

The Foot-in-the-Door Compliance Procedure: A Multiple-Process Analysis and Review

Jerry M. Burger

Department of Psychology
Santa Clara University

Research on the social compliance procedure known as the foot-in-the-door (FITD) technique is reviewed. Several psychological processes that may be set in motion with a FITD manipulation are identified: self-perception, psychological reactance, conformity, consistency, attributions, and commitment. A review of relevant investigations and several meta-analyses support the notion that each of these processes can influence compliance behavior in the FITD situation. I argue that the combined effects of these processes can account for successful FITD demonstrations as well as studies in which the technique was ineffective or led to a decrease in compliance. The experimental conditions most likely to produce an FITD effect are identified.

More than 3 decades ago, a team of psychologists telephoned housewives in Palo Alto, California and asked if the women would answer a few questions about the household products they used. Three days later, the psychologists called again. This time, they asked if they could send five or six men into the house to go through cupboards and storage places as part of a 2-hr enumeration of household products. The investigators found these women were more than twice as likely to agree to the 2-hr request than a group of housewives asked only the larger request (Freedman & Fraser, 1966). That investigation was the first experimental demonstration of the foot-in-the-door (FITD) procedure. The original Freedman and Fraser studies not only generated more than 100 published investigations in the intervening years but also ushered in a new area of social compliance research, an area sometimes referred to as the *compliance without pressure techniques*.

The basic FITD procedure is deceptively simple. Participants in the experimental condition are asked to perform a small request, one to which virtually everyone agrees. At some later point, participants are presented with a larger request. The second request is typically called the *target* request because securing agreement to this request is the true purpose of the procedure. A control condition receives only the target request. If successful, participants in the experimental condition agree to the target request at a higher rate than those in the control condition. Like

the proverbial salesperson who sticks a foot in the open door, getting the participant to agree with the easy request paves the way for agreement with the real request.

The widespread interest in the FITD technique can be attributed in part to what it tells us about the nature of social interactions and compliance. However, the procedure also carries with it some obvious practical applications. FITD studies can be found in psychology, marketing, communication, and economics journals. Yet despite the plethora of research, some important questions about the procedure remain unanswered. Several reviews and partial reviews of FITD research have been published (DeJong, 1979; Weyant, 1996; Yu & Cooper, 1983), including three meta-analyses (Beaman, Cole, Preston, Klentz, & Steblay, 1983; Dillard, Hunter, & Burgoon, 1984; Fern, Monroe, & Avila, 1986). Most of these reviews have addressed two basic questions. First, does the FITD manipulation reliably increase the probability that a participant will agree to the second request? Second, if the FITD procedure does increase compliance, how can we account for this effect?

To date, the answer to the first question appears to be a qualified "yes." Each of the reviews identified numerous studies replicating the basic FITD phenomenon. However, a large number of studies found no increase in compliance when using the FITD technique. More striking are the many published studies that found a decrease in compliance with the FITD procedure. Each of the three meta-analyses concluded that the FITD effect occurs more often than would be expected by chance (Beaman et al., 1983; Dillard et al., 1984; Fern et al., 1986). However, each of these

Requests for reprints should be sent to Jerry M. Burger, Department of Psychology, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA 95053. E-mail: jburger@scu.edu

reviews also pointed out that the size of the effect is relatively small (overall r range = .09–.17). Also, none was able to identify and explain the circumstances under which failure to produce the effect or reversals of the effect are most likely to occur.

The reviewers' conclusions about the process underlying the FITD phenomenon also are a bit mixed. As described in greater detail later, the generally accepted explanation for the effectiveness of the FITD procedure is that participants engage in an attitude-change process similar to that outlined in self-perception theory (Bem, 1972). Although several studies have provided results consistent with self-perception theory, other findings are not easily accounted for with this explanation (DeJong, 1979; Gorassini & Olson, 1995). One team of reviewers (Dillard et al., 1984) concluded that the self-perception explanation "come[s] up short" (p. 484). Another (Beaman et al., 1983) suggested that "[i]t may well be that [self-perception] theory is only a partial explanation accounting for only some of the variance" (p. 192).

In short, questions remain about the effectiveness of the FITD procedure, the conditions under which it will be found, and how to explain successful demonstrations of the effect. We hope to expand on the earlier FITD reviews in three ways. First, we begin by identifying several processes that potentially come into play in an FITD situation. This approach leads to several predictions that can be tested by examining relevant conditions in past FITD studies. Thus, we look at the effect of several variables left unexamined in earlier reviews. Second, we are more exclusive when selecting studies for the meta-analyses than were some of the earlier reviewers. The term *foot-in-the-door* has been used to describe a wide variety of experimental procedures. For example, some investigators have asked whether the original FITD compliance procedures might be expanded to encourage people to do something good for themselves (e.g., attending a class) or acting altruistically even when no request is given (e.g., stopping to pick up dropped papers). Although these are interesting questions, the findings from these studies may not reflect the same underlying processes at work in the type of situation studied in the original FITD research. Combining all investigations identified as FITD studies potentially clouds the results of the review. Consequently, we employ several criteria for including a study in the meta-analyses. Each of these criteria is used to eliminate studies and conditions that do not represent clear applications of the basic FITD phenomenon. Third, it has been about 15 years since the last published meta-analysis of FITD research. Many subsequent investigations provided more relevant data on which to base our conclusions.

Psychological Processes Affecting FITD Outcomes

We begin by identifying several psychological processes that theoretically play a role in participants' reactions to the basic FITD manipulation. The list of potentially relevant processes is presented in Table 1. This multiprocess analysis contrasts with the typical approach taken to explain the FITD effect. That is, researchers and reviewers trying to explain the mechanisms underlying the phenomenon have tended to search for a single process to account for the different findings. For most of the history of FITD research, this single process has been identified as the self-perception explanation. However, we argue that self-perception is but one process potentially set in motion by the initial request. Moreover, the impact of this self-perception process may be relatively weak. That is, more powerful psychological processes also may be operating in a given FITD situation, and these can overwhelm whatever impact self-perception has on the ultimate decision to agree with the target request.

How do the processes listed in Table 1 affect responses to an FITD manipulation? First, the procedures used to initiate and carry out the FITD technique have the potential to set several psychological processes in motion. As shown in Table 1, some of these processes increase the likelihood that the request recipient will agree to the target request. However, others are likely to decrease the chance that the individual will comply with the second request. Although we use the processes listed in the table to account for findings from most existing FITD studies, we do not presume the list to be exhaustive. That is, other processes may be identified in future research.

Second, the presence and strength of each of these processes will vary depending on the specific procedures employed to create the FITD manipulation. The methods employed by researchers to generate the FITD effect have been quite varied. Studies investigating FITD phenomena differ in the amount of time between requests, the relative size of the requests, information about other respondents, the type of request, requester characteristics, whether the same or a

Table 1. Psychological Processes Affecting Compliance in the Foot-in-the-Door Situation

Psychological Process	Potential Effect on Foot-in-the-Door
Self-Perception	Enhances effect
Reciprocity Rules and Reactance	Reduces effect
Conformity to Norm	Reduces or enhances effect
Consistency Needs	Enhances effect
Attributions	Reduces or enhances effect
Commitment	Enhances effect

different person presents the second request, and so on. These differences in procedures mean that the studies differ in the extent to which they set in motion both facilitating and inhibiting processes. We should note that some of these processes probably are not present in many FITD manipulations. For example, conformity to the norm is unlikely to affect response rates unless the participant somehow obtains information about the normative response.

Third, whether the FITD manipulation leads to an increase, a decrease, or no change in compliance compared to appropriate control groups depends on the strength of the various processes activated or made salient by the manipulation. For example, procedures that strongly activate two of the facilitating processes for an FITD effect and none of the inhibiting processes will likely generate a significant increase in compliance. On the other hand, procedures that only mildly set in motion one of the facilitating processes and strongly activate two of the inhibiting processes may well lead to a decrease in compliance relative to a control condition.

General Criteria for Inclusion in the Meta-Analyses

We identified potential studies for inclusion in the meta-analyses through several sources. We first located all published studies that used the term *foot-in-the-door* in any field within the PsycLIT (American Psychological Association, 1967–present) retrieval system. Next, we located any additional studies used in past reviews. Finally, we relied on personal awareness of any published study that might meet the criteria outlined next. We should note that in some cases the procedures used in a study met all the criteria for an FITD manipulation, yet the researchers did not identify the investigation as an FITD study.

Not all investigations identified as FITD studies were included in the meta-analyses. Studies were eliminated from the analyses if they failed to meet any of the following criteria:

1. Participants were adults.
2. A control group was included in which participants received only the target request.
3. The target request could conceivably be seen as larger than the initial request.
4. The target request asked participants to do something for either the requester, the organization he or she represented, or a cause. Studies in which the participants were asked to do something for their own benefit (e.g., getting a health checkup) were not included.

5. The target behavior was requested. For example, studies that examined whether participants told confederates that they had dropped a quarter were not included.

6. Behavior or verbal intention to perform a behavior was assessed. Studies that examined changes in general attitudes were not included.

7. Enough relevant data were reported so that necessary statistical information could be determined or reasonably estimated from the research report.

8. The majority of participants agreed to the initial request. Although these data often were not reported and we can identify no clear cutoff point for inclusion, one study in which only 8 of 77 participants agreed to the initial request was eliminated by this criterion (Harris, Liguori, & Stack, 1973, Experiment 2).

9. We can assume that the person who responded to the first request was the same individual who received the second request. Although relevant information on this assumption usually was not provided, one study that clearly included participants not meeting this criterion was eliminated (Groves & Magilavy, 1981).

10. The study was reported in an English-language academic journal. Dissertations, convention presentations, and unpublished reports were not included.

Selection Criteria for Type of Data and Statistical Analyses

One of the limitations of meta-analyses is that reviewers often are forced to make a number of assumptions and estimates about the data (Rosenthal, 1991). This is because the information reported in journal articles often is incomplete. For example, researchers may describe statistical tests that fall short of traditional probability cutoffs only as *non-significant*, forcing the meta-analytic reviewer to assume identical findings in the experimental and control conditions. Similarly, *p* values may be reported as .05 or .01 rather than as more precise and more useful numbers. The net result is that meta-analytic reviewers typically are forced to make a number of estimates and assumptions that lower the precision (and thus the validity) of the meta-analytic results. Finally, often the cell comparison of interest to the meta-analytic reviewer is not reported at all but rather analyzed within a larger experimental design.

This latter problem is particularly troublesome for those reviewing FITD studies. The typical FITD investigation goes beyond the basic two-condition paradigm. Most FITD studies include conditions examining the effects of such variables as the credi-

bility of the requester, whether the participant was rewarded or punished for complying with the initial request, and combinations of the FITD technique with other compliance-inducing procedures. Although some interesting findings have emerged from these studies, investigators typically report statistical analyses for the overall design rather than for the conditions of interest to those compiling FITD results.

Fortunately, the nature of the data reported in all but a handful of FITD studies allowed us to avoid most of these problems. That is, in virtually every study, we found researchers reported the number of participants in each cell who did and did not comply with the second request (or this information could be reasonably estimated). Thus, we were able to obtain data for the specific conditions of interest for each of the meta-analytic comparisons reported here. Moreover, because we had the raw numbers, we did not have to rely on estimates from p values or unreported data. The results from the different studies were combined in a weighted fashion simply by summing the numbers reported for relevant conditions.¹ The cost of relying on these numbers is that the data from a few studies were not included in the meta-analyses. For example, some studies (Baer & Goldman, 1978; Goldman, Creason, & McCall, 1981; Goldman, Gier, & Smith, 1981) recorded the participant's response on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*refused without an excuse*) to 3 (*refused but offered to do some other time*) to 5 (*unconditional compliance*). A few others reported only average amounts of money or hours donated (Gorassini & Olsen, 1995; Rind & Benjamin, 1994). However, these exceptions amount to fewer than 5% of the studies meeting the previous criteria for inclusion. Moreover, we include discussions of these excluded studies where relevant.

Another issue we had to address prior to conducting the meta-analyses concerns the use of verbal versus behavioral data. FITD investigations have typically reported either verbal agreement to perform the target request or actual performance of the request. Although researchers typically find the number of people who say they will perform a behavior is larger than the number who actually do, differences in verbal compliance across condition also are meaningful within the FITD paradigm. Thus, we combined data from studies reporting verbal compliance with

those reporting behavioral compliance. A handful of investigators reported both verbal and behavioral compliance data. In these cases, we decided to include the behavioral data only in the meta-analyses. We reasoned that whether people actually performed the task was more valuable information than whether they simply agreed to perform the request at some future time.

Finally, in addition to reporting the combined totals and averages for relevant conditions, we calculated three statistics for each meta-analysis. We report a chi-square statistic to test for statistical significance. We also report two indexes of effect size. One of these, phi, represents the correlation between two dichotomous variables. Because phi can be interpreted like a correlation coefficient, we report this statistic as r . However, we also report what is perhaps a more meaningful statistic, the odds ratio. The *odds ratio* tells us the relative difference of a phenomenon in two different conditions. For each analysis, we calculated the odds that someone in the experimental (FITD) condition would comply with the target request and the odds that someone in the control condition would comply with the request. The ratio of the two figures (experimental group odds:control group odds) tells us the relative likelihood of compliance in the two conditions. The higher the ratio, the more effective the FITD manipulation. Because the FITD procedure has obvious applications for sales, recruitment, and the like, the odds ratio can be a particularly useful statistic.

Examining the Effect of the Six Processes

We examine the effect the six psychological processes presented in Table 1 have on the FITD phenomenon through a series of meta-analyses as well as with some traditional review procedures. The organization scheme we employ looks at each of the processes listed in the table separately. However, the reader should keep in mind that we argue that these processes combine to determine the effectiveness of an FITD manipulation.

Self-Perception Processes

The most common explanation for the FITD effect is that participants engage in a process similar to that outlined in self-perception theory (Bem, 1972). Self-perception theory posits that people sometimes infer their attitudes by examining their own behavior. Bem argued that people often have only a vague idea about their attitudes and frequently do not know why

¹One concern when combining results from several studies this way has been referred to as *Simpson's paradox*, the possibility that the combined numbers will point to a conclusion opposite of that obtained when the studies are examined individually (Vokey, 1997). However, this problem is not likely to occur unless the number of participants in each condition varies a lot from study to study. Because this is not the case here, Simpson's paradox is not likely to be operating.

they engage in behaviors. As applied to the FITD procedure, people are said to change their attitudes as a result of seeing themselves agree to the initial request. Virtually all participants in FITD conditions agree to the small request, such as signing a petition or answering a few questions. According to the explanation, these participants are not entirely aware of why they acquiesce to the initial request, nor do they typically give their decision a great deal of thought at the time. However, when later presented with the larger, second request, participants are said to ask themselves if they are the type of person who supports these kinds of causes or engages in these kinds of actions. The most recent, and thus most salient, example of their own relevant behavior typically is their response to the initial request. Participants say to themselves something like, "I believe I am the kind of person who supports these kinds of causes, because I did so just the other day."

Although they did not tie their explanation to Bem's (1972) then nascent theory, one of Freedman and Fraser's (1966) initial accounts of the FITD effect sounds remarkably similar to self-perception theory:

What may occur is a change in the person's feelings about getting involved or about taking action. Once he has agreed to a request, his attitude may change. He may become, in his own eyes, the kind of person who does this sort of thing, who agrees to requests made by strangers, who takes action on things he believes in, who cooperates with good causes. (p. 201)

Self-perception theory leads to several testable hypotheses. Many of these have been identified and tested by researchers over the years. We identify three hypotheses that we examined through a series of meta-analyses. These analyses concern involvement with the initial request, whether the initial request is performed, and the size of the initial request. We also look at relevant data for one additional hypothesis derived from self-perception theory. That hypothesis concerns the similarity of the two requests.

Involvement with the initial request. If the process outlined in self-perception theory operates in the typical FITD study, then we would expect the more salient the initial request, the greater the likelihood of producing an FITD effect. That is, the self-perception explanation maintains that FITD participants recall their performance of the initial request when deciding if they are the kind of person who complies with these kinds of requests. If performing the initial request is noninvolving and inconsequential, it is less likely to be recalled and less likely to affect the individual's self-perception than when the behavior is engaging and memorable. Indeed, it is reasonable to ask whether such

small requests as signing a petition or giving directions are sufficient to alter the way people think about themselves.

To examine this prediction, we identified studies that included two FITD conditions that differed in the degree of involvement with the initial request. We also added one selection criteria for this analysis to the those listed earlier. We excluded one study because participants did not actually perform the initial request but only agreed to do so some time in the future (Shanab & Isonio, 1982). We reasoned that performance was necessary to effectively manipulate involvement and salience. Finally, in this and in all following meta-analyses, we included only relevant conditions in the analyses. Conditions designed to increase or decrease compliance were not included. For example, some researchers included conditions in which participants were punished for trying to help or told they would be paid for agreeing with the request. However, conditions added to the design to examine variables that had no effect on compliance were combined and included in the meta-analyses. For example, some researchers compared the responses of male and female participants but found no significant difference.

We located eight studies with conditions that met all the selection criteria. As shown in Table 2, the procedures used to increase involvement varied across the studies. Typically participants in the high-involvement conditions were asked to either engage in a lengthier task, such as answering more questions, or to act in a more mindful manner when responding to the task, such as elaborating on their answers to questions. As shown in the table, the combined low-involvement conditions produced more compliance than the combined control conditions, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,098) = 7.54, p < .008, r = .08$, odds ratio = 1.28. However, as predicted from self-perception theory, the high-involvement conditions created an even larger effect when compared with the control conditions, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,147) = 31.66, p < .001, r = .17$, odds ratio = 1.58. Finally, the high-involvement conditions produced more compliance than the low-involvement conditions, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,083) = 7.24, p < .009, r = .08$, odds ratio = 1.23.

Performance of initial request. We also can predict from self-perception theory that whether participants actually perform the initial request will affect the likelihood that they will agree to the target request. If people examine their behavior to determine their attitude, as self-perception theory maintains, then looking back at actual behavior should provide much more salient information about one's attitude than a simple verbal promise. Participants who put a small "Drive Carefully" sign in their window are more likely to go

Table 2. Percentage of Compliance in Conditions With High and Low Request Involvement

Study	Control		Low Involvement		High Involvement		Manipulation
	%	Participants /Total	%	Participants /Total	%	Participants /Total	
Fish & Kaplan (1974)	33.3	9/27	11.1	3/27	36.0	9/25	Listen to lecture versus write essay
Pliner, Hart, Kohl, & Saari (1974)	45.7	16/35	74.1	20/27	80.8	21/26	Wear pin versus also ask family to wear pin
Seligman, Bush, & Kirsch (1976)	30.7	8/26	38.1	8/21	60.0	39/65	Answer 5 questions versus 20, 30, or 45 questions
Tybout (1978), Experiment 1	41.6	25/60	36.7	22/60	35.6	16/45	Name on petition versus petition and explain why
Hansen & Robinson (1980)	23.0	46/200	38.0	76/200	52.0	104/200	Answer questions versus elaborate on answers
Kamins (1989)	26.5	40/151	33.6	43/128	38.7	48/124	Answer questions versus elaborate on answers
Wang, Brownstein, & Katzev (1989)	26.3	10/38	8.0	2/25	0.0	0/49	elaborate on answers
Dillard (1990)	18.2	8/44	38.1	11/29	37.7	12/32	Answer 10 questions versus 35 or 60 questions
Combined	27.88	162/581	35.78	185/517	43.99	249/566	Address 10 or 35 envelopes

through the hypothesized self-perception process than those who merely promise to do so.

We examined this hypothesis two ways. First, we found four studies that tested the prediction directly. That is, the investigators included a perform-not-perform variable in their designs. Interestingly, one of these relevant studies was the original Freedman and Fraser (1966, Experiment 1) investigation. As shown in Table 3, when we combined data for relevant conditions in the four studies, we found that participants in the perform conditions tended to agree to the target request more often than those in the control conditions, $\chi^2(1, N = 268) = 3.61, p < .07, r = .12$, odds ratio = 1.54. However, the rate of compliance in the not-perform conditions was not noticeably higher than in the control conditions, $\chi^2(1, N = 249) = 0.35, r = .04$, odds ratio = 1.19.

Next, we compared the results of studies that allowed participants to perform the initial request versus those in which the participant agreed to perform the request but did not do so. Again, we combined all relevant conditions, except when a condition was included specifically to eliminate the FITD effect. For reasons explained in later sections, we did not include conditions in which participants were paid to perform the initial request, were punished for performing the task, were given consensus information about others' responses to the request, or were overtly labeled by the requester.

We should note that each of the three earlier meta-analyses of FITD studies conducted similar analyses. Both Beaman et al. (1983) and Fern et al. (1986) reported a small but statistically significant difference in this comparison, with performance leading to greater compliance. However, Dillard et al. (1984) found that this difference disappeared when other factors, such as the type of appeal and whether participants were paid, were controlled for.

We included studies in the analysis only if we could clearly determine whether or not participants performed the initial request. In some cases, participants agreed to perform a task (e.g., distribute buttons to family members), but apparently no effort was made to determine if the behavior was actually performed. These studies were not included in our analysis. We

note that this selection procedure is different than that used by Dillard et al. (1984) in their meta-analysis. Those reviewers combined studies in which the task clearly was not performed with those in which the authors failed to state specifically that the behavior was performed.

As shown in Table 4, studies in which participants did not perform the initial task produced compliance rates in the FITD condition only slightly higher than those in the control condition, $\chi^2(1, N = 780) = 2.23, r = .05$, odds ratio = 1.16. However, the combined results of studies that allowed participants to perform the initial request produced a large difference between the FITD and the control conditions, $\chi^2(1, N = 8,356) = 159.84, p < .001, r = .14$, odds ratio = 1.47. In sum, consistent with the prediction from self-perception theory, it appears that allowing participants to perform the initial request increases noticeably the likelihood that they will agree to the target request.

Size of the initial request. Yet another prediction from the self-perception explanation concerns the size of the initial request. The initial request used in the typical FITD study is so small and easy to perform that virtually every participant agrees to the request. However, what if the initial request is so large that virtually every participant declines the request? According to the self-perception analysis, participants reflect back on their response to the initial request when deciding whether or not to comply with the target request. If that is the case, then participants who reflect on their previous behavior and see a refusal should see themselves as the type of person who does not support these kinds of causes or go along with these kinds of requests. In this situation, self-perception theory would predict a decrease in compliance relative to the control condition (Snyder & Cunningham, 1975).

We found five studies that included the conditions necessary to test this prediction. Each of these studies included a condition in which participants were asked a large request designed to elicit a refusal, then contacted later and presented with the target request. Each of the studies also included a control condition that re-

Table 3. Percentage of Compliance as a Function of Request Performance

Study	Control		Not Performed		Performed	
	%	Participants/ Total	%	Participants/ Total	%	Participants/ Total
Freedman & Fraser (1966), Experiment 1	22.2	8/36	33.3	12/36	52.8	19/36
Fish & Kaplan (1974)	33.5	9/27	11.8	4/34	23.1	12/52
Burger & Petty (1981), Experiment 3	0.0	0/15	16.7	5/30	10.0	3/30
Dillard (1990)	18.2	8/44	37.0	10/27	42.9	12/28
Combined	20.49	25/122	24.41	31/127	31.51	46/146

Table 4. Percentage of Compliance in Not-Performance Versus Performance Studies

Study	Control		Foot-in-the-Door	
	%	Participants/Total	%	Participants/Total
Initial Request Not Performed				
Freedman & Fraser (1966), Experiment 1	22.2	8/36	33.3	12/36
Fish & Kaplan (1974)	33.5	9/27	11.8	4/34
Snyder & Cunningham (1975)	33.3	10/30	51.7	15/29
Reingen & Kernan (1977)	57.7	15/26	74.1	20/27
Zuckerman, Lazzaro, & Waldgeir (1979)	45.0	18/40	64.3	27/42
Harari, Mohr, Hosey (1980)	56.8	25/44	33.3	19/57
Burger & Petty (1981), Experiment 3	0.0	0/15	16.7	5/30
Shanab & Isonio (1982)	25.6	10/39	28.6	22/77
Shanab & O'Neill (1982)	30.0	12/40	47.5	38/80
Dillard (1990)	18.2	8/44	37.0	10/27
Combined (Not Performed)	33.78	115/341	39.18	172/439
Initial Request Performed				
Freedman & Fraser (1966), Experiment 1	22.2	8/36	52.8	19/36
Freedman & Fraser (1966), Experiment 2	16.7	4/24	55.7	49/88
Harris (1972), Experiment 1	11.1	2/18	41.6	15/36
Harris, Liguori, & Stack (1973), Experiment 3	25.0	15/60	30.0	15/50
Fish & Kaplan (1974)	46.5	20/43	21.6	16/74
Cann, Sherman, & Elkes (1975), Experiment 1	50.0	13/26	74.4	32/43
Cann et al. (1975), Experiment 2	45.0	9/20	72.2	13/18
Harris & Samerotte (1976), Experiment 1	35.0	7/20	30.0	12/40
Harris & Samerotte (1976), Experiment 2	28.6	4/14	28.6	16/56
Scott (1976)	9.0	9/100	15.6	37/237
Seligman, Bush, & Kirsch (1976)	30.7	8/26	54.6	47/86
DeJong & Funder (1977), Experiment 1	55.6	20/36	45.8	11/24
DeJong & Funder (1977), Experiment 2	55.6	30/54	65.5	19/29
Reingen (1978)	18.8	6/32	34.4	11/32
Tybout (1978), Experiment 1	41.6	25/60	36.2	38/105
Tybout (1978), Experiment 2	22.5	9/40	35.9	14/39
Foss & Dempsey (1979), Experiment 2	3.3	1/30	4.9	2/41
Reingen & Kernan (1979)	44.2	46/104	50.0	59/118
Allen, Schewe, & Wijk (1980)	22.2	186/836	67.3	66/98
Hansen & Robinson (1980)	23.0	46/200	45.0	180/400
Wagner & Laird (1980)	35.7	27/76	65.8	50/76
Burger & Petty (1981), Experiment 3	0.0	0/15	10.0	3/30
DeJong (1981), Experiment 2	37.1	13/35	41.0	16/39
Furse, Stewart, & Rados (1981)	20.7	61/294	22.4	48/214
Rittle (1981)	20.0	3/15	57.1	8/14
Crano & Sivacek (1982)	31.2	10/32	71.9	23/32
DeJong & Musilli (1982)	40.0	40/100	51.9	139/264
Goldman, Seever, & Seever (1982)	16.7	5/30	40.0	12/30
Swanson, Sherman, & Sherman (1982)	52.5	21/40	90.0	36/40
Schwarzwald, Bizman, & Raz (1983)	53.2	41/77	92.2	71/77
Katzev & Johnson (1984)	69.2	9/13	61.5	8/13
Brownstein & Katzev (1985)	80.0	20/25	50.0	10/20
Wynn & McDaniel (1985)	17.6	57/324	48.4	59/122
Goldman (1986)	22.4	17/76	46.0	35/76
Patch (1986)	52.5	42/80	78.7	63/80
Stimpson & Waranusuntikule (1987)	25.0	5/20	23.3	7/30
Beaman, Steblay, Preston, & Klentz (1988)	22.4	11/47	23.9	59/246
Patch (1988)	47.5	19/40	75.0	30/40
Kamins (1989)	26.5	40/151	36.1	91/252
Kilbourne (1989), Experiment 1	9.7	6/62	13.3	8/60
Kilbourne (1989), Experiment 2	26.2	16/61	28.3	17/60
Kilbourne (1989), Experiment 3	9.4	96/64	30.0	18/60
Wang, Brownstein, & Katzev (1989)	26.3	10/38	2.7	2/74
Williams & Williams (1989)	33.8	22/68	27.9	19/68
Dillard (1990)	18.2	8/44	42.9	12/28
Hornik, Zaig, & Shadman (1991)	46.7	64/137	59.7	71/119
Bell, Cholerton, Fraczek, & Smith (1994)	10.1	17/169	23.1	39/169
Cialdini, Trost, & Newsom (1995), Experiment 2	61.8	76/123	67.2	78/116
Martens, Kelly, & Diskin (1996)	60.0	12/20	47.6	10/21
Chartrand, Pinckert, & Burger (1999)	27.0	10/37	40.3	58/144
Combined (Performed)	28.25	1,156/4,092	41.49	1,769/4,264

ceived only the target request. However, we added two criteria for inclusion that resulted in dropping two of the studies from the meta-analysis. One study was not included because the majority of the participants agreed to the initial large request (Reingen & Kernan, 1979). Obviously, these participants would not see themselves as the kind of people who refuse such requests. Another study was not included because less than an hour passed between the initial and target request (Brownstein & Katzev, 1985). The time lapse between requests is necessary to avoid the creation of a "door-in-the-face effect" (Cialdini et al., 1975). Numerous investigations found that, compared to a single-request control group, participants are more likely to comply to a small request if it comes immediately after they refuse a large request. This door-in-the-face effect is said to be caused by a need to reciprocate the requester's apparent concession (Cialdini et al., 1975). However, the need to reciprocate small favors dissipates quickly (Burger, Horita, Kinoshita, Roberts, & Vera, 1997) and thus is not likely to affect responses a day or two after participants refuse the initial request.

As shown in Table 5, we found the predicted decline in compliance when participants refused the large initial request in each of the three remaining investigations. The meta-analysis of combined studies also points to a small but consistent difference between the control and experimental conditions, $\chi^2(1, N = 170) = 2.82, p < .10, r = -.13$, odds ratio = 0.65. In short, although only a handful of investigations have examined the prediction, the findings from these studies are consistent with the notion that a self-perception process plays a role in the effectiveness of the FITD procedure.

Similarity of requests. There is one additional prediction derived from self-perception theory. We would expect that the more similar the first and second request in an FITD situation, the higher the rate of compliance with the target request. According to the self-perception explanation, agreeing to the initial request causes participants to see themselves as the type of person who supports these causes or engages in these kinds of tasks. The more similar the requests, the more likely it is that participants will draw this conclusion.

Although this hypothesis seems straightforward, we found only two investigations that examined this prediction directly. Again, one of these was from the seminal article by Freedman and Fraser (1966, Experiment 2). The target request in that study asked participants to display a large sign in their front lawns encouraging people to drive carefully. The highest rate of compliance to this request came from participants who earlier had been asked to display a small sign encouraging driver safety. Compliance to the target request dropped off when the initial request was either to engage in a different behavior (sign a petition) or to support a different cause (keeping California beautiful). The only other direct test of this prediction found no difference in compliance rates when using the same or a different issue for the two requests (Seligman, Miller, et al., 1976). Participants in this study accepted either a small campaign sign or a fire prevention sign to fulfill their agreement with the initial request. However, participants from both conditions were equally likely to accept a large campaign poster when contacted later by the experimenters.

Ideally, we could examine the similarity prediction through a meta-analysis that compared studies using similar requests with those using dissimilar requests. However, we did not attempt such an analysis because it would require a great deal of subjective judgment. That is, it would be difficult to quantify and code the degree to which the first and second request resembled one another. Perhaps for this reason, none of the earlier FITD meta-analyses examined a similar-dissimilar variable. Consequently, relevant data on the similarity hypotheses derived from self-perception theory are sparse. Although Freedman and Fraser (1966) provided evidence consistent with the prediction in their original study, this obvious variable has gone relatively unexamined ever since.

In sum, we uncovered a pattern of findings consistent with the notion that a self-perception process is operating in the typical FITD manipulation. Participants are more likely to comply with the target request when agreeing to the initial request requires additional involvement and, hence, is presumably more salient. Similarly, higher compliance is found when participants are allowed to perform the initial request.

Table 5. Percentage of Compliance After Refusing Large Initial Request

Study	Control		Large Initial Request	
	%	Participants/Total	%	Participants/Total
Cann, Sherman, & Elkes (1975), Experiment 1	50.0	13/26	28.6	6/21
Snyder & Cunningham (1975)	33.3	10/30	21.9	7/30
Crano & Sivacek (1982)	31.2	10/32	22.6	7/31
Combined	37.50	33/88	24.39	20/82

Finally, participants are less likely to agree to the target request if they have earlier declined a large request.

Reciprocity Rules and Reactance

The brief contact between requester and participant in an FITD experiment is a social encounter, and is, therefore, subject to the rules and norms that regulate the way people in our society interact with one another. Appropriate and inappropriate behavior by the requester can trigger a reaction by the participant that may affect the participant's decision about complying with the target request. Two related and well-researched concepts seem particularly relevant for understanding this reaction in the FITD paradigm. These two concepts are the norm of reciprocity and psychological reactance.

Norm of reciprocity is a widely accepted social rule in Western cultures that regulates the exchange of favors and requests. This social rule maintains that the give and take in social exchanges should be reasonably equal (Gouldner, 1960). More specifically, people are motivated to return favors and to see that the amount of giving and taking in a relationship, however brief and ephemeral, is fair and equal. In the classic demonstration of this effect, Regan (1971) found that participants were more willing to purchase raffle tickets from a confederate if that confederate had earlier given them a soft drink as an unexpected favor. The other side of the reciprocity norm is that people are uncomfortable with an unpaid debt and may even come to dislike those who do not allow the recipient to return the good deed (Gergen, Ellsworth, Maslach, & Seipel, 1975).

Psychological reactance is said to occur when people perceive a threat to their sense of personal freedom and choice (J. W. Brehm, 1966; S. S. Brehm & Brehm, 1981). When we become aware of an effort to reduce our freedom, such as pressure from a salesperson or requester, we often respond by reasserting our option to act as we please. In many situations, this means doing the opposite of whatever is being pushed on us. For example, we can reassert our freedom of choice by not purchasing the product offered by the pressuring salesperson. Thus, when participants in one study were pressured to return a favor, they were more likely to refuse the request than when no pressure was exerted (J. W. Brehm & Cole, 1966).

As applied to the FITD technique, we argue that requesters sometimes violate the rules for social exchanges, specifically the reciprocity norm. Further, we argue that this violation may lead to a response similar to a reactance effect. If participants feel the requester is making an inappropriate request and thereby pressuring them to comply with that request, the net result

may be a decreased likelihood of agreeing with the target request.

When might such a negative reaction occur? To answer this question, we need to look at two important variables that have been left relatively uncontrolled in FITD research: the amount of time between requests and whether the same or a different person presents the second request. First, the amount of time that lapses between the initial request and the target request has varied from essentially no time to more than 2 weeks. The optimal amount of time between requests has never been specified and may well vary as a function of the specific request. In one of their original demonstrations of the effect, Freedman and Fraser (1966) allowed 2 weeks to pass between requests. Some of the fascination with the FITD phenomenon probably stems from the fact that such a small manipulation (e.g., signing a petition) could lead to such strong effects over such a long period of time. Common sense argues for an upper limit for the time period between requests (surely the petition manipulation would not show effects 2 years later), but no such ceiling has yet been demonstrated empirically.

A handful of researchers have examined the time lapse variable directly. Three of these studies included a condition in which there was no delay between the two requests and one or more conditions in which at least 24 hr elapsed between requests (Cann, Sherman, & Elkes, 1975, Experiment 1; Foss & Dempsey, 1979; Shanab & Isonio, 1982). None of the three studies found a significant difference in compliance between the delay and no-delay conditions. However, it is also the case that none of the three studies reported a significant FITD effect when comparing either the delay or no-delay conditions separately against the control condition. Thus, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the FITD effect from these investigations. Similarly, Beaman, Steblay, Preston, and Klentz (1988) included six different time lapse conditions in their study. Although the investigators compared time lapse periods ranging from 1 to 19 days, they did not include a no-delay condition in their design. The researchers found no significant effect for the time variable in this study; however, they also failed to produce a significant FITD effect.

Each of the three earlier meta-analyses also examined the effects of time between requests (Beaman et al., 1983; Dillard et al., 1984; Fern et al., 1986). In each case, the reviewers did not find a significant relation between the length of time between requests and the strength of the effect. Thus, there is no empirical evidence to date that the length of time between requests significantly influences the effectiveness of the FITD phenomenon. However, as we show next, it is important to keep in mind that none of the meta-analyses examined the effect of time between requests and

whether the same or a different experimenter presented the second request.

Second, in some FITD studies the same person presented both requests, yet in many others two different requesters were used. Again, one of the impressive features of the original Freedman and Fraser (1966) studies is that a different person supposedly representing a different organization (and, thus, with no awareness of the earlier contact) presented the second request. Using two different requesters also eliminates several possible explanations for the effect, such as those based on familiarity, attraction with repeated exposure, and consistent self-presentation.

We found four FITD investigations that examined the effect of this requester variable directly (Burger & Petty, 1981, Experiment 3; Harris & Samerotte, 1976, Experiments 1 & 2; Stimpson & Waranusuntikule, 1987). That is, each of the studies included a condition in which the same person presented both requests and a condition in which a different person presented each request. None of these investigations found a significant difference in the rate of compliance when the same or a different person delivered the second request. Only one of the earlier meta-analyses examined this same-versus-different requester variable (Fern et al., 1986). The reviewers reported a small but nonsignificant tendency for greater compliance in studies using different requesters than in those using the same individual for both requests.

Thus, the evidence to date suggests that neither the amount of time that lapses between requests nor the number of requesters used in FITD studies has a significant impact on the effectiveness of the technique. However, we argue that both of these variables need to be considered together. Specifically, the FITD technique should be less effective when the same requester presents both requests with virtually no time lapse between requests. Imagine the reaction of a participant who agrees to a small request. According to the reciprocity norm, it is the requester's turn to do something nice for the participant, certainly not the other way around. A second, even larger request coming on the heels of the initial favor not only would appear to violate the understood rule for social exchanges but may also be seen as a type of badgering. A simple request from a stranger is acceptable, but continuing requests with no break might well be seen as inappropriate and perhaps exploitive. Under such situations, it is possible that a type of reactance effect could emerge. That is, not only will the participants in this same-requester/no-delay situation find the second request inappropriate, they may have an increased need to turn down the second request and thereby reassert their own sense of personal choice. Moreover, people often develop negative impressions of those who violate the accepted rules for social ex-

change (Cialdini, 1993). Thus, mixed in with this reactance effect, we might also find a dislike of the requester, which also can lead to a decrease in agreement to the second request. We are not suggesting that psychological reactance as described by J. W. Brehm (1966) is necessarily the underlying process in this situation (although this remains an empirical question). Rather, we are saying that participants are likely to have a negative reaction when the same person asks one request after another and that a type of reactance effect may contribute to this negative response.

To appreciate this hypothesized reaction, consider a study by Harari, Mohr, and Hosey (1980). In an interesting reversal of traditional roles, participants were university professors and the experimenters were students. The students telephoned the professors and explained that they were working on a term paper about the American university system. The student asked if he or she could meet for "15 or 20 minutes" to discuss the topic with the professor. As soon as the professor agreed to this request, the student announced that he or she also was looking for professors to participate in a 2-hr discussion and asked if the professor would be willing to participate. Professors assigned to the control condition were presented only with the large request. Based on the preceding analysis, it is not difficult to see how this double request violates an implicit rule about asking favors. Few professors will be surprised to learn that participants who agreed to the small request were significantly less likely to agree to the subsequent large request than participants in the control group.

We found 34 studies that included an FITD condition in which the same individual gave both requests and presented the target request immediately after participants agreed to the initial request.² However, again we added one important selection criterion for this meta-analysis. Specifically, a large number of studies with a same-requester-no-delay condition used what we might call a *continuing question* procedure. That is, the investigators asked participants in the FITD condition if they would be willing to answer a few questions. Immediately after the obliging participants answered the last question, the experimenter asked if they would be willing to answer more questions, typically on a longer questionnaire to be mailed to the participant. As described in detail in a later section, we argue that different psychological processes are operating in the

²Although the exact time between requests was rarely reported, we included studies in which the two requests were presented within the same contact period, such as within the same experimental session. One investigation with two requesters (Brownstein & Katzev, 1985) was included because the two requesters were part of the same team making the requests.

continuing question procedure than in the procedures used in the studies listed in Table 6. Each of the studies listed in Table 6 used a distinctively different task for the two requests.

A quick glance at Table 6 shows that the findings from studies using the same-requester/no-delay procedure are quite varied. Of the 24 studies, exactly half found more compliance in the FITD condition, whereas the other half found more compliance in the control condition. Although only a handful of these differences approach statistical significance, it is apparent that the same-requester/no-delay procedure often is ineffective in increasing compliance and may in some cases lead to the opposite reaction. Nonetheless, when the results from all of the investigations were combined, we still found a significant tendency for greater compliance with the FITD procedure, $\chi^2(1, N = 2,121) = 6.21, p < .02, r = .05$, odds ratio = 1.21.

Before interpreting these findings, let us look at what researchers have found when they used each of the three remaining procedural possibilities. First, FITD researchers often used two different requesters and allowed a reasonable length of time to expire between requests. We found 28 studies with conditions meeting this description. Each of these investigations allowed at least 2 days to lapse between requests. The

longest time lag was between 2 and 3 weeks. The combined findings for these studies are shown in Table 7. A glance at the table indicates that the different-requester–delayed-request procedure has been reasonably effective in producing an FITD effect. The FITD manipulation produced more compliance to the target request than the control condition in all but three cases, although many of the differences fell short of statistical significance. When the results of all 28 studies were combined, we found a significant difference between the FITD and control conditions, $\chi^2(1, N = 3,627) = 56.30, p < .001, r = .12$, odds ratio = 1.40.

Although less common, we found seven studies that used the same person for both requests but also employed a delay of at least 2 days between requests. As shown in Table 8, in six of the seven cases, participants in the FITD condition responded more favorably to the target request than participants in the control condition. The lone exception reported a nonsignificant tendency in the opposite direction. When the data for all seven studies were combined, we again found a significant difference between conditions, $\chi^2(1, N = 892) = 3.98, p < .05, r = .07$, odds ratio = 1.22.

Finally, we found five studies that included a condition in which different requesters were used with no delay between requests. As shown in Table 9, four of

Table 6. *Percentage of Compliance With Same Requester-No Delay Procedure*

Study	Control		Foot-in-the-Door	
	%	Participants/ Total	%	Participants/ Total
Harris (1972), Experiment 1	11.0	2/18	41.7	15/36
Harris, Liguori, & Stack (1973), Experiment 3	25.0	15/60	30.0	15/50
Cann, Sherman, & Elkes (1975), Experiment 1	50.0	13/26	78.0	18/23
Cann et al. (1975), Experiment 2	45.0	9/20	72.2	13/18
Cialdini & Ascani (1976) ^a	11.0	7/63	3.2	2/63
Harris & Samerotte (1976), Experiment 1 ^a	35.0	7/20	20.0	4/20
Harris & Samerotte (1976), Experiment 2	28.6	4/14	32.1	9/28
Cialdini, Cacioppo, Bassett, & Miller (1978), Experiment 2 ^a	20.0	2/10	10.0	1/10
Reingen (1978)	18.8	6/32	34.4	11/32
Tybout (1978), Experiment 1 ^a	41.6	25/60	36.2	38/105
Tybout (1978), Experiment 2	22.5	9/40	35.9	14/39
Foss & Dempsey (1979), Experiment 1 ^a	26.3	5/19	25.0	5/20
Harari, Mohr, & Hosey (1980) ^a	56.8	25/44	33.3	19/57
Wagener & Laird (1980)	35.5	27/76	65.8	50/76
Burger & Petty (1981), Experiment 3	0.0	0/15	20.0	6/30
Shanab & Isonio (1982) ^a	25.0	5/20	23.1	9/39
Shanab & O'Neill (1982)	30.0	12/40	47.5	38/80
Katzev & Johnson (1984) ^a	69.2	9/13	61.5	8/13
Brownstein & Katzev (1985) ^a	79.2	20/25	50.0	10/20
Goldman (1986)	22.4	17/76	46.0	35/76
Williams & Williams (1989) ^a	33.8	22/68	27.9	19/68
Bell, Cholerton, Fraczek, & Smith (1994)	10.1	17/169	23.1	39/169
Martens, Kelly, & Diskin (1996) ^a	60.0	12/20	47.6	10/21
Chartrand, Pinckert, & Burger (1999) ^a	27.0	10/37	7.0	3/43
Combined	28.43	280/985	34.42	391/1,136

^aDirection of difference reverse of the foot-in-the-door effect.

Table 7. Percentage of Compliance Percentages With Different Requesters-Delayed Procedure

Study	Control		Foot-in-the-Door ^{ITD}	
	%	Participants/Total	%	Participants/Total
Freedman & Fraser (1966), Experiment 1	22.2	8/36	52.8	19/36
Freedman & Fraser (1966), Experiment 2	16.7	4/24	55.7	49/88
Fish & Kaplan (1974) ^a	46.5	20/43	21.6	16/74
Pliner, Hart, Kohl, & Saari (1974)	45.7	16/35	77.4	41/53
Snyder & Cunningham (1975)	33.3	10/30	51.7	15/29
Seligman, Miller, et al. (1976)	15.8	6/38	26.3	10/38
DeJong & Funder (1977), Experiment 1 ^a	55.6	20/36	45.8	11/24
DeJong & Funder (1977), Experiment 2	55.6	30/54	65.5	19/29
Reingen & Kernan (1977)	57.7	15/26	74.1	20/27
Scott (1977)	12.5	5/40	36.7	22/60
Foss & Dempsey (1979), Experiment 1	26.3	5/19	26.7	8/30
Foss & Dempsey (1979), Experiment 2	3.3	1/30	4.3	3/69
Zuckerman, Lazzaro, & Waldgeir (1979)	45.0	18/40	64.3	27/42
DeJong (1981), Experiment 2	37.1	13/35	41.0	16/39
Furse, Stewart, & Rados (1981)	20.7	61/294	22.4	48/214
Crano & Sivacek (1982)	31.2	10/32	71.9	23/32
DeJong & Musilli (1982)	40.0	40/100	51.9	137/264
Katzev & Johnson (1984) ^a	93.8	15/16	85.7	12/14
Schwarzwald, Bizman, & Raz (1983)	53.2	41/77	92.2	71/77
Kilbourne & Kilbourne (1984)	22.5	9/40	37.5	15/40
Stimpson & Waranusuntikule (1987)	25.0	5/20	33.3	5/15
Beaman, Steblay, Preston, & Klentz (1988)	22.4	11/47	23.9	59/246
Hornik (1988)	51.1	46/90	64.1	184/287
Kilbourne (1989), Experiment 1	9.7	6/62	13.3	8/60
Kilbourne (1989), Experiment 2	26.2	16/61	28.3	17/60
Kilbourne (1989), Experiment 3	9.4	6/64	30.0	18/60
Dillard (1990)	18.2	8/44	38.8	45/116
Chartrand, Pinckert, & Burger (1999)	27.0	10/37	50.0	17/34
Combined	30.95	455/1,470	43.35	935/2,157

^aDirection of difference reverse of foot-in-the-door effect.

Table 8. Percentage of Compliance With the Same Requester-Delayed Procedure

Study	Control		Foot-in-the-Door	
	%	Participants/Total	%	Participants/Total
Cann, Sherman, & Elkes (1975), Experiment 1	50.0	13/26	70.0	14/20
Scott (1976)	9.0	9/100	15.6	37/237
Seligman, Bush, & Kirsch (1976)	30.7	8/26	54.6	47/86
Shanab & Isonio (1982)	26.3	5/19	50.0	9/18
Stimpson & Waranusuntikule (1987)	25.0	5/20	13.3	2/15
Hornik, Zaig, & Shadmon (1991)	46.7	64/137	59.7	71/119
Chartrand, Pinckert, & Burger (1999)	27.0	10/37	62.5	20/32
Combined	31.23	114/365	37.95	200/527

Table 9. Percentage of Compliance With Different Requester-No Delay Procedure

Study	Control		Foot-in-the-Door	
	%	Participants/Total	%	Participants/Total
Harris & Samerotte (1976), Experiment 1	35.0	7/20	40.0	8/20
Harris & Samerotte (1976), Experiment 2 ^a	28.6	4/14	25.0	7/28
Burger & Petty (1981), Experiment 3	0.0	0/15	6.7	2/30
Goldman, Seever, & Seever (1982)	16.7	5/30	40.0	12/30
Chartrand, Pinckert, & Burger (1999)	27.0	10/37	51.4	18/35
Combined	22.41	26/116	32.87	47/143

^aDirection of difference reverse of FIID effect.

the five studies found more compliance in the FITD condition, and the combined results reveal a near-significant effect, $\chi^2(1, N = 259) = 2.96, p < .09, r = .11$, odds ratio = 1.47.

According to the data in Tables 6 through 9, it appears that the FITD procedure is most likely to increase compliance when a delay is allowed between requests, or a different person presents the second request, or both. Although we cannot directly account for the findings in any given study, the mixed pattern found in Table 6 is consistent with the model and analysis presented earlier. That is, researchers using the same-requester–no-delay procedure appear to run the risk of violating perceived social rules and thereby generating a reactance-type effect. Of course, depending on how the procedure is carried out, investigators may avoid or overcome such effects. However, on other occasions the negative reaction appears strong and apparently overpowers other processes (e.g., self-perception) that might otherwise lead to an increase in compliance.

Interestingly, use of the same person for both requests does not appear to create the same potential for a backlash when a few days are allowed to pass between requests. Why might this be so? First, as mentioned earlier, a recent set of studies suggests that the reciprocity norm probably lasts only a few days, at least for the kinds of favors typically examined in social psychology studies (Burger et al., 1997). That is, the obligation people feel to return a small favor appears to dissipate after a short period of time. Similarly, meta-analyses find that the door-in-the-face procedure (participant refuses large request, then receives smaller request) may be effective only when the second request comes immediately after the initial request (Dillard et al., 1984). Because the door-in-the-face technique is said to tap into the reciprocity norm, this finding again suggests that the power of the norm diminishes rapidly. Thus, it is reasonable to argue that the perceived violation of the reciprocity norm is considerably less, if it exists at all, when the experimenter allows a few days to pass between requests. Apparently time wipes the give-and-take ledger clean, allowing the same person to return with a new request with little or no norm violation. Second, because the requester has allowed a space between requests, it is less likely he or she will be seen as pressuring or badgering, thus further reducing the possibility of a reactance effect.

What is needed, of course, is a study that manipulates both time delay and number of requesters within the same design. Fortunately, such an investigation was published recently (Chartrand, Pinckert, & Burger, 1999). Requesters in this study asked participants to wear a button for the American Heart Association. Either within 2 min or 2 days later, these participants

were asked to volunteer 3 hr of time to help the same organization. Some of the participants received both requests from the same individual, and some received the requests from two different people. Consistent with the analysis and findings presented here, the researchers found an increase in compliance relative to a control group when either a different person presented the second request or 2 days had lapsed between requests. When the same individual presented the second request immediately after the first request, participants were significantly less likely to agree with the target request than were people in the control condition. Combined with the results from the meta-analyses, these findings argue that using the same-requester–no-delay procedure has the potential to backfire on the investigator.

Finally, it also may be possible for researchers to generate the kind of reactance effect described previously even when not using the same-requester–no-delay procedure. For example, experimenters in one study distributed questionnaires door to door for the American Cancer Society (Wang, Brownstein, & Katzev, 1989). Participants were told that someone would come by for the completed questionnaire the next day. When a second individual arrived to pick up the questionnaire, that person also asked participants for a \$2.00 donation to the same charity. Although a different person delivered the two requests 24 hr apart, it is entirely possible that this procedure generated a type of reactance effect. After all, the participants had taken the time to fill out a questionnaire for the organization and, as soon as they had returned the questionnaire, were asked by someone working on the same team (and aware of the earlier request) for another request. Given the earlier analysis, it is perhaps not surprising that FITD participants in this study were significantly less likely to donate \$2.00 than were participants in the control condition (2.7% vs. 26.3%).

Conformity to the Norm

The concept of norm has been used often by psychologists to account for behavior in social settings. Numerous investigations using a wide variety of methods have demonstrated that people often act in a manner consistent with either what they believe most people do or what society says they are supposed to do (Asch, 1951; Berkowitz, 1972; Cialdini, Kallgren, & Reno, 1991; Sherif, 1936). For example, researchers have found that people are more willing to come to the aid of a stranger when they believe that this is the normative response (Schwartz, 1977).

When applied to the FITD procedure, we argue that the participants' decision to comply or not comply with the target request also can be influenced by per-

ceived norms. Specifically, requesters sometimes tell participants how often other people comply with the initial request. That is, participants learn the extent to which people typically engage in that kind of behavior or support that kind of cause. Because most participants have virtually no other source of norm information in these situations, the information provided by the requester can alter the perceived normative response both in terms of what people typically do and, by implication, what society says they should do.

Depending on what the norm data tell the participants, they can either increase or decrease the likelihood of complying with the target request. If participants learn that very few people go along with these kinds of requests or support these kinds of causes, we would expect a decrease in the FITD effect. That is, the tendency to comply with norm behavior and standards in this situation should inhibit compliance to the target request. On the other hand, learning that most people agree with these kinds of requests and support these kinds of causes should push participants toward agreeing with the target request, thereby increasing the FITD effect.

We identified four studies in which FITD investigators gave participants information about how many people typically respond to the kind of requests used in the investigation. Because only two of these studies provided the numbers needed for combining results, we did not examine the effects of norm information through a meta-analysis. Nonetheless, when we considered the results of the four studies, a clear pattern could be identified in the findings.

First, DeJong (1981, Experiment 1) asked participants to sign a simple petition. Depending on condition, participants were told "almost everyone" signs the petition or that "you are the only one so far" to sign. Interestingly, the investigator predicted that the latter condition would enhance the FITD effect. DeJong reasoned that these participants would attribute their initial agreement to a personal characteristic and therefore would see themselves as the kind of person who helps with such causes. This prediction is consistent with the self-perception explanation described earlier and the attributional process discussed in the next section. However, the norm information also told participants in this study that virtually no one engages in this kind of behavior or supports these kinds of causes. Thirty to 60 sec after the agreeing to the initial request, participants were given the opportunity to inform a confederate that he had dropped a quarter. Consistent with the norm information interpretation, participants who thought they were the only one to sign the petition were slightly less likely to help the confederate than a control group. On the other hand, FITD participants told that virtually everyone signs the petition were significantly more

likely to help the confederate than the control group. Thus, participants appeared to respond to the norm information, and this response was more powerful in determining their behavior than any self-perception process that might have been operating.

DeJong (1981, Experiment 2) replicated this design in a follow-up study. This investigation used a different target behavior as well as a 2-day delay between requests and a different experimenter presenting each request. He again found, relative to a control group, no increase in compliance when FITD participants believed few people agreed to such requests. However, as in the first study, FITD participants told that virtually everyone goes along with the initial request agreed to the target request more often than those in the control group.

A similar finding was reported by Kilbourne and Kilbourne (1984). These investigators informed participants in one condition that "most people have been too busy to participate" when presented with the target request. As in the DeJong studies, these participants did not differ from a control group in the extent to which they complied with the target request. Finally, Gorassini and Olsen (1995, Experiment 2) told male participants that "almost everyone" agrees to the initial request. When this information was combined with extended thanks by the experimenter (a manipulation designed to enhance the self-perception process), the investigators found an increase in compliance to the target request as compared to an appropriate control condition. Interpreting this last finding is complicated, however, because the effect was not found for the female participants in the study.

In sum, although we have only a few studies on which to draw conclusions, it appears that FITD participants rely on norm information when deciding whether to agree with the target request. In most studies, this information is absent. However, researchers who inadvertently inform participants about how often people comply with the request may generate a tendency to conform to the norm, and this response can overwhelm the effects of whatever other processes are operating in the situation.

Consistency Needs

Like social norms, theories and research based on consistency needs have a long history in social psychology (Berkowitz & Devine, 1989; Festinger, 1957; Heider, 1958; Newcomb, 1953). In general, these theories maintain that people have a need to view their behaviors and attitudes as consistent and to appear consistent to others. When made aware of inconsistencies, people are said to take steps to reduce either the apparent inconsistency or their awareness of it. When

applied to the FITD procedure, we argue that these consistency needs potentially affect the participants' response to the target request. Specifically, if participants are aware of their earlier behavior (agreeing to the initial request), they should be motivated to behave in a consistent manner when presented with the target request. Thus, the FITD effect should be enhanced to the extent that consistency needs are operating.

Predictions from consistency theories often are identical to those derived from self-perception theory (Bem, 1972). Looking at the analysis provided earlier, one could argue that most of the findings we found that support the self-perception explanation for the FITD effect also might be used to support a consistency interpretation. For example, we found involving initial requests led to greater compliance than noninvolving requests. One interpretation of this finding is that the behavior was more salient at the time of the second request and thus more likely to influence the participants' self-perception process. However, one also could argue that these participants simply were more likely to recall their response to the initial request and were trying to be consistent when presented with the second request. Fortunately for our purposes here, it is not necessary to disentangle which part of the FITD effect is due to self-perception and which can be attributed to consistency needs. Rather, we argue that both processes may contribute to the overall effect. Procedures that enhance either of these processes should increase the effectiveness of the FITD manipulation.

Nonetheless, we found one investigation that appears to support specifically the notion that consistency needs sometimes affect the FITD phenomenon. Cialdini, Trost, and Newsom (1995) developed the Preference for Consistency Scale to measure individual differences in the extent to which people prefer to act and to be seen as acting in a consistent manner. A set of validation studies demonstrated that those scoring high on the scale tend to act in ways suggesting a high need for consistency. One of these validation studies employed the FITD procedure. The investigators found that participants high in preference for consistency were more likely to show the FITD effect than participants who scored low on the scale. These findings thus support the notion that consistency needs may play a role in participants' reactions to the FITD procedure.

Attribution Processes

People sometimes ask themselves why they engage in a given behavior (Weiner, 1985). The answer to this question, accurate or not, influences how the person responds in subsequent similar situations. Although FITD participants typically agree to the initial request

in an almost mindless fashion, we argue that procedures used by researchers sometimes lead participants into attributional processes concerning their response to the request. Moreover, we maintain the attributions generated by this process can either increase or decrease the likelihood that the participant will agree with the target request. For example, participants who conclude that they believe in worthy causes are likely to go along with a subsequent request to help a similar cause. On the other hand, participants who believe they were pressured into complying with the initial request should be less likely to agree with the target request. We hasten to note that this attribution process is not entirely independent from some of the other processes examined here. For example, we could argue that the self-perception process described earlier represents a type of attribution activity.

Several FITD studies include conditions that allow us to examine two predictions based on this attributional analysis. First, several investigators have added a condition to the basic FITD paradigm in which participants are labeled as helpful persons. Second, some researchers have given participants external rewards for agreeing with the initial request. If the attributions participants make for their behavior affect whether they comply with the second request, we would expect the former procedure to increase compliance and the latter procedure to decrease compliance relative to a control condition.

Labeling. Several studies have demonstrated that labeling an individual as helpful can have pronounced effects on helping behavior (Batson, Harris, McCaul, Davis, & Schmidt, 1979; Kraut, 1973; Strenta & DeJong, 1981; Thomas & Batson, 1981). For example, participants in one investigation were given bogus personality test feedback that identified them as helpful people (Strenta & DeJong, 1981). These participants were more likely to stop and help a confederate who had "accidentally" dropped some papers than participants not receiving this label.

As applied to the FITD technique, we argue that investigators can aid the participants' self-attribution process through labeling, and thereby increase compliance to the target request. That is, telling participants they are the kind of people who help with such requests should alter the attributions they make for their compliance with the initial request. As a result of this attribution, these participants will be more likely to agree to the target request than those not receiving the label.

We found three studies that included a condition in which participants who agreed to the initial request were told they were "helpful" or "cooperative" people. Each of these studies also included the standard FITD condition without labeling and an appropriate control

condition. As seen in Table 10, FITD participants receiving no label complied with the target request more often than participants in the control conditions, $\chi^2(1, N = 174) = 7.64, p < .008, r = .21$, odds ratio = 1.87. However, consistent with the aforementioned reasoning, participants in the labeled conditions were even more likely to agree to the target request than those in the control conditions, $\chi^2(1, N = 174) = 18.30, p < .001, r = .32$, odds ratio = 2.36, although the difference between the labeled and unlabeled participants was not large, $\chi^2(1, N = 184) = 2.18, r = .11$, odds ratio = 1.26.

Two studies not included in the meta-analysis provide additional support for this point. First, participants who agreed to the initial request in one study were given a small sticker to put in their window (Hornik, 1988). The sticker identified the participant as the kind of person who supported the cause ("I Care—I Contribute to the ICA"). The results were similar to those in which participants were directly labeled. The participants who received the "I Care" stickers complied with the target request more than a control group or those who received a nonlabeling sticker. Second, Gorassini and Olsen (1995, Experiment 1) provided some FITD participants with effusive thanks for agreeing to the initial request, telling these participants their responses were "very generous." Although they did not report compliance rate data, the investigators found that participants in this effusive-thanks condition volunteered more hours of help (the target request) than participants in the control group or those who merely agreed to the initial request. These labeled participants also had slightly higher self-ratings of helpfulness on a subsequent measure, but the test for statistical significance on this measure was hampered by a ceiling effect.

In short, it appears that labeling the participants' agreement to the initial request as helpful enhances the FITD effect. Of course, this finding does not demonstrate that participants necessarily engage in self-attribution processes in the absence of labeling. It does, however, suggest that such processes can influence compliance rates in FITD situations. We also should note that all the studies to date have used labels

that attributed the participants' behavior to positive internal traits, which led to an increase in compliance. However, it is reasonable to suggest that labels attributing the behavior to external causes would lead to a decrease in compliance.

Extrinsic rewards. Several FITD researchers have included conditions in their studies in which participants were given an extrinsic reward for agreeing to the initial request. In each case, the investigators reasoned that payment would undermine any personal attributions for agreeing to the request and thereby decrease compliance to the target request. This prediction is consistent with a large body of research on the effects of extrinsic rewards (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Although the consequences of extrinsic rewards remain a topic with some controversy (Eisenberger & Cameron, 1996), there is general agreement that rewards have the potential to alter self-attributions and subsequent behavior. In the FITD situation, participants paid to perform the initial request should attribute their behavior to the reward rather than to their helpful nature or a tendency to support such causes. We would expect these participants to be less likely to agree with the target request than participants who are not paid.

We found six studies that included a condition in which participants were paid for agreeing with the initial request. In each case, the investigators also included a traditional FITD condition in which participants were not paid as well as a single-contact control condition. As shown in Table 11, the results of these studies were mixed. In four of the six cases, paid participants were less likely to agree to the target request than participants who were not paid. The combined results found only a nonsignificant tendency for the unpaid FITD participants to comply with the target request more than the control condition participants, $\chi^2(1, N = 428) = 1.80, r = .06$, odds ratio = 1.16, and for the paid participants to comply less often than the control condition, $\chi^2(1, N = 490) = 0.94, r = .04$, odds ratio = 1.12. Nonetheless, consistent with the attributional analysis, unpaid FITD participants agreed to the target

Table 10. Percentage of Compliance to Target Request After Labeled or Not Labeled

Study	Foot-in-the-Door					
	Control		No Label		Label	
	%	Participants/ Total	%	Participants/ Total	%	Participants/ Total
Crano & Sivacek (1982)	31.2	10/32	71.9	23/32	65.7	21/32
Goldman, Seever, & Seever (1982)	16.7	5/30	40.0	12/30	66.7	20/30
Stimpson & Waranusantikule (1987)	25.0	5/20	23.3	7/30	40.0	12/30
Combined	24.39	20/82	45.65	42/92	57.61	53/92

Table 11. Percentage of Compliance With Payment and No Payment

Study	Foot-in-the-Door						Payment Procedure
	Control		No Payment		Payment		
	%	Participants/ Total	%	Participants/ Total	%	Participants/ Total	
DeJong & Funder (1977), Experiment 1	55.6	20/36	45.8	11/24	78.3	18/23	\$2 to answer survey
DeJong & Funder (1977), Experiment 2	55.6	30/54	65.5	19/29	72.4	21/29	\$2 to answer survey
Reingen & Kernan (1977)	57.7	15/26	74.1	20/27	48.1	13/27	\$5 gift certificate to answer survey
Scott (1977)	12.5	5/40	36.7	22/60	26.7	32/120	\$1 or \$3 to put up sign
Zuckerman, Lazzaro, & Waldeir (1979)	45.0	18/40	64.3	27/42	33.3	15/45	\$1.50 to answer survey
Stimpson & Waranusutikule (1987)	25.0	5/20	23.3	7/30	20.0	6/30	Ball point pen to answer survey
Combined	43.06	93/216	50.00	106/212	38.32	105/274	

request significantly more often than the paid FITD participants, $\chi^2(1, N = 486) = 6.17, p < .02, r = .11$, odds ratio = 1.30.

Although the pattern shown in Table 11 generally is consistent with expectations, a closer look at the relevant studies suggests even stronger support for the predictions. In particular, one of the studies listed in the table requires additional scrutiny. Contrary to prediction, the paid participants in DeJong and Funder's (1977) first study were significantly more likely to agree to the second request than participants not paid to perform the initial request.

How can we account for this unexpected finding? The experimenters provided one reasonable explanation. When mailing paid participants their money (received shortly before the target request), the researchers included a letter that contained language that could have labeled the participant as the kind of person who agrees to these kinds of requests. If that were the case, the facilitating effect of the label, as described previously, could have overwhelmed the inhibiting effect of the payment. Indeed, when DeJong and Funder (1977) removed the language from the letter in their second experiment, the difference between the payment and no-payment conditions was negligible.

Although not included in the meta-analysis because the target behavior was not a request, a study by Uranowitz (1975) also sheds light on the impact of external attributions within the general FITD procedure. Participants were asked to watch a confederate's bags for a few minutes while he returned to the store to retrieve something. Some of the participants were told the confederate needed to retrieve his wallet, the others that he had lost a dollar. Uranowitz reasoned that participants in the wallet condition would have a strong external attribution for agreeing to help (would not anyone help in this situation?). The participants in the dollar situation would not. As expected, participants in the dollar condition were significantly more likely to tell a confederate she had dropped something than participants provided with the external attribution for their behavior.

In sum, it appears procedures used by researchers as part of an FITD manipulation can trigger attributional activity that leads to a subsequent increase or decrease in the effect. Although it is not clear that participants engage in this kind of cognitive work in all or even most FITD studies, investigators may be able to enhance the power of their FITD manipulations by either facilitating or reducing certain participant attributions.

Commitment

Once committed to a decision, individuals often become resistant to altering their movement toward the

goal or action to which they are committed (Kiesler, 1971). This phenomenon is used to account for the effectiveness of the low-ball procedure, a compliance technique similar to the FITD (Cialdini, Cacioppo, Bassett, & Miller, 1978). Requesters using the low-ball procedure first get participants to agree to an action at a given price, then raise the price slightly. For example, a customer might agree to buy a used car for \$5,000, only to have the sales representative return to say that he or she can not sell the vehicle for less than \$5,500. Studies find that low-ball participants agree to the higher priced action more often than control condition participants presented only with the final price. Cialdini et al. (1978) argued that the participant in this situation is committed to perform the request, a commitment that remains even after the price has gone up. Commitment also can extend to the person making the request. Burger and Petty (1981) argued that a commitment to the individual also contributes to the effectiveness of the low-ball procedure. For example, they found the technique failed to produce an increase in compliance when a different requester presented the higher price.

Returning to the FITD, we argue that under certain conditions participants feel committed to helping the requester and his or her cause. This commitment is most likely to be generated when the same person presents both requests, the requests are presented without interruption, and the second request resembles the initial request, that is, the second request appears to be a continuation of the same task the individual already has agreed to perform. Researchers who succeed in generating this sense of commitment should obtain higher agreement to the target request than those who do not.

One procedure commonly used by FITD researchers appears to meet all of these conditions. Specifically, participants in these studies initially are asked to answer a few questions. As soon as participants finish this task, the same requester immediately asks if they would be willing to answer a larger number of questions on the same general topic. We found 10 studies that used this basic procedure. All but one of these investigations contacted participants via telephone calls. The exception (Swanson, Sherman, & Sherman, 1982) contacted participants door to door.

As can be seen in Table 12, the continued-questions procedure is highly successful in producing the FITD effect. The combined data from the 10 investigations produced a compliance rate in the FITD condition that is nearly twice that of the control condition. This effect is highly significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 3,192) = 206.49, p < .001, r = .25$, odds ratio = 1.91.

Interestingly, the very effective continued-question procedure is similar in many ways to the procedure identified earlier as one of the least effective FITD ma-

Table 12. *Percentage of Compliance With the Continued-Questions Procedure*

Study	Control		Foot-in-the-Door	
	%	Participants/ Total	%	Participants/ Total
Reingen & Kernan (1979)	44.2	46/104	50.0	59/118
Allen, Schewe, & Wijk (1980)	22.2	186/836	67.3	66/98
Hansen & Robinson (1980)	23.0	46/200	45.0	180/400
Swanson, Sherman, & Sherman (1982)	52.5	21/40	90.0	36/40
Wynn & McDaniel (1985)	17.6	57/324	48.4	59/122
Goldman (1986)	22.4	17/76	46.0	35/76
Patch (1986)	52.5	42/80	78.7	63/80
Patch (1988)	47.5	19/40	75.0	30/40
Kamins (1989)	26.5	40/151	33.6	43/128
Cialdini, Trost, & Newsom (1995), Experiment 2	61.8	76/123	67.2	78/116
Combined	27.86	550/1,974	53.28	649/1,218

nipulations. As shown in Table 6, when the same individual immediately presents a second request that is not similar to the first, a type of reactance effect can occur. It appears that participants in this latter situation sometimes feel as if their commitment to the requester is complete after performing the initial task. When the requester then presents a second, unrelated request, the requester is seen as violating the norm for social give-and-take and perhaps unfairly pressuring the participant. However, when the second request seems like a continuation of the first, it appears the participants' sense of commitment is extended to the second request. A parallel finding was uncovered in research on the low-ball procedure. When investigators allowed participants to perform a different task and thereby fulfill their commitment to the requester, the effectiveness of the low-ball procedure declined (Burger & Petty, 1981).

In sum, some of the methods used to generate an FITD effect appear to also create a sense of commitment in participants. Commitment to the requester and to the request is especially likely to develop when the same requester presents a target request very similar to the initial request immediately after the initial request. The result of this commitment is an increased likelihood that the participant will agree to the target request.

General Discussion

We began by identifying several psychological processes that may be set in motion during an FITD manipulation and that potentially influence the effectiveness of the procedure. Whether the FITD procedure increases participants' compliance to the target request is a function of the combined effects from each of these processes. Depending on the specific procedures used to create an FITD manipulation, the tech-

nique can either increase, decrease, or have no effect on compliance rates relative to appropriate controls.

When successfully implemented, the FITD technique can be an effective procedure for increasing compliance. We found that some FITD manipulations produce a consistent and strong increase in compliance relative to control conditions. For example, investigators using the continued-questions manipulation produced an average compliance rate nearly double that of the control group. Other FITD manipulations vary in their effectiveness at increasing compliance. Our analyses thus extend the conclusions drawn by earlier FITD reviewers who pointed to the inconsistencies in FITD studies and the overall small effect size. By identifying variables that theoretically increase and decrease compliance with the target request, we have demonstrated some of the conditions most likely to produce a significant FITD effect as well as conditions under which a smaller or no effect is likely.

Although we can not always account for the results of any given study with our analysis, we can identify conditions under which certain outcomes are most likely to occur. Of course, this task is complicated when investigators use procedures that enhance the FITD effect along with those that decrease the effect. For example, we found that greater participant involvement with the initial request increased compliance to the target request, as compared to relatively noninvolving requests (Table 2). However, two of the studies examining the effects of involvement also used procedures that potentially generate a type of reactance response that decreases compliance (Tybout, 1978, Experiment 1; Wang, Brownstein, & Katzev, 1989). Indeed, as seen in the table, in both cases the FITD participants agreed to the target request less often than the control condition participants.

Our review also provides insight into the processes underlying the FITD effect. Most past investigations of this question have examined only one possible expla-

nation, typically a self-perception process. Inconsistent findings have led some researchers to suggest that self-perception theory should be replaced with another explanation for the FITD effect. In contrast, our analyses found a great deal of evidence to support a self-perception explanation. However, we argue that self-perception is only one process set in motion by an FITD manipulation and that many of the inconsistent findings in the FITD literature can be understood by considering the impact of processes in addition to self-perception. For example, it appears that whatever push self-perception gives toward agreement with the target request can be overwhelmed by telling the individual that few people go along with such requests.

Although our analyses suggest that self-perception processes contribute to the effectiveness of the FITD procedure, questions remain about how the process works. In particular, several researchers have asked whether the attitude change that takes place during the self-perception process is for a specific behavior or cause or for a more general and far-reaching attitude. Does the manipulation change, for example, how helpful the participants believe themselves to be or how they feel about safe driving? Indeed, this issue has been part of FITD discussions from the outset. Freedman and Fraser (1966) suggested that either a specific or a general change in attitude might be sufficient to produce the FITD effect:

The change in attitude could be toward any aspect of the situation or toward the whole business of saying "yes." The basic idea is that the change in attitude need not be toward any particular issue or person or activity, but may be toward activity or compliance in general. (p. 201)

One suggestion worthy of further investigation is that the FITD effect is enhanced to the extent that both a general and a specific change in attitude occurs. If the two requests resemble one another (e.g., support the same cause or require the same action), then both the general and specific attitude will affect the decision to comply with the second request. This analysis is supported by the research described earlier that found a stronger FITD effect when the two tasks were similar.

Finally, some obvious practical implications can be drawn from our analyses. The data patterns we uncovered provide guidelines for designing the most effective FITD manipulation. Researchers, salespeople, recruiters and others are most likely to increase compliance with the FITD technique when they (a) allow individuals to perform the initial request, (b) overtly label the person as helpful or as a supporter of these kinds of causes, (c) require more than a minimal amount of effort to perform the initial request, and (d) make the target request essentially a continuation of

the initial request. Researchers, salespeople, and the like will reduce the effectiveness of the procedure and may even do more harm than good when they (a) inform individuals that few people agree to the initial request, (b) use the same person to deliver a second request for a different behavior immediately after the first request, and (c) pay individuals for performing the initial request.

Researchers from several different disciplines have been investigating the effectiveness of and explanations for the FITD procedure for a third of a century. The possibility of increasing sales, donations, recruitment, and volunteers with a relatively quick, inexpensive, and nonthreatening technique has proven irresistibly tantalizing. Yet, as our review and analyses demonstrate, there is more to this simple and easy-to-use procedure than initially meets the eye.

References

- *References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in one or more of the meta-analyses.
- *Allen, C. T., Schewe, C. D., & Wijk, G. (1980). More on self-perception theory's foot technique in the pre-call/mail survey setting. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *17*, 498–502.
- American Psychological Association (1974–present). *PsycLIT* [CD-ROM]. Wellesley Hills, MA: SilverPlatter Information Services [Producer and Distributor].
- Asch, S. E. (1951). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. In H. Guetzkow (Ed.), *Groups, leadership, and men* (pp. 177–190). Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie.
- Baer, R., & Goldman, M. (1978). Compliance as a function of prior compliance, familiarization, effort and benefits: The foot-in-the-door technique extended. *Psychological Reports*, *43*, 887–893.
- Batson, C. D., Harris, A. C., McCaul, K. D., Davis, M., & Schmidt, T. (1979). Compassion or compliance: Alternative dispositional attributions for one's helping behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *42*, 405–409.
- 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.
- *Beaman, A. L., Steblay, N. M., Preston, M., & Klentz, B. (1988). Compliance as a function of elapsed time between first and second requests. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *128*, 233–243.
- *Bell, R. A., Cholerton, M., Fraczek, G. S. R., & Smith, B. A. (1994). Encouraging donations to charity: A field study of competing and complementary factors in tactic sequencing. *Western Journal of Communication*, *58*, 98–115.
- Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-perception theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 1–62). New York: Academic.
- Berkowitz, L. (1972). Social norms, feelings, and other factors affecting helping and altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 63–108). New York: Academic.
- Berkowitz, L., & Devine, P. G. (1989). Research traditions, analysis, and synthesis in social psychological theories: The case of dissonance theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *15*, 493–507.

- Brehm, J. W. (1966). *A theory of psychological reactance*. New York: Academic.
- Brehm, J. W., & Cole, A. H. (1966). Effect of a favor which reduces freedom. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 420–426.
- Brehm, S. S., & Brehm, J. W. (1981). *Psychological reactance: A theory of freedom and control*. New York: Academic.
- *Brownstein, R. J., & Katzev, R. D. (1985). The relative effectiveness of three compliance techniques in eliciting donations to a cultural organization. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 564–574.
- Burger, J. M., Horita, M., Kinoshita, L., Roberts, K., & Vera, C. (1997). The effects of time on the norm of reciprocity. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 91–100.
- *Burger, J. M., & Petty, R. E. (1981). The low-ball compliance technique: Task or person commitment? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 492–500.
- *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.
- *Chartrand, T., Pinckert, S., & Burger, J. M. (1999). The effects of time delay and requester on the foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 211–221.
- Cialdini, R. B. (1993). *Influence: Science and practice* (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- *Cialdini, R. B., & Ascani, K. (1976). Test of a concession procedure for inducing verbal, behavioral, and further compliance with a request to give blood. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, 295–300.
- *Cialdini, R. B., Cacioppo, J. T., Bassett, R., & Miller, J. A. (1978). The low-ball procedure for producing compliance: Commitment then cost. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 463–476.
- Cialdini, R. B., Kallgren, C. A., & Reno, R. R. (1991). A focus theory of normative conduct: A theoretical refinement and reevaluation of the role of norms in human behavior. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 24, pp. 201–234). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- *Cialdini, R. B., Trost, M. R., & Newsom, J. T. (1995). Preference for consistency: The development of a valid measure and discovery of surprising behavioral implications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 318–328.
- 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.
- *Crano, W. D., & Sivacek, J. (1982). Social reinforcement, self-attribution, and the foot-in-the-door phenomenon. *Social Cognition*, 1, 110–125.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- DeJong, W. (1979). An examination of self-perception mediation of the foot-in-the-door effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 2221–2239.
- *DeJong, W. (1981). Consensus information and the foot-in-the-door effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 7, 423–430.
- *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 versus nonhandicapped requesters and the foot-in-the-door phenomenon. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 8, 522–527.
- *Dillard, J. P. (1990). Self-inference and the foot-in-the-door technique: Quantity of behavior and attitudinal mediation. *Human Communication Research*, 16, 422–447.
- 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.
- Eisenberger, R., & Cameron, J. (1996). Detrimental effects of reward: Reality or myth? *American Psychologist*, 51, 1153–1166.
- Fern, E. F., Monroe, K. B., & Avila, R. A. (1986). Effectiveness of multiple request strategies: A synthesis of research results. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23, 144–152.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- *Fish, B., & Kaplan, K. J. (1974). Does a “foot-in-the-door” get you in or out? *Psychological Reports*, 34, 35–42.
- *Foss, R. D., & Dempsey, C. B. (1979). Blood donation and the foot-in-the-door technique: A limiting case. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 580–590.
- *Freedman, J. L., & Fraser, S. C. (1966). Compliance without pressure: The foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 195–202.
- *Furse, D. H., Stewart, D. W., & Rados, D. L. (1981). Effects of foot-in-the-door, cash incentives, and followups on survey response. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 473–478.
- Gergen, K. J., Ellsworth, P., Maslach, C., & Scipel, M. (1975). Obligation, donor resources, and reactions to aid in three cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 390–400.
- *Goldman, M. (1986). Compliance employing a combined foot-in-the-door and door-in-the-face procedure. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 126, 111–116.
- Goldman, M., Creason, C. R., & McCall, C. G. (1981). Compliance employing a two-feet-in-the-door procedure. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 114, 259–265.
- Goldman, M., Gier, J. A., & Smith, D. E. (1981). Compliance as affected by task difficulty and order of tasks. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 114, 75–83.
- *Goldman, M., Seever, M., & Seever, M. (1982). Social labeling and the foot-in-the-door effect. *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.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161–178.
- Groves, R. M., & Magilavy, L. J. (1981). Increasing response rates to telephone surveys: A door in the face for foot-in-the-door? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 45, 346–358.
- *Hansen, R. A., & Robinson, L. M. (1980). Testing the effectiveness of alternative foot-in-the-door manipulations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 359–364.
- *Harari, H., Mohr, D., & Hosey, K. (1980). Faculty helpfulness to students: A comparison of compliance techniques. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 6, 373–377.
- *Harris, M. B. (1972). The effects of performing one altruistic act on the likelihood of performing another. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 88, 65–73.
- *Harris, M. B., Liguori, R. A., & Stack, C. (1973). Favors, bribes, and altruism. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 89, 47–54.
- *Harris, M. B., & Samerotte, G. C. (1976). The effects of actual and attempted theft, need, and a previous favor on altruism. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 99, 193–202.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.
- *Hornik, J. (1988). Cognitive thoughts mediating compliance in multiple request situations. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 9, 69–79.

- *Hornik, J., Zaig, T., & Shadmon, D. (1991). Reducing refusals in telephone surveys on sensitive topics. *Journal of Advertising Research, 31*, 49–56.
- *Kamins, M. A. (1989). The enhancement of response rates to a mail survey through a labeled probe foot-in-the-door approach. *Journal of the Market Research Society, 31*, 273–283.
- *Katzev, R. D., & Johnson, T. R. (1984). Comparing the effects of monetary incentives and foot-in-the-door strategies in promoting residential electricity conservation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 14*, 12–27.
- Kiesler, C. A. (1971). *The psychology of commitment*. New York: Academic.
- *Kilbourne, B. K. (1989). A cross-cultural investigation of the foot-in-the-door compliance induction procedure. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 20*, 3–38.
- *Kilbourne, B. K., & Kilbourne, M. T. (1984). Norms of social conduct and the foot-in-the-door. *Journal of Social Psychology, 123*, 13–20.
- Kraut, R. E. (1973). Effects of social labeling on giving to charity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9*, 551–562.
- *Martens, B. K., Kelly, S. Q., & Diskin, M. T. (1996). The effects of two sequential-request strategies on teachers' acceptability and use of a classroom intervention. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 7*, 211–221.
- Newcomb, T. (1953). An approach to the study of communicative acts. *Psychological Review, 60*, 393–404.
- *Patch, M. A. (1986). The role of source legitimacy in sequential request strategies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 12*, 199–205.
- *Patch, M. A. (1988). Differential perception of source legitimacy in sequential request strategies. *Journal of Social Psychology, 128*, 817–823.
- *Pliner, P., Hart, H., Kohl, J., & Saari, D. (1974). Compliance without pressure: Some further data on the foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 10*, 17–22.
- Regan, R. T. (1971). Effects of a favor and liking on compliance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 7*, 627–639.
- *Reingen, P. H. (1978). On inducing compliance with requests. *Journal of Consumer Research, 5*, 96–102.
- *Reingen, P. H., & Kernan, J. B. (1977). Compliance with an interview request: A foot-in-the-door, self-perception interpretation. *Journal of Marketing Research, 14*, 365–369.
- *Reingen, P. H., & Kernan, J. B. (1979). More evidence on interpersonal yielding. *Journal of Marketing Research, 16*, 588–593.
- Rind, B., & Benjamin, D. (1994). Effects of public image concerns and self-image on compliance. *Journal of Social Psychology, 134*, 19–25.
- *Rittle, R. H. (1981). Changes in helping behavior: Self- versus situational perceptions as mediators of the foot-in-the-door effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7*, 431–437.
- Rosenthal, R. (1991). *Meta-analytic procedures for social research* (2nd ed). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 221–279). New York: Academic.
- *Schwarzwald, J., Bizman, A., & Raz, M. (1983). The foot-in-the-door paradigm: Effects of second request size on donation probability and donor generosity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9*, 443–450.
- *Scott, C. A. (1976). The effects of trial and incentives on repeat purchase behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research, 13*, 263–269.
- *Scott, C. A. (1977). Modifying socially-conscious behavior: The foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Consumer Research, 4*, 156–164.
- *Seligman, C., Bush, M., & Kirsch, K. (1976). Relationship between compliance in the foot-in-the-door paradigm and size of first request. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33*, 517–520.
- *Seligman, C., Miller, R., Goldberg, G., Gelberd, L., Clark, N., & Bush, M. (1976). Compliance in the foot-in-the-door technique as a function of issue similarity and persuasion. *Social Behavior and Personality, 4*, 267–271.
- *Shanab, M. I., & Isonio, S. A. (1982). The effects of contrast upon compliance with socially undesirable requests in the foot-in-the-door paradigm. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 20*, 180–182.
- *Shanab, M. I., & O'Neill, P. J. (1982). The effects of self-perception and perceptual contrast upon compliance with socially undesirable requests. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 19*, 279–281.
- Sherif, M. (1936). *The psychology of social norms*. New York: Harper.
- *Snyder, M., & Cunningham, M. R. (1975). To comply or not comply: Testing the self-perception explanation of the "foot-in-the-door" phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*, 64–67.
- *Stimpson, D. V., & Waranusuntikule, S. (1987). Mediating effects of material payment, social reinforcement, and familiarity on foot-in-the-door phenomena in Thailand. *Journal of Psychology, 121*, 515–520.
- Strenta, A., & DeJong, W. (1981). The effect of a prosocial label on helping behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 44*, 142–147.
- *Swanson, E. B., Sherman, M. F., & Sherman, N. C. (1982). Anxiety and the foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Social Psychology, 118*, 269–275.
- Thomas, G., & Batson, C. D. (1981). Effect of helping under normative pressure on self-perceived altruism. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 44*, 127–131.
- *Tybout, A. M. (1978). Relative effectiveness of three behavioral influence strategies as supplements to persuasion in a marketing context. *Journal of Marketing Research, 15*, 229–242.
- Uranowitz, S. W. (1975). Helping and self-attributions: A field experiment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*, 852–854.
- Vokey, J. R. (1997). Collapsing multiway contingency tables: Simpson's paradox and homogenization. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers, 29*, 210–215.
- *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.
- *Wang, T., Brownstein, R., & Katzev, R. (1989). Promoting charitable behaviour with compliance techniques. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 38*, 165–183.
- Weiner, B. (1985). "Spontaneous" causal thinking. *Psychological Bulletin, 97*, 74–84.
- Weyant, J. M. (1996). Application of compliance techniques to direct-mail requests for charitable donations. *Psychology and Marketing, 13*, 157–170.
- *Williams, K. D., & Williams, K. B. (1989). Impact of source strength on two compliance techniques. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 10*, 149–159.
- *Wynn, G. W., & McDaniel, S. W. (1985). The effect of alternative foot-in-the-door manipulations on mailed questionnaire response rate and quality. *Journal of the Market Research Society, 27*, 15–26.
- Yu, J., & Cooper, H. M. (1983). A quantitative review of research effects on response rates to questionnaires. *Journal of Marketing Research, 20*, 36–44.
- *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.