_{(1,69)}=12.08$, $p<.001$, $\phi=.42$).

The participants' total scores in the questionnaire measuring implicit theories were selected on the basis of the median split, which was 23 ($SD=4.99$). The participants whose results were higher than 23 were classified as entity theorists ($n=66$) and those scoring lower than 23 incremental theorists ($n=67$). Four people obtained a score which equaled the median and were excluded from further analysis.

Taking the individual differences into account, the relation-continuing DITF technique was significant among both incremental theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,35)}=11.09$, $p<.001$, $\phi=.56$) and entity theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,33)}=4.16$, $p=.04$, $\phi=.36$). Moreover, in the case of the relation-ending DITF strategy, both the entity theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,33)}=10.94$, $p<.001$, $\phi=.58$) and the incremental theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,33)}=5.31$, $p=.02$, $\phi=.401$) agreed to go once and help children do homework (Tab. 4).

The results of the pilot study indicate additionally that entity theorists rated the costs connected with rejecting both target requests significantly higher than the incremental theorists did ($F_{(1,19)}=8.27$, $p<.01$, $\eta^2_p=.3$), but only in the case of the DITF sequence of demands ($F_{(1,8)}=5.95$, $p=.04$, $\eta^2_p=.4$). They estimated the costs of rejecting the initial request higher than the incremental theorists did, but only in the case of the relation-continuing DITF sequence ($F_{(1,19)}=5.39$, $p=.03$, $\eta^2_p=.22$).

Table 4

Compliance rates with the target request demanding or not demanding intense social interaction according to the FITD technique among entity and incremental theorists (study 4)

		Control condition	Foot-in-the-door condition
Sequence of growing request difficulty connected with intense social exposure			
Entity theorists	Complied	18.8% (3)	52.9% (9)
	Did not comply	81.3% (13)	47.1% (8)
Incremental theorists	Complied	30% (6)	86.7% (13)
	Did not comply	70% (14)	13.3% (2)
Sequence of growing request difficulty connected with no social interaction			
		Control condition	Foot-in-the-door condition
Entity theorists	Complied	5.3% (1)	57.1% (8)
	Did not comply	94.7% (18)	42.9% (6)
Incremental theorists	Complied	43.7% (7)	82.4% (14)
	Did not comply	56.3% (9)	17.6% (3)

Discussion

The DITF technique was tremendously effective in both groups of people. Therefore, the results of the fourth experiment confirm our predictions only partly. It was anticipated that only entity theorists would be vulnerable to the DITF procedure; however, incremental theorists complied as well. Both groups succumbed to the decreasing sequence of requests in both the relation-continuing and relation-ending context. On the other hand, the results of the pilot study confirm the asymmetric emotions experienced by entity and incremental theorists. Only the entity theorists overestimated the costs connected with rejecting both the initial and

target requests connected with the relation continuing. This indicates that entity theorists succumb to their negative emotions, which leads to a greater compliance rate with the DITF technique.

The conditions created in this experiment made it possible to verify the role of sense of guilt in compliance with the DITF among entity theorists. This effect appeared in the second experiment and was interpreted as a result of specific task functioning connected with realizing demands of optimal difficulty. Nonetheless, if sense of guilt also makes the DITF fruitful, the effect should disappear when performing a request is not connected with contact with the experimenter. With no experimenter, he or she cannot check if the demand was fulfilled. The results indicate that regardless of the prospect of the contact continuing or ending, the DITF effect occurred. This may mean that sense of guilt towards the experimenter does not underlie this strategy except for the fact that the technique was effective not only among entity theorists, but also among incremental theorists. Incremental theorists' compliance with the DITF strategy cannot be explained by their preference for tasks which decrease in magnitude as they chose the sequence of requests which increased in difficulty. It is probable that the mechanism responsible for DITF's effectiveness was a sense of guilt in both groups. The significant DITF effect in the relation-ending condition may mean that the source of feeling guilty was not the experimenter herself, but the children from the orphanage with whom the request was linked. Refusing to help those who really need it could have aroused a strong sense of guilt among them and could thus have motivated them to perform the second, smaller favor (also helping children from the orphanage, but once only, which was much less costly and effortful). Performing such a target request could have successfully released the participants from feeling guilty as it gave them a chance to restore a good self-image and to compensate those whom the participants refused to help earlier.

It is likely that the conditions introduced in the fourth experiment evoked emotions which were so strong that neither individual differences nor other situational factors could influence compliance.

General Discussion

The results of the four experiments generally confirmed the predictions. Implicit theories of traits differentiated behavior within the FITD and the DITF paradigms.

Incremental theorists are more prone to the FITD technique and entity theorists succumb to the DITF strategy to a greater extent. Especially unambiguous differences appeared in the social, thus more demanding, conditions, mainly with the FITD procedure. People believing in malleable traits complied with this technique particularly strongly when the target request was connected with further interaction with the experimenter and fulfilling the request gave the opportunity to verify their social skills.

Incremental theorists most likely comply more with the requests of social influence techniques if they are consistent with their typical functioning style, i.e. a mastery orientation, which means setting oneself growing challenges and verifying and developing one's skills. The more apparent the increase in a request's difficulty, as is the case in the FITD sequence, the more strongly this style of functioning is activated and it may motivate incremental theorists to comply with the target request. In contrast, entity theorists, preferring easy tasks guaranteeing success, succumb to conditions of decreasing request difficulty, i.e. the DITF paradigm. Presenting them with a large task may result in lessening the subjective difficulty of another, smaller request and thus may raise their motivation to perform the latter.

Therefore we can assume that the two motivational patterns typical of the two groups of people are activated more robustly in conditions of a perceived significant contrast between the requests. The results of the first and the second experiments may thus indicate that the

effectiveness of FITD and DITF is linked to performing tasks of different levels of difficulty. Increasing or decreasing the difficulty level of requests may activate the commitment of different types of people according to their typical patterns of motivation. The rise in the difficulty of the requests in the FITD sequence may stimulate people who set themselves ambitious goals, like challenges, and attempt to develop their skills, while the decline in request difficulty in the DITF technique may activate people who avoid failure and risk and who are less focused on developing their skills but rather on positive verification.

The mechanism of the effectiveness of FITD and the DITF connected with engaging in tasks of different difficulty is different from the explanations suggested up to now. The way of its functioning was derived from knowledge about endorsing one of the implicit theories of traits. Its effectiveness was confirmed mainly by the behavior of the two groups of people in all four experiments, but also by the results of the pilot studies. These findings show that incremental theorists perceive more benefits of performing a request especially in the case of the FITD strategy. Entity theorists see a greater subjective contrast between the tasks' difficulty particularly in the case of the DITF technique.

The aim of the third and fourth experiments was to investigate mechanisms other than motivational of FITD and the DITF effectiveness among people endorsing either of the two implicit theories of traits. In the case of the FITD, commitment and obligation to continue the conversation with the experimenter could have been the mechanism responsible. After agreeing to fulfill the smaller initial request the participants could have complied with the target one as they wanted to be maintain consistency in the relationship with the experimenter or because they had got involved in the dialogue. This reasoning is in line with Cialdini's (2001) rule of commitment and obligation. It is also consistent with Dolinski and colleagues' way of explaining the FITD technique in terms of involvement in a dialogue (Dolinski,

Grzyb, Olejnik, Prusakowski and Urban, 2002; Dolinski, Nawrat and Rudak, 2001). As the no-delay FITD version was implemented in the experiments, it is probable that the self-perception process influenced compliance as well: mindless narrow self-inferences could have appeared after performing the initial request and then mediated compliance (Gamian-Wilk and Dolinski, in press).

The results obtained in the third experiment confirmed our approach: the social factor, i.e. building the relationship with the experimenter, has an impact on generating compliance with the FITD technique. As in the first experiment, the incremental theorists succumbed to the FITD, but only under conditions of direct contact with the experimenter. When the interaction was to be impeded, the incremental theorists were no longer compliant. This pattern of results suggest that in order to generate compliance with the FITD among incremental theorists, both social (maintaining a relationship) and personal (endeavor to perform an interesting tasks) factors are needed.

The significance of the social factor in compliance with the DITF technique among entity theorists was verified in the fourth experiment, in which performing the target request was also linked with continuing or ending the relationship with the experimenter. The purpose of the introduced manipulation was to investigate the impact of the mechanism of sense of guilt on compliance with the DITF strategy among entity theorists. It is probable that, similarly to the case of generating the mechanism of commitment in the FITD condition in which the interaction is continued, in the DITF condition the awareness of further contact with the experimenter may increase the sense of guilt due to rejecting the previous request and thus motivate fulfillment of the target request. However, the results of the fourth experiment indicate that entity theorists complied with the DITF strategy both when the target request could be performed in direct contact with the experimenter and when the interaction was to be

ended. Moreover, incremental theorists complied in both conditions created in the experiment. Such a situation may be a result of a very strong sense of guilt, not connected with the relationship with the experimenter, but caused by children in need. Rejecting help could have induced a strong sense of guilt among both groups and led to compliance with the less costly target request. Therefore it was shown that a social factor is present to a great extent and it may even overcome the impact of personal factors connected with the motivational pattern of behavior. Such a situation took place in the case of incremental theorists, who usually prefer performing tasks which increase rather than decrease in difficulty, i.e. opposite to the DITF procedure.

Considering the results of all four studies presented here, it was shown that individual differences connected with the endorsed implicit theory modify behavior in the FITD and DITF conditions. Mechanisms connected with the particular motivational pattern and mechanisms triggered by social factors, i.e. engaging in a relationship, are responsible for the effectiveness of both techniques among entity and incremental theorists. Therefore, including individual differences when exploring social influence techniques allows us to broaden our knowledge about the nature of both individual differences and the mechanisms of their effectiveness. The entity and incremental theorists' styles of functioning in the conditions of increasing or decreasing request magnitude allows predicting differences in compliance with the FITD and DITF techniques. The anticipated differences presented in the four studies described here and earlier (Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek, 2007; Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek, in press) reveal that the effectiveness of both techniques depends on both mechanisms known from the literature on social influence techniques and mechanisms based on involvement in a relationship and which generate motivational mechanisms. In this way the studies presented here are in line with the "hybrid" approach to investigating the

impact of individual differences on social phenomena. The key point of this approach is personality theory and knowledge about a certain phenomenon. This way of exploring individual differences enriches our knowledge about both individual differences and the particular phenomenon (Eagly, 1981).

References

- Beaman, A.L., Cole, C.M., Preston, M., Klentz, B. & Steblay, N.M. (1983). Fifteen years of foot-in-the-door research: A meta analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, 181-196.
- Bem, D. (1967). Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena. *Psychological Review*, 74, 183-200.
- Bem, D. (1972). Self-perception theory. In: L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (6, pp. 1-62). New York: Academic Press.
- Burger, J.M. (1999). The foot-in-the-door compliance procedure: A multiple-process analysis and review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 303-325.
- Burger, J.M. & Caldwell, D.F. (2003). The effects of monetary incentives and labeling on the foot-in-the-door effect: Evidence for a self-perception process. *Basic Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 235-241.
- Burger, J.M. & Guadagno, R.E. (2003). Self-concept clarity, responsiveness to false feedback, and the foot-in-the-door procedure. *Basic Applied Psychology*. 25, 79-86.
- Cann, A., Sherman, S.J. & Elkes, R. (1975). Effects of initial request size and timing of a second request on compliance: The foot in the door and the door in the face. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 774-782.
- Channouf, A. & Sénémeaud, C. (2000). Norme de consistance, norme d'intériorité et changement d'attitude dans les paradigmes de soumission forcée et de soumission sans pression. *Les Cahiers Internationaux de Psychologie Sociale*, 46, 49-61.

- Chartrand, T., Pinckert, S. & Burger, J.M. (1999). When manipulation backfires: The effects of time delay and requester on the foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29*, 211-221.
- Chiu, C., Hong, Y. & Dweck, C.S. (1997). Lay dispositionism and implicit theories of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 19-30.
- Cialdini, R.B. (2001). *Influence: science and practice*. 4th Ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cialdini, R.B., & Goldstein, N.J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 591-622.
- Cialdini, R.B., Cacioppo, J.T., Basset, R. & Miller, J.A. (1978). Low-ball procedure for producing compliance: Commitment then cost. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 463-476.
- Cialdini, R.B., Vincent, J.E., Lewis, S.K., Catalan, J., Wheeler, D. & Darby, B.L. (1975). Reciprocal concessions procedure for inducing compliance: The door-in-the-face technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*, 206-215.
- Cialdini, R.B., Trost, M.R. & Newsom, J.T. (1995). Preference for consistency: The development of a valid measure and the discovery of surprising behavioral implications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 318-328.
- Crano, W.D. & Sivacek, J. (1982). Social reinforcement, self-attribution, and the foot-in-the-door phenomenon. *Social Cognition, 1*, 110-125.
- DeJong, W. (1979). An Examination of self-perception mediation of the foot-in-the-door effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 192-199.

- DeJong, W. & Funder, D. (1977). Effect of payment for initial compliance: Unanswered questions about the foot-in-the-door phenomenon. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 3, 662-665.
- DeJong, W. & Musilli, L. (1982). External pressure to comply. Handicapped vs. nonhandicapped requesters and the foot-in-the-door phenomenon. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 8, 522-527.
- Dillard, J.P. (1991). The current status of research on sequential request compliance techniques. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 283-288.
- Dillard, J.P., Hunter, J.E. & Burgoon, M. (1984). Sequential request persuasive strategies: Meta analysis of foot-in-the-door and door-in-the-face. *Human Communication Research*, 10, 461-488.
- Dolinski, D. (2000). On inferring one's beliefs from one's attempts and consequences for subsequent compliance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 260-272.
- Dolinski, D. (2001). Automatyzm a skuteczność technik wpływu społecznego. (Automaticity and the effectiveness of social influence techniques.) In: R.K. Ohme, M. Jarymowicz & J. Reykowski (Eds.), *Automatyzm w procesach przetwarzania informacji*. (Automaticity in information processing) (pp. 167-178). Wydawnictwo Instytutu Psychologii PAN, SWPS.
- Dolinski, D., Grzyb, T., Olejnik, J., Prusakowski, S. & Urban, K. (2002). Let's dialogue about penny. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 1150-1170.
- Dolinski, D., Nawrat, R. & Rudak, I. (2001). Dialogue involvement as a social influence technique. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1395-1406.

- Dweck, C.S. (1996). Implicit theories as organizers of goals and behavior. In: P.M. Gollwitzer & J.A. Bargh (Eds.), *The role of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior* (pp. 69-90). New York: Guilford Press.
- Dweck, C.S. (2000). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Dweck, C.S. & Leggett, E.L. (1988). A social cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 25, 109-116.
- Eagly, A.H. (1981). Recipient characteristics as determinants of responses to persuasion. W: R.E. Petty, T.C. Brock, T.M. Ostrom (Eds.) *Cognitive responses to persuasion*, s. 173-196. Hillsdale, NJ; Erlbaum.
- Erdley, C.A. & Dweck, C.S. (1993). Children's implicit personality theories as predictors of their social judgments. *Child Development*, 64, 863-878.
- Erdley, C.A., Cain, K., Loomins, C., Dumas-Hines, F. & Dweck, C.S. (1997). The relations among children's social goals, implicit personality theories and responses to social failure. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 263-272.
- Fennis, B.M., Janssen, L. & Vohs, K.D. (in press). Acts of benevolence: A limited-resource account of compliance with charitable requests. *Journal of Business Research*.
- Freedman, J. & Fraser, S. (1966). Compliance without pressure: the foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 195-202.
- Furse, D.H., Steward, D.W. & Rados, D.L. (1981). Effects of foot-in-the-door, cash incentives, and follow-ups on survey response. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 473-478.

- Gamian-Wilk, M. & Dolinski, D. (in press). Compliance without pressure: The role of self-perception in the mechanism of the foot-in-the-door strategy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Gamian-Wilk, M. & Lachowicz-Tabaczek, K. (in press). Komu łatwiej zatrzasnąć drzwi przed nosem: wiara w stałość lub zmienność natury ludzkiej a uległość wobec technik wpływu społecznego. (Who is more prone to the door-in-the-face technique: implicit theories and the sequential influence techniques.)
- Gamian-Wilk, M., Lachowicz-Tabaczek, K. (2007). Implicit theories and compliance with the foot-in-the-door technique. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 38, 50-63.
- Gervey, B., Chiu, C., Hong, Y. & Dweck, C.S. (1999). Differential use of person information in power: Violence profile No. 10. *Journal of Communication*, 29, 177-195.
- Goetz, T.E., Dweck, C.S. (1980). Learned helplessness in social situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 246-255.
- Goldman, M. & Creason, C.R., McCall, C.G. (1981). Compliance employing a two-feet-in-the-door procedure. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 114, 259-265.
- Goldman, M., Kiyohara, O. & Pfannensteil, D.A. (1984). Interpersonal touch, social labeling, and the foot-in-the-door effect. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 125, 2, 143-147.
- Goldman, M., Seever, M. & Seever, M. (1982). Social labeling and the foot-in-the-door effect. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 117, 19-23.
- Gorassini, D.R. & Olson, J.M. (1995). Does self-perception change explain the foot-in-the-door effect? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 91-105.

- Guadagno, R.E., Asher, T., Demaine, L.J. & Cialdini, R.B. (2001). When saying yes leads to saying no: Preference for consistency and the reverse foot-in-the-door effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 859-867.
- Hong, Y., Chiu, C., Yeung, G. & Tong, Y. (1999). Social comparison during political transition: Interaction of entity versus incremental beliefs and social identities. *Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23, 257-279.
- Lachowicz-Tabaczek, K. (1999). Źródła, funkcje i konsekwencje prywatnych koncepcji natury ludzkiej. (Origins, functions, and consequences of implicit theories). *Kolokwia Psychologiczne*, 7, Warszawa: Instytut Psychologii PAN, 77-106.
- Lachowicz-Tabaczek, K. (2002). Przekonania o naturze ludzkiej jako element stylu regulacji zachowania. (Implicit theories as an element of behavior regulation style). *Studia Psychologiczne*, 40, 67-86.
- Lachowicz-Tabaczek, K. (2004). *Potoczne koncepcje świata i natury ludzkiej*. (Lay theories of the world and human traits). Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Gdańsk.
- Levy, S.R., Stroessner, S.J. & Dweck, C.S. (1998). Stereotype formation and endorsement: The role of implicit theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1421-1436.
- Nawrat, R. (1989). Manipulacja społeczna. Przegląd technik i wybranych wyników badań. (Social manipulation. The review of techniques and some results of studies). *Przegląd Psychologiczny*, 32, 125-154.
- O'Keefe, D.J. & Figle, M. (1997). A guilt-based explanation of the door-in-the-face influence strategy. *Human Communication Research*, 24, 64-81.

- Patch, M.E. (1986). The role of source legitimacy in sequential request strategies of compliance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 12, 199-205.
- Patch, M.E. (1988). Differential perception of source legitimacy in sequential request strategies. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 128, 817-823.
- Pańska, M. (2002). Ja nie chciałem... Sekwencyjne techniki wpływu społecznego a zachowania nieetyczne. (I didn't want to... Sequential social influence techniques and immoral behavior). *Studia Psychologiczne*, 40, 69-91.
- Sharkin, B.S., Mahalik, J.R. & Claiborn, C.D. (1989). Application of the foot-in-the-door effect to counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36, 2, 248-251.
- Sénémeaud, C. (2003). L'adhésion à la norme de consistance: une nouvelle variable prédictive du changement d'attitude obtenu en situation de soumission forcée. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale*, 2, 29-72.
- Stimpson, D.V. & Waranusuntikule, S. (1987). Mediating effects of material payment, social reinforcement, and familiarity on foot-in-the-door phenomena in Thailand. *The Journal of Psychology*, 121, 5, 515-520.
- Wagener, J.J. & Laird, J.D. (1980). The experimenter's foot-in-the-door. Self-perception, body weight, and volunteering. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 6, 441-446.
- Zuckerman, M., Lazzaro, M.M. & Waldgeir, D. (1979). Undermining effects of the foot-in-the-door technique with extrinsic rewards. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 9, 292-296.