

Original Papers

Polish Psychological Bulletin
2009, vol. 40 (2), 85-100
DOI - 10.2478/s10059-009-0009-z

Malgorzata Gamian-Wilk*

Kinga Lachowicz-Tabaczek**

The belief to have fixed or malleable traits and help giving: implicit theories and sequential social influence techniques

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

Keywords: *compliance, social influence techniques, implicit theories, interaction dynamics*

Many times in real life situations we wonder how to ask a quite difficult request in such a way a person agrees to fulfill it. There are circumstances when we have to be more persuasive, for instance if we work in a bank or we are a shopkeeper and we want our clients to take benefit from our special offer. The way a request is proposed 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 to client's profile. Some of these strategies are empirically verified and broadly described in the psychological literature. The studies presented here enlarge knowledge on methods of using certain social influence techniques in the case of different groups of people.

A social influence technique is a kind of method which helps increase the likelihood of a relatively difficult request to be fulfilled. An asked person most often does not realize that she or he is a target of manipulation (Dolinski, 2000). From a great variety of social influence tactics we can distinguish a group of sequential social influence strategies. Their efficacy is based on posing some other favor before asking a 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 the low-ball (Cialdini, Cacioppo, Basset and Miller, 1978) are composed of a sequence of requests.

The two above mentioned 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 symmetrical, 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 his inner states on the ground of his or her recent behavior, here performing the first favor. Then the person acts consistently with his or her new self-descriptions 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 DITF effectiveness, two mechanisms are often

* Malgorzata Gamian-Wilk, University of Lower Silesia, ul. Strzegomska 55, 53-611 Wroclaw, Poland, e-mail: m.gamian@wp.pl

** Kinga Lachowicz-Tabaczek, Institute of Psychology, University of Wroclaw, 50-527 Wroclaw, Poland, e-mail: kla@dawid.uni.wroc.pl

evoked: the reciprocity rule (Cialdini et al., 1975; Cialdini and Goldstein, 2004) and the sense of guilt (O'Keefe and Figge, 1997). After a person's rejection of a very large request the interaction partner, here the experimenter reduces his demands and proposes a smaller, target request. An asked person feels obliged to return this act of good will and in turn 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 avoiding to perform such a favor cause a person feel guilty and then more willing to agree with a target request (Dillard, 1991; O'Keefe and Figge, 1997; Patch, 1986, 1988).

The FITD technique moderators are connected mainly with the self-perception process specifics. 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 an initial request performance inhibit the self-perception process, these factors cause the strategy to be ineffective too. Those factors which facilitate self-inference from overt behavior, that is positive label accompanying fulfilling 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), several initial favors performed (Goldman, Creason and McCall, 1981) or significant involvement connected with the first favor fulfillment (Burger, 1999; Freedman and Fraser, 1966) leads the FITD to be more effective.

These moderators are specific for the FITD phenomenon to be significant. Fairly different are the facilitators and the limitations of the DITF technique, but in fact all of these influence the FITD strategy as well. Time lapse between the first request and the second one is a very important factor in case of both techniques. The DITF stops to be effective if there appears 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 circumstances of a single person reducing his or her demands immediately after a person's negative answer is perceived as giving a favor which should be reciprocated and hence is interpreted as a relation opening. Taken the FITD into consideration the problem is more complex. It is stated (Beaman, Cole, Preston, Klentz, and Steblay, 1983; Burger, 1999) that the no-delay FITD (second request is asked immediately after performing the first favor) is less effective than 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, a small and a target requests are proposed by the same

experimenter (Chartrand, Pinckert and Burger, 1999). Fast escalation of demands is seen as destruction of reciprocity rule and thus inhibiting further interaction between an asked and asking person. When another person poses the second request or in case of the time-delay FITD the effect is much more often significant. However the single-person-no-delay FITD tactic is sometimes effective. A target request should not be much different in size, form and subject from an initial request (Gamian-Wilk and Dolinski, in press; see also Burger, 1999; Fennis, Janssen and Vohs, in press).

One more factor influences the DITF and the FITD efficacy. It is the requests' topic. The meta-analysis results indicate that both, the DITF and the FITD effects are stronger when the source has prosocial character (e.g. the organizations giving support for those in need) contrary 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 case of the FITD technique (Paska, 2002; Patch, 1986, 1988). Otherwise, we can obtain greater compliance rates with the DITF when 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 where two people meet and try to make a consent, which is more easy if the dialogue concerns important issues. During this short meeting a couple of people gets known each other to the extent that one of them is prone to the other one'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, the dialogue involvement (Dolinski, Grzyb, Olejnik, Prusakowski and Urban, 2002; Dolinski, Nawrat and Rudak, 2001). Posing several questions (here asking for a favor) and letting a person answer results in greater compliance with a request comparing to a situation when 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 leads to greater compliance as people are more prone to agree with those whom they know (Dolinski, 2005). Thus even a short dialogue, posing a request and hearing the answer makes two people acquainted. The more the sequence of requests reminds a typical course of interaction the more these techniques are influential in raising compliance. These are situations when the same person is asking both demands in a short period of time. These are conditions when the DITF seems to be very fruitful. The FITD may be beneficial when both requests are alike and a target request is not too demanding.

The aim of this article is to point out the optimal circumstances of adopting the sequential social influence techniques implementation to different people profiles. As various groups of people prefer different kinds of interaction courses both techniques should be preferred by

different groups of people. The literature points out some examples of individual differences in proneness to the FITD and the DITF. Wagener and Laird did not find the FITD effect among overweight people, because the group of overweight people has limited insight into their feelings and that the 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 difference indicating the extent to which a person's self-concept is accessible. It was shown that only people with a clearer self-concept succumbed to the FITD compared with low self-concept clarity participants.

There are results showing that dispositional differences do affect compliance with a relatively large request both in the case of the FITD and 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 influence 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 comply with 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 symmetrical pattern of results in case of the DITF strategy.

Previous studies have shown that another dispositional feature have impact on both sequential influence techniques' effectiveness. Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2007, 2009) have shown that incremental theorists and entity theorists are prone to the FITD and the DITF techniques consisted of different requests' magnitude in sequences. The implicit theory concerning the malleability versus stability of human traits is a lay theory which has been examined by Carol Dweck and her collaborators (Chiu, Hong and Dweck, 1997; Dweck, 1996, 2000; Dweck and Leggett, 1988; Erdley and Dweck, 1993; Gervery, Chiu, Hong and Dweck, 1999; Hong, Chiu, Yeung and Tong, 1999). Dweck noticed the existence of two types of behavior undertaken when faced with difficult tasks or obstacles. Incremental theorists increase effort after experiencing defeats. 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 (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). In contrast, entity theorists claim that personality cannot be changed. They prefer easy tasks

which guarantee success. Because they endorse 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 that they could be successful in pursuing tasks and resign from trying 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 stimulation emotions intensity regulator. Results of studies indicate that entity theorists are more emotionally reactive, emotionally vulnerable and have less stamina comparing with incremental theorists (Fura, 2001; Lachowicz – Tabaczek, 2002). Entity theorists are less active than incremental theorists. Such a pattern of temperamental features suggest that entity theorists should avoid stimulation. Therefore, they fail in performing tasks when emotionally overloaded. The author treats implicit theories as a link between temperamental traits and behavior. Model presented by Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2002, 2004) suggests that entity theory is a component of emotional-defending style of regulation. Endorsing entity theory results in avoiding situations which could expose to experiencing negative emotions. This self-protective attitude means choosing only easy tasks which minimize the risk of failure. Contrary, incremental theory facilitates maintaining rational-developmental style of regulation. Incremental theorists endorse active attitude. They courageously undertake new challenges and they choose difficult and risky tasks.

Moreover, incremental and entity theorists tend to perceive and judge people in quite different ways. People who endorse belief in malleability of human traits do not make judgments quickly before gathering merit, important data about others. Entity theorists tend to form global ascriptions very quickly, even on the basis of a single behavior or even face features (Gervery, Chiu, Hong and Dweck, 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 a feedback suggesting being rejected by peers entity theorists blamed themselves ascribing themselves negative features, they were losing motivation and did not try enough to persuade to be invited to a friends club. Incremental theorists perceived the cause of their mistake in the effort, thus later they were 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, gain experience

in social interactions, while entity theorists prefer situations minimizing possibility of being rejected (e.g. meeting with a person who they were sure liked them).

Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2007, 2009) have shown that as people constantly self-developing, searching for possibilities to endorse new skills, 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 in control condition. Entity theorists succumb 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 handle 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 situation does not mean ambitious goals. In a follow-up study Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2007) showed that entity and incremental theorists rate request 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, to estimate the probability of performing such requests, and to evaluate the costs connected with fulfilling and the costs connected with rejecting the requests. The results showed that entity theorists assessed particular requests as more difficult to fulfill and the costs of performing them as higher than incremental theorists did.

A conclusion may be drawn suggesting that compliance with both strategies is regulated by different styles of task functioning among people endorsing different naive theories. The FITD situation activates incremental theorists' task functioning. This group of people complies with escalating sequence of requests when the tasks are interesting and challenging, thus providing benefit. Greater compliance with the FITD observed among incremental theorists may be caused by their perception of the requests as relatively not costly and demanding. This strategy occurs to be ineffective among entity theorists. Their greater unwillingness to comply with 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-defending style of behavior, thus fear of not managing the request is reduced by the perceived contrast between difficulty level of an initial and a target request. The decreased in requests difficulty magnitude sequence in the DITF strategy seems

to be unchallenging and not meeting incremental theorists' developmental goals. As they do not perceive enough benefit in succumbing a target request, they do not engage.

To sum up, requests are treated as tasks to fulfill. In face of a sequence of demands diverse behavior regulation styles are triggered depending on endorsed implicit theory of traits. Incremental theorists are more willing to comply with the FITD technique because of perceived benefit connected with performing an interesting and ambitious escalating sequence of requests. Entity theorists are more vulnerable to the DITF strategy because of perceived reduction of costs of fulfilling a smaller request in the sequence of tasks decreased in magnitude. On the base of the obtained pattern of results we can infer that in the FITD strategy incremental theorists are drawn by mastery-orientation. Contrary, helpless pattern of behavior and self-defending 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 presented in this article series of studies was a further verification of the differences among entity and incremental theorists in task functioning in the FITD and the DITF paradigms. The first and the second experiment are a direct continuation and replication of previously obtained findings (Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek, 2007, 2009). We investigated entity and incremental theorists' different styles of task functioning which are activated by increasing or decreasing requests' magnitude sequences. The demands difficulty level was here enhanced by introducing social context. Highlighted condition of social interaction creates additional challenge in the case of the escalating demands in the FITD procedure thus providing greater benefit for incremental theorists. On the other hand the necessity of increased social contact generates greater contrast in the case of decreasing sequence requests difficulty in the DITF procedure as perceived by entity theorists costs connected with performing a 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 with various emotional reactions. People endorsing the belief in malleable traits chose challenging and ambitious tasks as they are driven by positive feelings. Entity theorists' task functioning is connected with the need of reducing negative emotions. In the third and the fourth experiment the asymmetry of experienced by both groups of people positive vs negative feelings was enhanced by introducing conditions activating sense of guilt or 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 from Orphans' House). Agreeing or rejecting a favor in such case cause strong feelings of obligation or guilt. We

anticipated that driven by positive emotions incremental theorists would fall into a pitfall of commitment (because of their need of new and challenging tasks) and will comply with the FITD strategy especially in highlighted social context. Contrary, entity theorists would fall in a pitfall of negative emotions – their sense of guilt experienced after refusing help a person in need and thus they will comply with the DITF technique particularly in the case of stressed social conditions.

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

Experiment 1

Overview of the experiment

In the first study entity and incremental theorists were asked a sequence of requests according to the FITD technique. Thus, interaction demanding initial request in both experimental conditions was used. Manipulation of requests' character was introduced. The same difficulty level target requests were presented as demanding a lot of social interaction or little social interaction. It was anticipated that only incremental theorists would comply with the sequence of requests connected with high level of social interaction. The experimental design was as follows 2 (entity vs incremental theorists) × 2 (social-interaction vs no-social-interaction FITD) with 2 control only target requests 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 Wrocław and Political Sciences canteen served as participants. The female experimenter approached randomly assigned students and asked them for help in doing research. In order to avoid conformistic 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 experimental and control conditions. In the FITD condition 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 to fill out a Polish adaptation of 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 Likert's 5-point scale ranging from 1 ("definitely disagree") to 5 ("definitely agree"). The reliability of the Polish version of the questionnaire was Cronbach's $\alpha=.72$ (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 scale, he or she was asked to complete only the implicit theories measure.

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 for helping conducting studies. Participants were to encourage other students to complete 300-adjectives scales and monitor their work. Thus, fulfilling such target request demanded initiating a number of social interactions, though 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 participants were asked to spend two hours in order to copy and prepare materials for the study the experimenter was conducting. This time the target request did not demand initiating new social interactions. The task had purely technical character. In the control conditions participants were asked to fulfill only the target requests: to sacrifice two hours on encouraging peers to complete long questionnaires or on 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 implicit theories among all the participants.

Whenever a participant was willing to sacrifice two hours irrespectively of the condition the experimenter took his or her e-mail address or telephone number and told she would contact in a few days. The participants were contacted, thanked and debriefed.

There was a pilot study for the first and the second experiment done. The aim of the additional study was to check how participants perceive various aspects of particular tasks in sequences introduced in the experiments. Participants ($n=57$, undergraduates of the Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities Wrocław Faculty and University of Lower Silesia) were asked to imagine

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 requests 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 requests difficulty 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)

a situation similar to the one from the main experiments (while 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 7-point scales on which they were to evaluate the difficulty level, estimate benefits and costs of fulfilling and costs of rejecting presented requests. Participants were to evaluate two of four requests introduced in the main experiment (the social-interaction FITD requests sequence or the no-social-interaction FITD requests sequence or the social-interaction DITF requests sequence or the no-social-interaction DITF requests sequence).

Results

The initial analysis indicated that neither participants' sex ($\chi^2 < 1$) nor participants' affiliation ($\chi^2 < 1$) had 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 disagreed with the initial request) were asked the target request (Burger, 1999; DeJong, 1979; see also Freedman and Fraser, 1966).

In the social-interaction FITD condition 33.3% of participants (19 out of 57) agreed to sacrifice two hours encouraging peers to complete surveys compared with the control condition, where 9.4% of 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 participants (16 out of 53) agreed to spend two hours on preparing materials to the study compared with the control condition, where 17% of 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' totaled scores in the questionnaire measuring implicit theories were selected on the basis of the median split, which was 22 (SD=5.1). The participants whose results were higher than 22 were classified as entity theorists ($n=103$) and those who scored lower than 22 were classified as incremental theorists ($n=104$). Nine people obtained a score which equaled the median and were excluded from further analysis.

Taking individual differences into account the social-interaction FITD technique was significant only among 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 benefits of fulfilling the social-interaction target request as higher ($F_{(1,17)} = 6.12$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2_p = .26$) comparing with entity theorists did but only when it followed the initial request (in the social-interaction FITD sequence). They would perform this request especially because of pure kindness ($F_{(1,27)} = 2.26$, $p = .08$, $\eta^2_p = .077$) irrespectively of the kind of the initial request. This pattern of results was absent in the case of no-social-interaction FITD sequence. This time 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, $F_{(1,20)} = 4.55$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2_p = .19$) greater than entity theorists did.

Discussion

The results obtained in the first experiment show that the FITD strategy is generally more effective with requests connected with initiating and maintaining social interactions in comparison with the situation when the sequence consists of task-like requests. The clearest and the most important finding indicate that only incremental theorists agreed with the social interaction target request. This finding is consistent with previous results obtained by Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2007, 2009). The FITD strategy activated incremental theorists' task functioning. This group of people is generally more open to new ambitious tasks. Social context seems to have constituted additional difficulty and challenge. Results of the pilot study indicate clearly that incremental theorists are drawn by potential benefits connected with performing a task while complying. It is also evident that incremental theorists concentrate to greater extent on the partner of interaction. 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 pilot study findings indicate also that the no-social FITD sequence is not challenging and beneficial enough for incremental theorists to comply. However, negative emotions they felt in face of less interesting target demand did not influence compliance. This pattern of result is in line with Lachowicz-Tabaczek's (2002, 2004) model of style of behavior regulation. Incremental theorists as a result of endorsing active attitude tend to constant self-develop. They undertake tasks which give them stimulation and allow them being active.

Contrary, entity theorists as a result of endorsing emotional-defending style of regulation tend to avoid situations giving to much of stimulation. Their unwillingness to comply with the FITD technique results from their perception of lack of benefits connected with fulfilling a favor. Faced with social expectations they withdraw because they are suppressed by evaluation of requests as difficult and effortful. Moreover, they are more shy, they are afraid of new interactions, which mean the need of constant self-examining and thus being under pressure. They are afraid of the possibility of being badly assessed, as they tend to perceive themselves and other people holistically and tend to ascribe fixed global features quickly. Thus they withdraw from forthcoming social interaction especially if it means contacting with 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 utterly unsocial. Thus they rejected spending time on 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 with 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. Probably, that is why the FITD was not generally effective as the no-time delay FITD is effective only with target requests strictly connected with initial favors as 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) there are formed new self-descriptions, which are narrow and concrete and mediate further compliance only if the target request is consistent with new self-inference descriptions. Thus the no-social interaction FITD could backfire as both requests in the sequence were inconsistent.

Previous studies (Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek, 2007) have shown that while incremental theorists comply the FITD when the requests sequence is fairly difficult and challenging, entity theorists succumb this strategy only when the sequence is quite simple and unriskey. Other findings (Gamian-Wilk and Lachowicz-Tabaczek, 2009) indicate the opposite effect taking the DITF technique into consideration. Here the entity theorists were more prone to comply with the DITF especially when the sequence of requests seemed to be significantly reduced. It is interesting if this pattern of results is true with the DITF sequence of requests connected with reducing social interaction or requests strictly task-like. The second study aimed at verifying the DITF efficacy with the same social-interaction and no-social-interaction target requests as those introduced in the case of the FITD strategy in the first study.

Experiment 2

Overview of the experiment

In the second study entity and incremental theorists were asked a sequence of requests according to the DITF technique. Thus, very large interaction demanding initial request in both experimental conditions was used. Similarly as in the previous experiment manipulation of target

requests' character was introduced. The same difficulty level target requests were presented as demanding a lot of social interaction or little social interaction. It was anticipated that this time task-oriented incremental theorists would comply with the sequence of requests connected with low level of social interaction. Entity theorists would be prone to comply the DITF when sequence of decreasing requests was connected with social interaction. The experiment design was as follows 2 (entity vs incremental theorists) \times 2 (social-interaction vs no-social-interaction DITF) with two control conditions where only 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 Wrocław and Wrocław University canteens served as participants. One of three female experimenters approached randomly assigned students and asked them for help in doing research. In order to avoid conformistic behavior, only students who were sitting alone or in couples were approached. Participants were randomly assigned to experimental and control conditions. In the DITF conditions participants were first presented with a very large request, which was to sacrifice two hours each day during next two weeks on helping in conducting a study. Participants' task would be to assist the experimenters encourage other students to fill out various surveys. The initial request proposed in such way was most often rejected, only two students agreed to help. Irrespectively to the fact whether participants agreed or rejected the first request the target one was presented immediately after.

The target requests were both in case of the social-interaction DITF condition and no-social-interaction DITF condition identical as in the first study. Thus, in the social-interaction DITF procedure participants were asked (if not two hours every day during the whole two weeks) to sacrifice two hours once only for helping conducting studies. Participants were to encourage other students to complete 300-adjectives scales 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 participants were asked (if not two hours every day during the whole two weeks) to spend two hours once only copying and preparing materials for the study the experimenter was conducting. In both experimental conditions participants were asked additionally to fill out entity versus incremental theories measure.

In the control conditions participants were asked to fulfill only the target requests: to sacrifice two hours on encouraging peers to complete long questionnaires or on 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 implicit theories among all the participants.

Whenever a participant was willing to sacrifice two hours irrespectively of the condition the experimenter took his or her e-mail address or telephone number and told she would contact in a few days. The participants were contacted, thanked and debriefed.

Results

The initial analysis indicated that neither participants' sex ($\chi^2 < 1$) nor participants' affiliation ($\chi^2 < 1$) had impact on compliance with the target request. Moreover, there was no experimenter impact on the eagerness to spare two hours on 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 participants (12 out of 34) agreed to spend two hours on helping doing research compared with the control condition, where 15.4% of 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 participants (17 out of 41) were willing to spend two hours on copying materials to the study compared with the control condition, where 14.6% of participants (6 out of 41) complied. The no-social-interaction DITF effect was significant ($\chi^2_{(1,82)} = 5.57$, $p = .02$, $\phi = .29$).

The participants' totaled 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 who scored lower than 22 were classified as 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 case of 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, entity theorists were not ($\chi^2_{(1,40)} = 1.01$, $p = .31$, $\phi = .158$) (Tab. 2).

Results of the pilot study additionally confirm our predictions, as they indicate that entity theorists assessed the difficulty of the social target request as significantly lower when it followed the DITF initial request comparing to the FITD initial request ($F_{(1,13)} = 5.85$, $p < .03$, $\eta^2_p = .31$). There was no such difference in evaluating social-interaction

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 requests 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 requests difficulty 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)

target request among incremental theorists. Entity theorists assessed costs of denying the social-interaction target request ($F_{(1,27)}=3.83$, $p=.06$, $\eta^2_p=.12$) as relatively higher comparing to incremental theorists did irrespectively of the kind of the initial request. There was no difference between incremental and entity theorists in the case of no-social-interaction target request ($F<1$).

Discussion

As the target requests are the same both in the first and the second experiments, entity and incremental theorists' reactions to the FITD and the DITF techniques can be compared. Here it occurred that the pattern of results is completely symmetrical to the one obtained in the first study. This time the dispositional difference influence 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 (2009). 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 social target request. Entity theorists seem to perceive 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, thus demand meaning decreasing of social demands seems to be bearable. The perceived social expectations reduction results in lower anxiety and gives the possibility of accustoming with a new task. Such a reaction is a sign of helpless task functioning. The tendency of self-protection results in withdrawing from tasks giving

to much of stimulation. The fact that entity theorists did not agree with the no-social DITF procedure shows that only perceived social expectations reduction makes them more courageous. On the other hand, entity theorists perceived denying with the social-interaction request as more emotionally costly than rejecting a technical demand.

Incremental theorists were more reluctant with the perceived social interaction withdrawal and social-interaction DITF technique was not effective in this group of people. 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 relationship closing. In comparison with the too large but giving ample possibility of meeting new people and engaging in further relationship with the experimenter initial request, the second demand meant withdrawal from social interaction and gave not enough stimulation. Thus the reduction of social demands was not interesting for them. As more task-oriented they chose no-social target request, which on the one hand did not lead to relation development but on the other hand was connected with achieving new skills of preparing a research.

The DITF technique proved to be generally effective, both in the case of social and no-social-interaction target requests. Such a pattern of results indicates that reciprocity rule seems to explain well the DITF phenomenon as reducing the magnitude of the first request led to compliance with the target favor irrespectively of its topic. These findings are consistent with Cialdini's (Cialdini and Goldstein, 2004) line of the technique's mechanism explanation. On the other hand, O'Keefe and Figge's (1997) reasoning suggesting that the sense of guilt appears after rejecting an initial demand and then 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), thus refusing it could have resulted with negative emotions which

were enhanced by the similarity of the source and the participants. Moreover, the results can also be explained by the mechanism based on interaction dynamics, posing and rejecting the very large initial request opens an interaction typical for the course of negotiations.

Next two experiments were conducted to investigate the asymmetry in experienced by entity and incremental theorists emotions. As incremental theorists are driven by positive emotions they should fall into a pitfall of obligation to continue a new relationship and they should comply with the FITD strategy especially in highlighted social context. On the other hand, entity theorists driven by negative emotions should fall in a pitfall of their sense of guilt experienced after rejecting a social request and thus they should comply with the DITF technique particularly in the case of stressed social conditions.

Experiment 3

Overview of the experiment

The third study is a replication of the first experiment. Here the FITD technique among entity and incremental theorists has been introduced, but this time target request was connected with deepening the relation with one newly met person. Thus, the aspect of 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 experiment design was as follows 2 (entity vs incremental theorists) × 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 Agriculture University campus participated in the study. One of three female experimenters visited students in their rooms. The rooms were randomly assigned to one of four conditions. There were always one or two persons in the rooms. The experimenters presented themselves as Orphans' Association volunteers. In the FITD conditions participants were firstly asked to fill out a short survey on the need of volunteering in various charity actions and to fill out entity versus incremental theories measure. If a participant did not agree to fill out a 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, 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 the contact with a child, I would assist you if you need". This was a kind of a promise of continuation 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 participants were also asked to go to an Orphans' House and help a child in his or her homework but this time the experimenter added: "I would send you by an e-mail the address of the Orphan's House and you would make an appointment with a child". Such target request was not connected with depending the relation with the experimenter. Agreeing with this task actually ended the contact.

In the control conditions participants were asked to fulfill only the target requests: to go to an Orphans' House and help a child in his or her homework with or without experimenter's promise of support and continuation. 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 implicit theories among all the participants.

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

Results

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

In the relation-continuing FITD condition 52.4% of participants (22 out of 42) agreed to go to the Orphans' House with the experimenter's company compared with the control condition, where 39% of participants (16 out of

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 requests 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 requests' 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)

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 participants (28 out of 41) agreed to go to the Orphan's House alone compared with the control condition, where 47.6% of 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' totaled 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 who scored lower than 23 were classified as incremental theorists ($n=81$). Seven people obtained a score which equaled the median and were excluded from further analysis.

Taking individual differences into account the relation-continuing FITD technique was almost significant only among 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 incremental theorists ($\chi^2_{(1,42)}=0.86$, $p=.35$, $\phi=.14$) nor 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 benefits of performing any of the target requests ($F<1$). In the case of the FITD sequence incremental theorists rated the costs of performing the target request as higher ($F_{(1,9)}=12.57$, $p=.006$, $\eta^2_p=.58$) comparing to entity theorists did. Incremental theorists would however fulfill the target request because of pure kindness to a greater extent than would entity theorists ($F_{(1,15)}=5.23$, $p=.04$, $\eta^2_p=.26$). This effect was marginally stronger for the relation-continuing target request comparing to 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 entity theorists ($F<1$).

Discussion

The purpose of conducting the third study was to replicate and confirm the findings obtained in the first experiment. Generally implementing different kind of requests led to consistent pattern of results. The present study indicate some limitations of the FITD technique. Surprisingly, the strategy was somehow more effective with sequence of requests promising 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 in their lessons on one's own, in a face-to-face contact. Thus assistance is not essential. As the target request seemed to be utterly ambiguous and strange, participants could have been generally more reluctant with complying 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 mere declaration. Students could have decided more willingly, as for the experimenters it was difficult to check if participants really went to the Orphan's House. When the experimenter stressed she would assist each participant's step, the real behavior started to be more apparent and perhaps this fact led the strategy to be less effective.

Nevertheless, once again it was the incremental theorists who were more prone to succumb the FITD procedure, but only when it meant deepening the relationship with a newly met person. Although the relation-deepening FITD technique was generally unsuccessful, people who believe in malleable traits tended to comply. The pilot study findings indicate that factors connected with social interaction are very important for incremental theorists. They seem to be driven by the obligation to be kind. In spite of obvious difficulties and costs of performing the relation-continuing target request this group of people feel duty to maintain a relationship. They fall into a pitfall of their positive

emotions and necessity of being a nice person. They seem to be open to new acquaintances, they are more curious of other people. They are said to give more chances in even difficult relations. Perhaps because they do not formulate general evaluations of other people, they need more time to get them known. 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 the FITD procedure. This group of people tended to withdraw from both relation-continuing and relation-ending sequence 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 possibly difficult and not guaranteeing success.

Experiment 4

Overview of the experiment

The fourth study is a replication of the second experiment and the manipulation introduced is similar to the one introduced in the third experiment. Here the DITF technique was used among entity and incremental theorists. Both initial and target requests were connected with deepening or ending the relation with a newly met person. Thus, the aspect of 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 the sequence of requests connected with reducing the amount of contact within a relation. Incremental theorists would avoid such situations. The experiment design was as follows 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 four conditions. There were always one or two students in the rooms. The experimenters presented themselves as Orphans' Association volunteers. In the DITF condition participants were first presented with a very large request, which was to help children in their homework four times a week during a period of next two weeks. The initial request proposed in such way was most often rejected, only five students agreed to help. Irrespectively to the fact whether participants agreed or rejected the first request the target one was presented immediately after.

In the relation-continuation DITF condition immediately after the first favor was rejected, participants were asked (if

not four times during whole two weeks) to go once only to the Orphans' House and help a child doing homework. The experimenter added: "We could go there together, I would help you initiate the contact with a child, I would assist you if you need". The target request presented in the context of the large initial task meant, on the one hand, reduction of intensity of the contact with a newly met person, on the other hand it was a promise of continuation the interaction.

In the relation-ending DITF condition participants were also asked to go to an Orphans' House and help a child in his or her homework once only but this time the experimenter added: "I would send you by an e-mail the address of the Orphan's House 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 a newly met person and was connected with withdrawal from the relationship.

In the control conditions participants were asked to fulfill only the target requests: to go to an Orphans' House and help a child in his or her homework with or without experimenters' promise of support and relation continuation. In all four conditions irrespectively 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 out. Such a strategy allowed measuring implicit theories among all the participants.

Results

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

In the relation-continuing DITF condition 68.8% of participants (22 out of 32) agreed to help children in their homework with the experimenter assistance compared with the control condition, where 27% of 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 participants (22 out of 31) agreed to help a child in his homework without the experimenter's assistance compared with the control condition, where 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' totaled 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 who scored lower than 23 were

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

Sequence of decreasing request difficulty connected with deepening a relationship			
		Control condition	Door-in-the-face condition
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 decreasing request difficulty not connected with deepening a relationship			
		Control condition	Door-in-the-face 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)

classified as incremental theorists ($n=67$). Four people obtained a score which equaled the median and were excluded from further analysis.

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

The results of the pilot study indicate additionally that entity theorists rated costs connected with rejecting both target requests as significantly higher comparing to entity 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 costs of rejecting the initial request as higher than incremental theorists did but only in the case of the relation-continuing DITF sequence ($F_{(1,19)}=5.39$, $p=.03$, $\eta^2_p=.22$).

Discussion

The DITF technique occurred to be tremendously effective in the case of both groups of people. Therefore, results obtained in the fourth experiment confirm only partly our predictions. It was anticipated that only entity theorists would be vulnerable with the DITF procedure, however incremental theorists complied too. It occurred that both groups of people succumb the decreasing in magnitude sequence of requests both in the relation-continuing and in relation-ending context. On the other hand, results from the pilot study confirm the asymmetry in experienced by entity and incremental theorists emotions. Only entity theorists overestimated costs connected with rejecting both the initial and the target request connected with relation-continuing.

These findings indicate that entity theorists fall into a pitfall of their negative emotions which lead to 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 optimal in difficulty demands. Nonetheless if sense of guilt also makes the DITF fruitful, the effect should disappear when performing the request is not connected with the contact with the experimenter. In the case of the lack of the experimenter he or she cannot check if the demand was fulfilled. The results indicate that irrespectively of the contact continuation or ending the DITF effect occurred. This finding may mean that sense of guilt towards the experimenter does not underlie this strategy unless 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 to decreasing in magnitude task as these people chose the increasing in difficulty sequence of requests. It is probable that the mechanism responsible for the DITF effectiveness was sense of guilt in both groups of people. Significant DITF effect in relation-ending condition may mean that the source of feeling guilty was not the experimenter herself but children from the Orphan's House with whom the request was linked. Refusing help those who really need it could have aroused strong sense of guilt among everyone and thus could have motivated to perform the second smaller favor (also helping children from Orphan's House but once only, which was much less costly and effortful). Performing such a target request could have successfully release participants from feeling guilty as it gave chance to restore good self-image and to compensate those whom participants refused to help earlier.

It is likely that conditions introduced in the fourth experiment raised to strong emotions for neither individual differences nor other situational factors to influence compliance.

General Discussion

The results obtained in all four experiments generally confirm the predictions. Implicit theories of traits occurred to differentiate 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 greater extent. Especially unambiguous differences appeared in the social thus more demanding conditions mainly in the case of 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 favor gave the opportunity to verify their social skills.

Most likely incremental theorists comply with the social influence techniques to greater extent when requests are consistent with their typical functioning style – mastery orientation which means setting oneself growing challenges, verifying and developing one's skills. The more apparent is the increase in the level of requests' difficulty as it is in the FITD sequence the stronger this style of functioning is activated and may motivate incremental theorists to comply with the target request. Contrary entity theorists preferring easy success guarantying tasks succumb in the conditions of decreasing requests' difficulty, that is in the DITF paradigm. Presenting them a large task may result in lessening the subjective difficulty of another smaller request and thus may raise motivation to perform the later one.

Therefore we can assume that both motivational patterns typical for both groups of people are activated more robustly in the conditions of significant perceived contrast between requests. The results obtained in the first and the second experiment may thus indicate that the FITD and the DITF effectiveness is linked with performing tasks different in difficulty level. Increasing or decreasing difficulty level of requests may activate commitment of different types of people according to their typical pattern of motivation. The raise in difficulty of requests within the FITD sequence may stimulate people who set themselves ambitious goals, who like challenges and who attempt to develop their skills. Contrary, the decline in difficulty of requests within the DITF technique may activate people who avoid failures and risk, who are less focused on developing their skills but rather on a positive verification.

The mechanism of the FITD and the DITF effectiveness connected with engaging in different in difficulty tasks has diverse character from explanations suggested up till now. The way of its functioning was derived from the knowledge about endorsing one of the implicit theories of traits. Its

effectiveness was confirmed mainly by the behavior of both groups of people in all four experiments but also by the results of pilot studies. These findings show that incremental theorists perceive more benefits of performing the request especially in the case of the FITD strategy. Entity theorists see a greater subjective contrast between tasks' difficulty particularly in the case of the DITF technique.

The aim of the third and the fourth experiment was to investigate other than motivational mechanisms of the FITD and the DITF effectiveness among people endorsing various implicit theories of traits. In the case of the FITD commitment and obligation to continue the conversation with the experimenter could have been the responsible mechanism. After agreeing to fulfill the smaller initial request participants could have complied with the target one as they wanted to maintain consistent within 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 his 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 introduced 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 confirm our approach: the social factors, building the relationship with the experimenter has an impact in generating compliance with the FITD technique. Similarly as in the first experiment incremental theorists succumbed the FITD but only in conditions of direct contact with the experimenter. When the interaction was to be impeded incremental theorists were not compliant any longer. This pattern of results suggest that in order to generate compliance with the FITD among incremental theorists both social factors (maintaining a relationship) and personal factor (endeavor to perform interesting tasks) are needed.

The significance of the social factor in compliance with the DITF technique among entity theorists was verified in the fourth experiment where performing the target request also was linked with continuing or ending the relationship with the experimenter. The purpose of 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 as in the case of generating the mechanism of commitment in the FITD condition when the interaction is continued, in the DITF condition the awareness of further contact with the experimenter may increase the sense of guilt because of rejecting the previous request and thus motivate to fulfill

the target one. However, the results obtained in the fourth experiment indicate that entity theorists complied the DITF strategy both when the target request could be performed in the direct contact with the experimenter and when the interaction was to be ended. Moreover, in both created in the experiment conditions incremental theorists complied too. Such a situation may be a result of generated very strong sense of guilt not connected with the relationship with the experimenter but caused by children in need. Rejecting help could have induced strong sense of guilt among both groups of people and led to compliance with the less costly target request. Therefore it was shown that social factor is present to a great extent and it may even overcome the impact of personal factors connected with motivational pattern of behavior. Such a situation took place in the case of incremental theorists who usually prefer performing tasks increasing rather than declining in difficulty level oppositely to the DITF procedure.

Taking into consideration results of all four presented here studies it was shown that individual differences connected with endorsed implicit theory modify behavior in the FITD and the DITF conditions. Mechanism connected with certain motivational pattern and mechanism triggered by social factors, engaging in the relationship are responsible for the effectiveness of both techniques among entity and incremental theorists. Therefore, including individual differences while exploring social influence techniques let broaden knowledge about the nature of both individual differences and mechanisms of their effectiveness. The entity and incremental theorists style of functioning in the conditions of increasing or declining requests' magnitude allows predicting differences in compliance with the FITD and the 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, 2009) 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 the relationship and generating motivational mechanisms. This way presented here studies are in line with "hybrid" approach to investigate the impact of individual differences on social phenomena. The key point of this approach is personality theory and the knowledge about a certain phenomena. This way of exploring individual differences enrich both knowledge on individual differences and on a particular phenomena (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'internelité 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). Automatyzmy a skuteczność technik wpływu społecznego. (Automaticity and the effectiveness of social influence techniques.) In: R.K. Ohme, M. Jarymowicz & J. Reykowski (Eds.), *Automatyzmy 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. & Doliński, 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. (2007). Implicit theories and compliance with the foot-in-the-door technique. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 38, 50-63.
- Gamian-Wilk, M. & Lachowicz-Tabaczek, K. (2009). 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). In: B. Danieluk, K. Stasiuk (Eds.), pp. 57-69. *Spotkania z psychologią społeczną. Tom I. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS*.
- Gervy, 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). Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- 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. & Figge, 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.
- Paśka, 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.