

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

EFFECTS OF MESSAGE ORDER ON MEMORY
FOR A REQUEST FOR HELP

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By
NASSER NAZEMZADEH
Norman, Oklahoma
1984

EFFECTS OF MESSAGE ORDER ON MEMORY
FOR A REQUEST FOR HELP
A DISSERTATION

Approved By

Lauren Wispe

William Carmack
Edmund C. Nuttall

John C. Smith
David Sorenson

Dissertation Committee

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to the following persons who contributed to this dissertation. To Dr. Lauren G. Wispe, Dissertation Committee Chairperson, for his encouragement; his reading, corrections and very valuable comments were extremely helpful.

To Dr. William R. Carmack who served as the advisor during my coursework, and also served on my Dissertation Committee; and Dr. Jay Smith, Professor of Education, who not only served as a Committee member in my program, but also gave me access to audio visual equipment making it possible for me to produce my research instruments. I am also indebted to the other members of my Committee, Dr. Edmond C. Nuttall, Dr. David Sorenson, and finally Dr. Roger M. Babich who helped me with his guidance throughout my entire Ph.D. Program.

I am also indebted to Lisa Portwood, in the Instructional Services Center for her patience, understanding, technical assistance, and finally her efforts for fitting me on her busy schedule for taping and editing. I would also like

compliment her for her outstanding technical crew who assisted me with my audio and video tapes.

I feel special grattitude to the graduate teaching assistants who gave me a part of their class time in the Spring semester of 1983, to show my video tapes to their students.

Special thanks are given to Margaret Smith, Louise Butler, Clair Cummings who served as the talent in different steps of my video tapes and to Terry O'Neil for recording the audio portion of my tapes.

I am also grateful to Abedin Zanganeh for his moral and financial support for providing me with a scholarship which made my graduate study possible.

Special thanks to Katy Monfort for making the time in her busy schedule to help me when I needed help.

For all the computer help, I owe a debt of gratitude to may friend Manoucheher Javidi.

Special credit must be given to Anita Marie "Tulip" Fanshier for her patience and coping with the frustration in typing this dissertation.

My greatest thanks go to my parents who have sacrificed the most. I must thank my sisters Zivar Nazemzadeh, M.D., and Aghdas Nazemzadeh who have always supported me morally and made me believe that I could do it since the beginning of my graduate work.

Thanks to my parents-in-law, for helping me in the past and assuring me that they will be there when I needed them in the future.

Last but not the least, I would like to express my appreciation to my wife, Soossan, for putting up with my school work since we got married and doing so many of the thankless jobs including my typing (that is what she hates the most) regardless of what time of the day or night it was and how tired of her schooling and house work she was, just to keep me going.

To all of you I give my deepest respect. I do not know how I could have done this without you all.

ABSTRACT

Langer and Abelson (1972) hypothesized that the frequency in compliance to a "legitimate" request for help would be greater when the opening phrase was "victim-oriented" and also to an "illegitimate" request when the opening phrase was "target-oriented." Victim-oriented appeals started with a statement of the victim's need, whereas the target-oriented shifted attention immediately to the object of the request. Results of their study confirmed their hypothesized interaction between legitimacy and type of appeal and Innes (1974) confirmed these results in a cross cultural sample.

These two studies suggested that the frequency of compliance was greater in the legitimate victim-oriented and in the illegitimate target-oriented appeals. These two types of appeal for help appear to motivate, or "demand," and somehow move the passers-by to comply in helping the victim more often. If this explanation is true, then it follows that these types of appeals are remembered better than the alternative ones. The present study tested the hypothesis that legitimate victim-oriented and illegitimate target-oriented appeals are remembered better than legitimate target-oriented and illegitimate victim-

oriented ones. Both memory recall and recognition tests were administered to eight groups of twenty students enrolled in Communication 1113 after their viewing a video tape of the same messages used in Langer and Abelson's study. The recognition test confirmed this hypothesis, but the recall test did not support confirmation. Since recognition memory is easier than recall, obviously these results provide only weaker support for Langer and Abelson findings than if the subjects had been able to recall the messages.

In a finer grained chi-square analysis, the subjects revealed that they recognized legitimate appeals more than illegitimate ones and victim-oriented appeals over target-oriented ones. (See Tables 17 & 18). If, for the purpose of this study, it can be argued that recognition may be a factor in attention, then the present results suggest that legitimate victim-oriented messages and illegitimate target-oriented messages may be more cognitively demanding (that is, get more attention) than their counterparts. By an extension of these results, one could then suggest the implications of these results for various appeals for help and charity. It could be argued that it would be better to use victim-oriented appeals when the request was one that would probably be seen as legitimate in that sub-culture, and target-oriented appeals when the request might be perceived as illegitimate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	x
Chapter	
I. RATIONALE AND LITERATURE REVIEW	1
Introduction	i
Purpose of the Study	2
Literature Review	4
II. METHODOLOGY	33
Overview	33
Video Tape	33
Audio Tape	34
Messages	35
Subjects	37
Procedure	37
III. RESULTS	40
Legitimacy Test	40
Dependent Variables	44
Recall a. Verbatim Recall	
b. Meaning Recall	
Recognition	
Helping Attitude and Message Content	
Sex Differences in Recall, Recognition, and Helping Attitudes	77

Chapter	Page
Recall	
Recognition	
Helping Attitudes	
V. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION	91
Verbatim Recall	91
Meaning Recall	92
Recognition	93
Helping Attitudes	94
Sex Differences	96
Summary	101
REFERENCES	103
APPENDICES	111

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	Page
1. Percentages of Compliance with Requests in Innes, Langer and Abelson Study	6
2. Rating of "Legitimacy"--Experiments I and II Combined	42
3. Frequency and Percentage of Verbatim Recall Scores for All Messages in Experiments I and II	47
4. Frequency and Percentage of the Subjects on the Recall Test Considering the Legitimacy Factor . . .	49
5. Frequency and Percentage of the Subjects on the Recall Test Considering the Appeals	51
6. Analysis of Victim-Oriented, Legitimate Appeals Against All Other Appeals for Verbatim Recall	52
7. Analysis of Target-Oriented, Illegitimate Appeals Against All Other Appeals for Verbatim Recall	53
8. Frequency and Percentages of the Recall for Each Part of the Messages in Experiments I and II Combined	55
9. Frequency and Percentage of Meaning Recall Scores for Messages in Experiments I and II	58
10. Frequency of the Subjects on the Meaning Recall Test According to Legitimacy Factor and Orientation of the Appeals for Experiments I and II	58

TABLES

Page

11.	Frequency of the Subjects on the Meaning Recall Test According to the Legitimacy Factor for Experiments I and II	60
12.	Frequency of the Subjects on the Meaning Recall Test According to the Appeals for Experiments I and II	61
13.	Analysis of Victim-Oriented, Legitimate Appeals Against All Other Appeals for Mean- ing Recall	62
14.	Analysis of Target-Oriented, Illegitimate Appeals Against All Other Appeals for Meaning Recall	63
15.	Frequency and Percentage for Recognition of the Messages for Combined Experiments I and II	64
16.	Frequency of the Subjects on the Recognition Test Accord- ing to Legitimacy Factor and Orientation of the Appeals for Experiments I and II	66
17.	Results of the Recognition Test Considering the Legiti- macy Factor for Experiments I and II Combined	67
18.	Results of the Recognition Test Considering the Appeals for Experiments I and II Combined	69
19.	Analysis of Victim-Oriented, Legitimate Appeals Against All Other Appeals for Recog- nition	70

TABLES	Page
20. Analysis of Target-Oriented, Illegitimate Appeals Against All Other Appeals for Recognition	71
21. Results of the Interaction on the Recognition Test	72
22. Frequency and percentage of the Subjects on the Helping Attitudes Test for Experiments I and II	73
23. Frequency of the subjects on the helping attitudes test according to legitimacy factor and orientation of the appeals for experiments I & II	75
24. Results of the Helping Attitude for Experiments I and II Considering Legitimacy	76
25. Results of the Helping Attitude for Experiments I and II Considering the Appeals	78
26. Frequency of the Subjects on the Recall Test According to Their Sex for Experiments I and II Combined	79
27. Frequency of the Subjects on the Recall Test Considering the Legitimacy Factor and Sex of the Subjects for Experiments I and II Combined	81
28. Frequency of the Subjects on the Recall Test Considering Orientation of the Appeals and Sex of the Subjects for Experiments I and II Combined	82
29. Frequency and Percentage of the Subjects on the Recognition Test According to their Sex for Combined Experiments I and II	84

TABLES

Page

30.	Frequency of the Subjects on the Recognition Test According to Their Sex and Legitimacy of the Requests for Combined Experiments I and II	85
31.	Frequency of the Subjects on the Recognition Test According to their Sex and Orientation of the Appeals for Combined Experiments I and II	86
32.	Frequency and Percentage of the Subjects Who Said "They Would Help" or "Would Not Help" According to Their Sex for Combined Experiments I and II	88
33.	Frequency of the Subjects Who Said "They Would Help" or "Would Not Help" Considering the Legitimacy Factor and Sex of the Subjects for Combined Experiments I and II	89
34.	Frequency of the Subjects Who Said "They Would Help" or "Would Not Help" Considering Orientation of the Appeals And Sex of the Subjects for Combined Experiments I and II	90
35.	Summary of the Results Considering Sex Differences	97
36.	Summary of the Results	100
37., 38., 39., 40., and 41.	Distribution of the Population in the Present Study According to Their Sex, Age, Ethnic Background, Size of Hometown, and Location of Residence	124-126

CHAPTER I

EFFECTS OF MESSAGE ORDER ON MEMORY FOR A REQUEST FOR HELP

RATIONALE AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

There has been considerable research on the communication-related factors that influence the effectiveness of a message. These factors include where the message originates, who delivers the message, how the message is delivered, what the message says, and how the message is organized. In addition, other factors influence the effectiveness of a message including the receiver's perception of the messenger, message, and general circumstances. In this research, the investigator was concerned, in particular, with the receiver's, or subject's, memory of a viewed message (a request for help) in terms of recall and recognition of the message's content and structure, or meaning and semantic organization. Within a laboratory setting the present study included testing the subjects' memories about the previously viewed request for help. The tests concerned recall and recognition in terms of the

legitimacy factor and its combination with two types of appeal (victim-oriented and target-oriented) in a request for help.

Purpose of the Study

Message Order and Helping

The purpose of the present study was to explore a hypothesis, derived from a study by Langer and Abelson (1972) that small semantic variations in requests for help would affect helping responses. Specifically, the hypothesis was that legitimate requests for help using a victim-oriented appeal and illegitimate requests for help using a target-oriented appeal are remembered better than legitimate target-oriented messages and illegitimate victim-oriented ones.

The specific parameters used in this study, "legitimacy" and "orientation of the appeal" (victim or target) were taken directly from the Langer and Abelson study, and these terms are defined as they were used therein.. As is usually in the procedures in investigation of this kind, the two standard methods for testing memory, recall and recognition, were used. This procedure is explained in greater detail in context. It is generally acknowledged that recall memory is more difficult than recognition memory. Using both kinds of memory tests, therefore, gave us a strong and a weak test of the hypothesis. So, confirmation of the hypothesis either in re-

call or in recognition memory would mean that the interaction of legitimacy and orientation were in fact, remembered better. The implications of this study extend beyond the confines of the Langer and Abelson study, however. Those investigators did not say exactly why legitimate requests crossed with victim-oriented appeals and illegitimate ones with target-oriented appeals should increase helping response rates. It is the argument of the present study that, somehow-or-other, these kinds of appeals receive more attention and therefore, lead to more helping. If this argument is correct, at least in part, then these kinds of appeals should also be remembered better. This, then, was the rationale for the hypothesis. But the implication of the results, if confirmed, relate to other kinds of appeals: for charity, for community and political cooperation, for participation in any kind of altruistic endeavor, and many more. In the context that follows, each of the methods and factors will be discussed in detail.

A final concern was with the effect of message manipulation on the viewing subjects' reply to the item about helping. The reader should be aware that this item asked the audience of subjects whether they thought they would have helped in a situation like the one they had just seen. These results are covered in Tables 22, 23, 24 and 25. Table 24 shows that significantly more subjects said they would have helped in this situation if the message contained a legitimate appeal rather than an illegitimate one. Table 25 shows that

more subjects said they would have helped with victim-oriented appeals than target-oriented ones; although the differences are not very great (89 percent as opposed to 77 percent), and the chi-square was not significant. Therefore, this particular item was a question about attitudes toward helping in a viewed situation, rather than getting an actual commitment to help.

Literature Review

Since the present study was based upon the Langer and Abelson (1972) study which was later partially replicated by Innes (1974), it is important to first review these two studies in detail. Following that, appears a review of other relevant studies concerning the variable of legitimacy to helping behavior and some selected studies related to memory.

Legitimacy Studies

Langer and Abelson (1972) in two field experiments tested the effect of subtle semantic variations of the frequency of compliance to requests for help. The help appeals were identical except for sentence order and were thus characterized by the wording of the opening phrases to the potential helper. The "victim-oriented" appeal directed attention to the victim's plight. The "target-oriented" appeal emphasized the duty or responsibility of the target to offer

assistance. It was hypothesized that compliance to a legitimate favor would be greater when the opening phrases were "victim-oriented" rather than "target-oriented." On the other hand, compliance to an illegitimate favor was expected to be greater with a "target-oriented" approach. The favor involved making a phone call for a distressed person. Experimental conditions were balanced for legitimacy and orientation. Langer and Abelson used a 2x2 analysis of the two factors of legitimacy and orientation of the appeal for treating the data. The hypothesized interaction between legitimacy and type of appeal was strongly confirmed. The legitimacy variable made a very large difference when the appeal was "victim-oriented," but no difference when the appeal was "target-oriented."

The importance of the legitimacy variable was confirmed in the Innes (1974) study. This study, in an attempt to replicate Langer and Abelson (1972) study, repeated Langer's second experiment in Scotland with some changes to adapt to a different culture. His purpose was to test the hypothesis as in Langer and Abelson that the form in which an appeal for help is made, dependent upon the legitimacy of the request and the orientation of the appeal, will affect the helping rate. The favor involved posting a bulky envelope for a distressed person. The results confirmed Langer and Abelson's findings. Compliance to a legitimate favor was higher when the emphasis was placed upon the plight of the victim (victim-oriented).

Whereas, compliance to an illegitimate favor was higher when the request emphasized the responsibility of the helper (target-oriented).

Table 1 shows the percentages of people agreeing to post the envelope in the Innes (1974) study and in the second experiment done by Langer and Abelson (1972).

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGES OF COMPLIANCE WITH
REQUESTS IN INNES, LANGER AND ABELSON STUDIES

REQUEST	APPEALS	
	Victim-Oriented	Target-Oriented
Legitimate	90% (80%)	80% (55%)
Illegitimate	75% (20%)	80% (45%)

Note: Percentages based on N=20 in every cell. Data in parentheses are from Langer and Abelson (1972), second experiment.

In terms of the legitimacy, the Scottish data overall indicate that the legitimate request elicited a compliance rate of $(\frac{90\% + 80\%}{2}) = 85\%$ and the illegitimate a rate of $(\frac{75\% + 80\%}{2}) = 77\frac{1}{2}\%$. The same results from Langer and Abelson

were $(\frac{80\% + 55\%}{2}) = 67\%$ for legitimate and $(\frac{20\% + 45\%}{2}) = 32\frac{1}{2}\%$ for illegitimate type of request. The difference between the legitimate and illegitimate requests in the Scottish study was $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ ($85\% - 77\frac{1}{2}\%$) which is not statistically significant. On the other hand, difference between legitimate and illegitimate requests in the American study was $35\frac{1}{2}\%$ ($67\% - 32\%$) which was highly significant. The significant difference between the legitimate and illegitimate requests in the American study was quite understandable. Obviously, people will be more likely to comply only with a request they think is legitimate. When they are given the opportunity to act emphatically, they comply more often to requests they believe warrant their empathy, i.e. a legitimate favor. It can be argued that when people feel that they are being used, they become resistant and do not comply with an illegitimate request for help. For example, if a victim asks someone to make a telephone call to her spouse because she has sustained a slight injury, the target, or helper, sees that as a legitimate request. However, the same request to call the victim's employer to "tell him I'll be late" may smack of malin-gering and be viewed as relatively illegitimate.

Finally, as noted in Table 1, when the appeal is target-oriented, the legitimacy variable makes little or no difference in the Scottish study or in the American one. There is good reason why the legitimacy of the request should make little or no difference when the appeal is target-oriented.

Whether the request for help is legitimate or illegitimate in the target-oriented appeal, the pressure of decision is immediately put on the potential helper (e.g. the message is, "Would you do something for me?"). It forces the helper to review his own situation and mood before he even knows what the request is. He does not have an invitation to act empathically as he would if the appeal were victim-oriented. Instead of his attention being focused upon the plight of the victim, his thoughts are shifted away from the specifics of the requested favor to his own personal considerations: Does he have time? Does he feel in the mood? Will he win the gratitude of the victim? In effect, will the target choose to act in a dutiful way? According to the data, the target will respond empathically to a legitimate target-oriented appeal as often as he responds dutifully to an illegitimate target-oriented appeal. Thus, the legitimacy variable is virtually insignificant in target-oriented appeals because whether or not the target responds empathically or dutifully, he is still complying to the victim's communicated message or appeal for help.

On the other hand, the two victim-oriented cells in Table 1 display quite a different picture. Here, the evidence shows that when the appeal is victim-oriented, the attention of the helper is focused on the characteristics of the victim and her state of mind. In such circumstances, the helper then has the option to act empathically depending

upon whether he views the victim's need as legitimate or illegitimate. Thus, the difference is significant between compliance to legitimate and illegitimate requests: $(90\% - 75\%) = 15\%$ for the Scottish and $(80\% - 20\%) = 60\%$ for the American study.

Again, according to Table 1, the $7\frac{1}{2}$ percent difference between legitimate and illegitimate requests in the Scottish study allows one to hazard the guess that the Scottish people when asked for help are more willing to help than Americans. In other words, regardless of the type of request (legitimate or illegitimate) Scots would help the bystander. On the other hand, in the American sample with 35 percent difference between legitimate and illegitimate requests, one may conclude that American culture teaches that people should not let others take advantage of them and that they should comply, whenever possible, only with legitimate requests to help those in need.

One might question the reasons for the different results in these two studies. It is a fact that "helping behavior" is a multidimensional concept, involving both communication and behavioral aspects. The higher level of compliance in the Scottish study could be attributed to many factors such as age, sex, ethnic background, size of the city, cost and consequences of helping, and attitudes toward helping. There are also environmental factors of the population such as degree of movement, urbanization, density, type of setting and time

pressure. All these factors, considered together could have easily caused the different results in the two studies. If these experiments were conducted in a third country with a different culture, the results of that study would probably also vary in line with the characteristics of that specific culture.

The legitimacy variable has been examined in other studies of helping behavior. Briefly, these studies also indicate that the nature of the victim's need interacts with the legitimacy of the request for help.

In a laboratory setting, Schopler and Matthews (1965) conducted an experiment to check the hypothesis that a powerful person who perceives his partner's dependence to be caused by "external" factors (circumstances beyond one's control) will help more than a powerful person who perceives his partner's dependence to be caused by "internal" factors (personal or self-created). It was expected that someone who chooses to become dependent "internal" focus is not likely to arouse the "norm of social responsibility" (according to Berkowitz (1969) in a shared societal ideal, the assistance should be given to people in need) because he will be seen as responsible for his own fate. The powerful person would be expected to offer him little help because the legitimacy of the partner's dependency would not be enough to expect a strong response in helping behavior. In contrast, the partner who is forced by circumstances to be dependent is more likely to be seen as some-

one for whom the social responsibility norm is appropriate . and as someone whose dependence is legitimate. His dependence is not of his own making and he may, therefore, be seen as "deserving" of help. Results, as predicted, showed that when the person in need of help was a victim of circumstances, he was helped more often than in the cases when he was being dependent of his own violation.

In his study, Berkowitz (1969) found significant relationships between the degree of a partner's dependency on a subject and how much work the subject did for his partner under externally (legitimate) and internally (illegitimate) caused dependency. His study pointed out that one's motivation in regard to a social responsibility norm to help a dependent person is greatly affected by situational conditions. Generally speaking, the clearer the rule that help-giving is morally necessary in the given situation, the stronger is the motivation to aid the dependent other and the greater is the the discomfort aroused by anticipated departures from the ideal. Clear-cut rules minimize the possibility of the subject's establishing suitable excuses for not aiding the dependent individual. Such excuses can be found, for example, in the belief that the other person's dependency is improper or "illegitimate."

In addition to assessing the subject's frequency of compliance to the partners' request for help, Berkowitz. (1968) also assessed the comparative level of the subject's resentment

when confronted by a legitimately dependent partner (i.e., a person needing assistance because of conditions he could not control), as well as the resentment in subjects faced by an internally (illegitimate) dependent other. His findings indicate that when the partner required help because of circumstances beyond his control and his (legitimate) dependency was greater on the subject, the subject tended to turn out more work on the partner's behalf even though the subject bore a low level of resentment toward the partner's request for assistance. When the partner's own deficiency had made him (illegitimately) dependent on the subject, that (internal) dependence was associated with the subject's somewhat lower level of work on the partner's behalf and with the subject's greater resentment toward the partner.

Field (1974) suggests that the singular fact of dependency by one person on another does not automatically cause evocation of the social norm of responsibility. She believes instead, that the sense of responsibility is determined by the dependency situation and that in some situations the norm of social responsibility is legitimately evoked and in others it is not. In dependency situations, the independent person evaluates the situation and decides whether or not the norm of social responsibility should be legitimately evoked in that particular circumstance. Thus, it is Field's idea that dependency is a self-defined characteristic of the situation by the dependent individual; legitimacy is an other-defined character-

ristic of the situation by the independent individual. If the independent individual does not legitimate the dependency situation, then the norm of social responsibility is not evoked, the power of the norm does not enter the situation, and the outcome will be less favorable to the dependent individual. Field (1974) hypothesized that a request which has a high legitimacy base for the evocation of the norm of social responsibility will produce results defined as more favorable by the requestee than one which has a low legitimacy base. To test this hypothesis a dependency situation was selected, and three treatment conditions that would create different legitimacy perceptions by the subjects were employed.

A field experiment design was conducted in a chain of convenience store. The experimenter, or dependent one, entered a store and tried to purchase an item with insufficient change, \$.30 less than the purchase price. After alerting the clerk, or subject, to her insufficient amount of money, the experimenter would pause briefly to allow the subject to offer to let her have the item. If there were no offer, the experimenter would then ask if she could have the item and return the money at a later time. The subject had the power to decide whether or not to offer the item or to take less money with the promise to pay later, or to refuse the experimenter's request. The items that the experimenter attempted to purchase were thought to influence the subject's perceptions of legitimacy. In eight stores the experimenter attempted to

buy beer (low legitimacy base); in another eight stores she tried to buy milk for her baby (medium legitimacy base); and in another eight stores she tried to buy an antiseptic and anesthetic ointment for first aid purposes in taking care of her burned baby (high legitimacy base). The data indicated a marked trend in the hypothesized direction between a request with a low legitimacy base. The communicated message with the high legitimate base elicited the greatest frequency of compliance to the dependent individual's request for help.

After reviewing Langer and Abelson (1972), Innes (1974), Schopler and Matthews (1965), Berkowitz (1969), and Field (1974), one may conclude that in addition to the legitimacy of a request being significantly influential in the different subjects' decisions to comply with helping behaviors, the subjects were also influenced by the motivation and degree of dependency of the "victim", or dependent individual. As could be inferred from the previously reviewed studies, dependency is that lacking of power to control necessary to meet one's needs. The following studies were most concerned with that dependency and whether or not the dependency was regarded by a target, or subject, as being the result of externally produced factors (environmental) or internally produced factors (personal) and how and to what extent the subject's evaluation affected his response.

Schopler and Matthews (1965), previously reviewed in terms of the legitimacy variable, also demonstrated that subjects gave greater assistance to the partner requiring their

help because of factors beyond his control (external locus of dependency) than to a person needing help because of his own shortcomings (internal locus of dependency).

Similarly, Horowitz (1968) found that subjects were more willing to assist an internally dependent individual if they had a choice as to whether to help him or not, perhaps because the choice lowered reactance and made it unnecessary to find an excuse for not assisting the other person. Brehm and Sensenig (1966) defined psychological reactance as "...A motivational state directed toward the reestablishment of whatever freedom has been threatened or eliminated (p. 703)." Therefore, if a subject is being forced to give aid he could reestablish his freedom by not helping. Horowitz (1968) focused upon the effect of the subject's "freedom of choice" and the locus of the other's dependence on helping behavior. One hundred and twenty (subjects) were randomly assigned to either high-choice or no-choice conditions in a helping situation. They were also given conditions of either external or internal locus in the dependent individual's situation. It was suggested that under no-choice conditions, the subjects' psychological reactance would be aroused by a request for aid from one who is internally dependent. In accordance with previous findings, it was predicted that more help would be given to one who is externally, as opposed to internally, dependent under conditions of no choice. A second hypothesis was that the amount of help given to a dependent other would depend

directly on the amount of freedom the more powerful person had in deciding whether or not to help. As predicted, the data showed that more help was given to the dependent other under high-choice as contrasted to no-choice conditions. The internally dependent person received more help under high-choice than no-choice conditions, as predicted. Unexpectedly, the internally dependent person was helped more by the powerful individual under high-choice conditions than was the externally dependent person. The reason for the latter finding was not clear to the experimenter. It seems apparent that the perception of other's dependence is differentially affected by the amount of choice the helping person possesses. In this study, under the high-choice conditions, subject might have interpreted the dependency (internal locus) more favorably than under no-choice conditions. In any event, a situation which allows for increased freedom of choice for the helping person enhances desirable adherence to the social responsibility norm.

Gruder, Romer, and Korth (1978) attempted to explain reversals as occurred in the Horowitz (1968) study in addition to testing their proposal that when the requestor is very dependent and the potential benefactor thus feels responsible to help, the benefactor is likely to interpret the requestor's negligence as an indication of how needy he is. That is, prior negligence may be a sign of characteristic incompetence and thereby elicit more help. This is consistent with the

norm of social responsibility (Berkowitz, 1972; Schwartz, 1975) which has often been invoked to explain helping. On the other hand, when the requestor's dependency is low and the potential helper does not feel responsible to help, he may interpret evidence of prior negligence as an indication that the request is illegitimate. Someone who is at fault for being in a predicament does not deserve to be helped. According to this study, different norm must be called on a "norm of self-sufficiency." This norm dictates that persons should take responsibility for their own well being and that they should only receive assistance if they demonstrate that they have. The purpose of this particular study was to demonstrate the interaction of dependency and fault on helping, which would replicate separately observed findings that a requestor's fault sometimes elicits more help and sometimes less.

In a natural setting Gruder et al. investigated a female requestor's dependency on the subject for help and whether or not she was at fault for her plight. It was predicted that the negligent requestor would be more likely to receive help than the victim of circumstance when her dependency was high, but would be less likely to receive help than the negligent requestor would be more likely to receive help when her dependency was low. Randomly selected telephone subscribers received a "wrong number" telephone call from a stranded woman motorist. The woman asked the subject to make a phone call for her; the dependent variable was whether

the subject helped by making the call. Results were consistent with predictions. When dependency was high, the victim's negligence appeared to operate as an indication of greater need, whereas when dependency was low, it seemed to operate as a sign that the victim was less deserving of help. However, the fact that the direction of the fault effect reverses as dependency varies suggests that there is considerable complexity in people's reactions to the fault of the requestor and that no simple principle can encompass the results. If adherence to the norm of social responsibility were the only determinant of helping, the effect of fault would not reverse itself under conditions of low dependency. Instead, it appears that a different process is at work when dependency is low. The existence of two distinctly different helping norms can explain the reversal in the effect of requestor fault as a function of requestor dependency.

In considering the dependency variable and its locus (external or internal) these studies have run parallel in their attention to three sources of motivation that have proven to affect helping behavior. First is the desired adherence to the norm of social responsibility. In general, people feel compelled to comply with reasonable requests, and they regularly follow rules they learned in early childhood in order to avoid guilt feelings (as well as social disapproval; (Berkowitz, 1969). Individual differences in moral behavior are linked

primarily to differences in the degree to which relevant moral standards have been internalized (i.e., in regard to helping behavior, one learns early through life experiences when and under what conditions to help people in need.)

A second motivation that affects one's helping behavior is the "norm of self-sufficiency" (Gruder, Romer, and Korth, 1978). Because life experiences also teach people that there are many times when they must take responsibility for their own well being, they also learn that unless they attempt to do so, help may not be readily forthcoming. Tied closely to this norm is the third motivating force, psychological reactance (Brehm, 1966), that affects helping behavior. In one way or another, more specifically the acquiescence or the refusal of assistance. A victim's dependency (whether internal or external locus) may cause the target, or subject, to feel that whatever demand is being made, it is one that implies an unwelcome limitation on his range of behavioral options in a response to the request for help.

Thus, in a communicated message or appeal for help, the dependency variable, like the legitimacy variable, is highly significant in evaluating a person's response to that request for help. The communication involved between the victim and the target reveals the degree of the situation's legitimacy and the victim's dependency. How the target assesses the circumstances provides the source of his motivation to act or react in a helping situation.

Memory Studies

Studies measuring memory in terms of recall and recognition are not new. In free recall, as Ellis (1972) described it, the subject is presented a series of verbal items one at a time and required to recall the items with no regard to order. The order of presentation of the units on each trial is varied, and the learner is free to recall in any order chosen. In free recall the learner is not passive but is actively involved in searching for grouping rules and imposing structure or organization on the learning tasks. In recognition, as Ellis (1972) describes it, the learner is shown a series of items in a study phase and then is tested for recognition on subsequent trials. In other words, recognition is the process by which we become able to distinguish familiar from unfamiliar events in the environment. Recognition learning is similar to free recall learning during the study phase, but it is different during the testing phase. During testing, the learner is presented with a series of items and asked to select from that list those items he has already been presented with. The series of test items consist of both correct and incorrect (distractor) items that are similar to the correct items. Therefore, recognition does not require the learner to produce the items but only to recognize them. The difference between recall and recognition can be identified easily. Their difference can be represented by the use of the concept of "comparison and decision" for recognition and "search" for recall.

A review of the literature on the recall and recognition shows a superiority of recognition to active recall. For example, Andrew and Bird (1938) found that recognition was superior to active recall when the number of correct responses was compared after a constant amount of practice. Postman, Jenkins, and Postman (1948) also found that after a constant amount of practice, recognition was significantly better than recall. Davis, Sutherland, and Judd (1961) also suggested that recognition was superior to recall because it involved response selection from fewer alternatives.

In addition to the literature on recall and recognition, many psycholinguistic studies dealing with the relationship between language and memory have been conducted. In general, these studies yield the same finding: The semantic content or meaning of a sentence, passage, message, or story is remembered much better than its actual syntactical structure. Subjects demonstrated that they often can not recognize or recall a particular syntactic expression of information, but they can remember accurately the semantic content. Theorists in this area of research stress the active participation of the listener in their emphasis on "constructive memory theory." According to them, the listener constructs semantic descriptions of situations from the linguistic input and incorporates them into his knowledge of the world.

Some early studies indicated that the meaning of verbal material was the most important factor in determining the later recall of the material. Some studies reveal that sub-

jects could remember little or nothing about the actual stimulus; all they could remember was the meaning. These findings support the evidence that recall of a specific sentence must be the result of reconstruction based on meaning.

Bartlett (1932) argued that recall is seldom exact; rather he said, it is constructed or reconstructed from a few remembered details combined with an impression left by the original. Recallers think the result is actually a reproduction of what they have retained. Whereas, in fact, it has been built up from fragments.

Mehler (1963) argued the fact that a person can often rephrase "in his own words" the general sense of a nonmemorized message. Such rephrasing would seem to indicate that semantic components of a meaningful message are easier to recall than are its specific grammatical details. He attempted to explore this possible difference by conducting an experiment in which his results suggested a partial answer to the question of how subjects can remember the general sense even when they cannot repeat it verbatim. The suggested answer was that subjects do not recall the sentence verbatim, but rather they analyze it syntactically and encode it as a kernel sentence plus appropriate transformation. In other words, subjects analyze the sentences into a semantic component plus syntactic correction when they learn them, and this separation of semantic content from syntactic form is one reason that the general meaning of a message is generally so much easier to

to recall than its exact wording.

Sachs (1967) reported a study in which subjects were to listen to passages and then attempt to recognize changes in the sentences they heard. With this method, subjects tried to remember as much as they could about the original form of the sentences. The results suggested that information about the particular syntactic form of a sentence is quickly forgotten, while its semantic content is very well retained. Thus, the memory of the meaning is not dependent on memory of the original form of the sentence. These findings were taken as support of the idea that linguistic material becomes encoded in terms of meaning.

In another study, Sachs (1974) attempted to broaden the generality of the earlier study by including both auditory and visual presentation of linguistic material. After reading or listening to short passages, subjects attempted to recognize semantically changed sentences and paraphrases (syntactically and lexically changed sentences). The intervals between the original presentation and test ranged from 1 to 23 seconds. In general, paraphrases were poorly detected after a brief time, supporting earlier findings that the exact wording of sentences is not stored in long-term memory. Thus, Sach's results support the notion that comprehension of a sentence requires the use of the words to get to the meaning, and once that occurs, the specific words are not stored. In order to recall the sentence, then, the words would have to be

reconstructed from the meaning.

The primacy of semantic memory over syntactic-lexical memory was demonstrated in a different manner by Bransford and Franks (1971) and Franks and Bransford (1972). They demonstrated that subjects combine the information expressed in separate but semantically-related sentences into "wholistic" semantic ideas. Their subjects demonstrated high false recognition rates for new sentences that incorporated all of the information characteristic of the complete idea. Other studies have distinguished between semantic memory and memory for deep structure, indicating that it is primarily the semantic information that is retained rather than the deep structure information.

The results of the three experiments conducted by Bransford and Franks (1971) indicate that subjects acquire something more general or abstract than simply a list of those sentences experienced during acquisition. Subjects integrated the information communicated by sets of individual sentences to construct "wholistic" ideas. Memory was a function of those ideas acquired during acquisition. The studies of Bransford and Franks and their associates indicated that recall of sentences is related to comprehension of the sentences. The results also indicated that comprehending utterances entails doing more than simply extracting the meaning from each sentence as it is heard or read. First, the information from several sentences can be combined into a more detailed

and complete structure than that conveyed by any single sentence individually. Second, the information in sentences may serve as the basis for the production of additional information by the hearer, as when an inference is made from the information. These results are therefore supportive of the notion that recall depends upon reconstruction.

Experimenters in constructive memory usually present subjects with a variety of oral or written sentences from which inferences may be drawn. From this paradigm the researchers can test subjects' knowledge of important semantic information and their construction of ideas. Such had been confirmed by Bransford et al., 1972. An implicit assumption of the constructive memory perspective was well stated by Bransford et al. (1972) "People carry meanings and linguistic inputs that merely act as cues which people can use, recreate, and modify their previous knowledge of the world."

Hirata's (1980) study was aimed at investigating the effect of prior knowledge on comprehension and ability to remember a prose passage. It was found that a group given an appropriate context in advance gained an exceptionally high meaning retention score. On the other hand, there was no difference between groups in correct responses. The results pointed to the conclusion that subjects hearing a passage tended to remember the meaning of sentences but to forget its form rather rapidly. Also, in this study, two factors found to be of greatest importance were the order of context. The

results suggest that in the comprehension of a sentence linguistic input is only one of several factors which promote memory, and that the effect of context is very important in these processes.

Theoretical shift in constructive memory approach is toward a consideration of many psychological variables, linguistic and non-linguistic, in ideation itself. Hirata's (1980) study is indicative of such a shift. The results supported previous studies such as Sach(1967) in that people listening to connected discourse tend to remember the meaning of sentences rather rapidly. However, more important to the present study is the finding that subjects who were given appropriate context in advance performed significantly well in ability to remember meaning.

The concept of appropriate context, or background, could be linked to the "knowledge of the world" that one has or doesn't have when confronting legitimate or illegitimate situation in everyday life. One's knowledge of the world cues his thinking processes and behavior in a given situation. Based upon previous knowledge, a person will confront, sort, and accept or reject presented messages and he will respond or react, positively or negatively, to his environment. Thus, a plurality of psychological variables, linguistic and nonlinguistic, are responsible for the person's encoding of communications and his physical response to those communications.

The role that memory plays in the communication and res-

ponse process is therefore highly significant. A person's perception of what is important information is responsible for what he stores in his memory for immediate and future use. Johnson (1970) investigated the relationship between the perceived importance of ideas in a passage and their recall. He found that ideas perceived as being more important to the passage were more likely to be recalled. Remembering more important ideas or information rather than other relatively insignificant data would appear to be a logical, rational behavior. However, Langer, Blank, and Chanowitz (1978) raise questions in their study about such rational behavior. Their study does not question the assumption that people attend to their world and derive behavioral strategies based on current incoming information, nor does it question whether people are capable of thoughtful action. They question whether, in fact, behavior is actually accomplished much of the time without paying attention to the substantive details of the "informative" environment. They are most concerned with behavior that is commonly assumed to be mindful but may be, in fact, rather automatic. They refer to this type behavior as mindless behavior -- mindless in the sense that attention is not paid precisely to those substantive elements that are relevant for the successful resolution of the situation. It has all the external earmarks of mindful action, but new information actually is not being processed. Instead, prior scripts, written when similar information really was once new, are stereotypically reenacted.

(To Abelson (1976), a script is a "highly stylized sequence of typical events in a well-understood situation,... a coherent sequence of events expected by the individual, involving him either as a participant or as an observer.")

The notion of a script as used to describe the aforementioned study by Langer and Abelson (1972), indicates that the asking of a favor has certain script dimensions and that the success of getting compliance depends on the specific syntax of the request rather than on the specific content of the statement. Thus, the idea of a script speaks to the individual's ability to abide by the particulars of the situation without mindful reference to those particulars.

Langer, Blank, and Chanowitz (1978) undertook three field experiments similar to those in the Langer and Abelson (1972) study involving an appeal for a favor. However, the purpose of their study was to test the mindlessness of ostensibly thoughtful action in the domains of spoken and written communication. It was hypothesized that when habit is inadequate, thoughtful behavior will result and that this will be the case when either of two conditions is met: (a) when the message transmitted is structurally (rather than semantically) novel or (b) when the interaction requires an effortful response. The results support the hypothesis that an interaction that appears to be mindful can, nevertheless, proceed rather automatically between two people who are strangers to each other and thus have no history that would enable precise

prediction of each other's behavior, and in which there are no formal roles to fall back on to replace that history, if a reason for the favor were presented to the subject, the subject was more likely to comply than if no reasons were presented, even if the reason conveyed no information. Once compliance with the request required a modicum of effort on the subject's part, thoughtful responding seemed to take place of mindlessness, and the reason now seemed to matter. Under these circumstances, subjects were more likely to comply with the request based on the adequacy of the reason presented.

These results seem to support the line of thought that one's memory stores information gained from everyday experiences to provide a background for future use. If, in a help-request situation, the information stored in a subject's memory is inadequate in cueing him to react in a "stereotypical" manner i.e. mindlessly, then the effort he exerts is a result of his concentration on the meaning and reasonableness of the request. Thus, each time one receives and evaluates a request for help and judges it to be adequately deserving of his compliance, he remembers the circumstance and uses the information gained from the incident for future use.

A review of the literature concerning the legitimacy factor in a request for help yielded important implications. The degree of a victim's dependency upon a target and the locus of that dependency were important influences in the target's compliance to the request for help. In addition, the target

was motivated by other factors in his compliance to the request. These factors included the norm of social responsibility and/or the norm of self-sufficiency. In some cases the target exhibited a psychological reactance to the request and thus behaved in an unexpected way. Nevertheless, in all of the studies, the targets complied to the request for help more often when the request was viewed as legitimate.

The present study concentrated on whether or not a similar result would occur in remembering a legitimate request vs illegitimate request for help. As seen in Table 36, a significant difference was noted in the number of subjects who remembered the legitimate requests over illegitimate requests for help. Possible reasons for this significant difference lie in the fact that in general, when asked for help, one must decide if the request is appropriate and not presumptuous i.e. legitimate. If a request is judged as legitimate, then one will more likely consider the request as a reasonable one that deserves his compliance and then respond to the request in a helpful way. As to why the questioned subjects remembered the legitimate request for aid over an illegitimate request, several assumptions could be made. First the memory of subjects may have been triggered by their identification, or empathy, with the victim and her plight based upon the subject's own backgrounds, experiences, and/or "knowledge of the world." Second, their memory of the legitimate requests may have been triggered by their recognition of a sit-

uations that elicit dutiful or obligatory behavior. And third, the subjects may have remembered the legitimate requests more often because they imagined themselves in a situation (via the target) that enabled them to maintain their self-concepts by believing they would respond to a legitimate request for help were they ever in that situation. Again, identification, this time with the target and his compliance to the request, would make the subjects feel good about themselves for being "a helpful person who is socially responsible." And thus, it may seem almost desirous to remember for future reference such instances that reinforce one's self-concept in a positive way. These different reasons for remembering legitimate requests for help more often than illegitimate requests would seem to parallel the reviewed studies that focused upon behaviors motivated by different norms.

The review of the literature concerning memory revealed that recognition was repeatedly superior to recall in measuring stored information. Too, the semantic content was retained more accurately than the syntactical structure in written or verbal communication. The present study also shows that a significant difference exists between the memory of a message's content and its structure. According to Table 36, this significance in remembering content over structure is directly related to the legitimate victim-oriented appeal for help. Several reasons are possible for this relationship in

view of the cited memory studies. As stated in several studies, psychological factors influence memory. What subjects perceived as being important and/or how empathic they felt about the victim seems consistent with how they viewed the legitimacy of the situation. The influences upon what a person remembers would appear to go hand-in-hand with the finding of the present study, that is, the subjects remembered more frequently the meaning of legitimate victim-oriented requests. Their memory combined their own past experiences in helping situations with the legitimate plight of the victim. Consequently, they remembered the legitimate victim-oriented message most accurately.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Overview

In this attempt to investigate further the Langer and Abelson (1972) study in a laboratory setting, 160 students drawn from Speech Communication 1113 who were enrolled during the Spring of 1983 at the University of Oklahoma served as subjects. The stimulus materials of the study were recorded on video tape and were shown to the subjects in eight different classes. Following viewing the video tape, a questionnaire containing different questions about the legitimacy of the help requests, as well as recall, recognition and helping attitudes measures was distributed among the subjects.

Video Tape

Prior to the production of the final instruments, the video tape consisting of the four messages used in the first experiment of Langer and Abelson (1972) was pretested. The role of the woman in need of help was played by one of the graduate assistants in the Communication Department. In order to get the same picture by non-verbal means, such as

gesture, facial expressions and a constant physical setting for all of the different messages, one message for each experiment was video taped and then dubbed four times for the four different messages. The video tape was shown to one of the 1113 speech communication classes at the University of Oklahoma. After viewing the tape, the subjects were provided with a questionnaire. This questionnaire tried to collect attitudinal information about the tape. The questionnaire was then modified slightly and used in the final data collection.

Audio Tape

In order to produce the audio portion of the stimulus materials, it was necessary to maintain exactly the same intensity of delivery for all of the different forms of the messages. A narrator was hired to perform the first reading of the message which was then broken into component phrases. Since most parts of the four messages in each experiment were exactly the same (only the order of the phrases are different), her voice was recorded while she read the phrases of the first message of each experiment separately with some gap between each. Then the phrases were put together in different ways to produce the desired messages. The different messages were thus exactly the same with regard to intensity of delivery, strength and pitch of voice, and speech rate.

After the production of both audio and video portion, the audio was dubbed on the video tape. As a result of this

procedure, the different messages looked and sounded exactly the same. Any differences between messages could not likely be the result of differences in the stimuli intensity.

Messages

The tape consists of eight different messages from both of the experiments in Langer and Abelson (1972) study. Below are the four different messages used in the first experiment of the present study.

MESSAGE 1: Victim Oriented, Legitimate

My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up.

MESSATE 2: Target Oriented, Legitimate

Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.

MESSAGE 3: Victim Oriented, Illegitimate

My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late.

MESSAGE 4: Target Oriented, Illegitimate

Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.

The major difference between messages 1 and 3 or 2 and

4 is whether the object of the request was the victim's husband or her employer.

Below are the four different messages used in the second experiment of the present study. The video tape for this experiment was produced in front of the Main Post Office in Norman, Oklahoma. Two changes from the original Langer and Abelson study were made in the following four messages. First, "Safeway" was used in this study as opposed to "Macy's" in Langer and Abelson. Second, "catch a train" in Langer and Abelson study was changed to "catch a plane," because trains do not pass through Norman.

MESSAGE 1: Victim Oriented, Legitimate

I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I have to catch a plane.

MESSAGE 2: Target Oriented, Legitimate

Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. I have to catch a plane.

MESSATE 3: Victim Oriented, Illegitimate

I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this to the post office. I have to go to Safeway.

MESSAGE 4: Target Oriented, Illegitimate

Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state, and

I need this envelope mailed. I have to go to Safeway.

In the second experiment, the major difference between messages 1 and 3 or 2 and 4 is whether the woman who needs help must "catch a plane" or has to go to "Safe-way."

Subjects

The experiment was conducted at the University of Oklahoma, with 160 students of Speech Communication 1113 classes as subjects. The subjects were in eight classes (twenty students in each) that were randomly selected from among the thirty-four introductory Speech Communication classes during the Spring of 1983. Each class of twenty subjects saw only one condition.

Procedure

Each class was told by the experimenter that they would first see a scene on the video tape, and then they will be asked to fill in a questionnaire about it. Each class saw and heard only one of the eight messages while seated in their regular class-room. Included in the questionnaire were questions about whether the subjects would have helped in that situation, legitimacy, and finally some general questions about the subjects (see appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire). The questionnaire also contained the recall and recognition test questions.

For the recall test, the subjects were asked to write

word-for-word, if possible, the woman's request for help as they could remember it. If they could not repeat it word-for-word, they were asked to write it as well as they could remember it.

The recognition test was also administered as another measure of memory. In this test, the subjects were asked to circle the message which they thought they had heard from among four different given messages. The recognition test was composed of four different messages for each subject. A true message, a slightly altered true message, and another two incomplete, partially true message. Here the messages were randomized in four different forms in each class in order to control for order effect.

For the legitimacy test, following a definition of legitimate and illegitimate request, all of the eight different messages used in the present study were presented to every subject and they were asked to rate the message for legitimacy on the provided scale. The scale had three check points as follows: "clearly legitimate," "clearly not legitimate" or "questionable." The eight different messages for legitimacy test appeared as they are shown in the appended questionnaire with the only change being their order of appearance for different classes in order to control the order effects.

Finally, the subjects were asked to provide the experimenter with some general information about their gender,

age, ethnic background, approximate size of hometown, and location of residence (see sample characteristics in appendix B).

The collected information in the present study was coded for legitimacy, verbatim recall, meaning recall, recognition, helping attitude, and finally sex differences. Different scoring systems were applied in order to analyze the findings. These are discussed in the results section.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Legitimacy Test

In order to determine whether the subjects in the present study would rate "legitimacy" the same way as Langer and Abelson's (1972) subjects, all eight messages used in Langer and Abelson study were presented to the subjects in the present study. They were asked to rate the messages as "clearly legitimate," "clearly not legitimate" or "questionable" based on a description of legitimacy included with the rating task. The description of legitimacy was as follows:

The extent to which the appeal is perceived by the target as appropriate and not presumptuous. (See the legitimacy test form in the appended questionnaire.)

The results of the messages in both experiments I and II of the legitimacy test were combined in Table 2. For example, the number 175 in the first row indicates the combined result of frequency in response to the first message in experiments I and II. The same procedure is used for the second, third, and fourth messages in experiments I and II.

From Table 2, one can see that 55 percent of the subjects (N=175) who responded to the first message of both experiments I and II (legitimate, victim-oriented), considered them as "clearly legitimate." The remaining 45 percent of the subjects (N=145) judged them as "clearly not legitimate" (11 percent) or "questionable" (34 percent). Of the second message of experiment I and II (legitimate, target-oriented), 37 percent of the subjects (N=118) judged these messages as "clearly legitimate"; while the remaining 63 percent (N=202) felt that the messages were "clearly not legitimate" (15 percent) or "questionable" (48 percent). The combination of the results of the third message of experiments I and II (illegitimate, victim-oriented), showed that 23 percent of the subjects (N=75) judged them as "clearly legitimate." The remaining 77 percent (N=245) believed that the messages were either "clearly not legitimate" (42 percent) or "questionable" (35 percent). Only 17 percent of the subjects (N=53) who rated the final messages of experiments I and II (illegitimate, target-oriented), regarded them as "clearly not legitimate" (52 percent) or "questionable" (31 percent).

It is clear from the findings above that not all of our subjects judged legitimacy and illegitimacy the same as Langer and Abelson's subjects did. In order to test our hypothesis, however, it was necessary to have congruence between the experimenter's and the subjects' perception of

TABLE 2
RATING OF "LEGITIMACY"--EXPERIMENTS I AND II COMBINED

Messages	Legitimacy	Clearly Legitimate	Questionable	Clearly Not Legitimate	Total
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency
MESSAGE I-1: Victim-Oriented, Legitimate. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up.	175	55	109	34	36
MESSAGE II-1: Victim-Oriented, Legitimate. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I have to catch a plane.	118	37	154	48	48
MESSAGE I-2: Target-Oriented, Legitimate. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.	118	37	154	48	48
MESSAGE II-2: Target-Oriented, Legitimate. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. I have to catch a plane.	118	37	154	48	48
MESSAGE I-3: Victim-Oriented, Illegitimate. My knee is killing me; I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late.	75	23	112	35	133
MESSAGE II-3: Victim-Oriented, Illegitimate. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I have to go to Safeway.	75	23	112	35	133
MESSAGE I-4: Target-Oriented, Illegitimate. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.	53	17	99	31	168
MESSAGE II-4: Target-Oriented, Illegitimate. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. I have to go to Safeway.	53	17	99	31	168

legitimacy. For this reason we adopted the following procedure.

The subjects who rated as "clearly legitimate" those messages we (and Langer and Abelson) called legitimate were counted in the legitimate condition. Those who rated them as "clearly not legitimate" or "questionable" were not analyzed further. The same procedure was followed for the illegitimate requests. Those who rated as "clearly not legitimate" those messages we (and Langer and Abelson) called illegitimate were counted and those who rated them as "clearly legitimate" or "questionable" were disregarded. As a result of this refinement of the sample, 43 percent of the sample (N=69) who disagreed with Langer and Abelson judgement of legitimacy were omitted from further analysis. That left a total of 91 subjects (42 subjects in the first and 49 subjects in the second experiment). The "purified sample judged the legitimacy factor the same as Langer and Abelson's (1972) subjects did.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables used in the present study were (a) recall, (b) recognition, and (c) helping attitude. In the present study, a recall and a recognition test, already described, were given to the subjects to determine whether changing the order of the sentences in a message would make a significant difference in the amount of recall and recognition. The subjects in the present study were tested for "verbatim" as well as for "meaning" recall. The procedure for both of the tests will be explained below.

Verbatim Recall

For the verbatim recall test, each message was broken down into its four arbitrary components. In experiment I, message 1, these four components were (1) My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. (2) Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor, (3) call my husband, (4) ask him to pick me up. Thus the four components were (1) state the problem, (2) make the request of the subjects, (3) guide to target, (4) state what must be done. The four components were scored as follows: For complete correct recall of all the four components, a score of 5 was given; for three of four components recalled, a score of 4 was given; for two of four components recalled, a score of 3 was given; for one of four components recalled, a score of 2 was given; and finally where none of the four components were recalled cor-

rectly, a score of 1 was given. The experimenter scored all respondents. Below are a few examples of the scoring scheme for experiment I.

Score of 5

(1) My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up.

(2) Would you do something for me? Please do me a favour and call my employer and tell him I'll be late. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.

Score of 4

(1) Would you help me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up. My knee is killing me. I think I've sprained it.

(2) My knee is killing me. I think I sprained it. Could you do something for me. Call my husband and have him pick me up.

Score of 3

(1) My knee is killing me. I think I sprained it. Would you do me a favor? Would you call my husband for me and ask him to pick me up.

(2) Would you help me? Would you please do me a favor? Would you phone my husband and ask him to come get me? My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.

Score of 2

(1) My knee is killing me. Would you please help?
Will you call my husband to come and pick me up.

(2) Would you please help me and call my husband,
my knee is hurt. I think I sprained it.

Score of 1

(1) Excuse me, I need help will you help me to call
my husband?

(2) My leg really hurts, could you help me? I
really could use your help. Would you call my husband to
come and pick me up.

The first and second messages in experiment II were similarly broken down as follows: (1) I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. (2) Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and (3) take this envelope to the Post Office. (4) I have to catch a plane. The same scoring procedure was used for the messages in experiment II.

Table 3 gives the results of the recall test for all messages in experiments I and II.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

The first column in Table 3 shows the complete recall of the messages. As shown, none of the 91 subjects, who were used for both experiments recalled the message pre-

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF VERBATIM RECALL SCORES FOR ALL
MESSAGES IN EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Recall Scores	5 All Correct (100%)	4 Mostly Correct (75%)	3 Half Correct (50%)	2 Slightly Correct (25%)	1 None Correct (0%)	Total
Messages	%	%	%	%	%	
MESSAGE I-1: Victim-Oriented, Legitimate. My knee is kill- ing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up.	-	2 8	6 24	4 16	13 52	25
MESSAGE II-1: Victim-Oriented, Legitimate. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do some- thing for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I have to catch a plane.		(1)	(4)	(8)	(12)	
MESSAGE I-2: Target-Oriented, Legitimate. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.	-	2 8	4 15	8 31	12 46	26
MESSAGE II-2: Target-Oriented, Legitimate. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state and I need this envelope mailed. I have to catch a plane.		(1)	(4)	(8)	(13)	
MESSAGE I-3: Victim-Oriented, Illegitimate. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late.	-	- -	3 14	9 41	10 45	22
MESSAGE II-3: Victim Oriented, Illegitimate. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I have to go to Safeway.		(1)	(3)	(7)	(11)	
MESSAGE I-4: Target-Oriented, Illegitimate. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.	-	- -	- -	7 39	11 61	18
MESSAGE II-4: Target-Oriented, Illegitimate. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. I have to go to Safeway.		(1)	(3)	(5)	(9)	
TOTAL	-	4 4	13 14	28 31	46 51	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$\chi^2(9) = 12.45, P > .20$

cisely the way it was delivered. The second column shows that only 4 percent of the subjects ($N = 4$) recalled three-quarters of the message. In the third column 14 percent of the subjects ($N = 13$) recalled half (50 percent) of the message. The fourth column shows that 31 percent of the subjects ($N = 28$) recalled a fourth (25 percent) of the message. The last column shows that 51 percent of the subjects ($N = 46$) did not recall any part of the message correctly.

In order to determine whether there was a significant over-all difference among the recall measure of the combined eight messages, a chi-square test was performed. Results of the chi-square $\chi^2(9) = 12.45$ $P > .20$ were not significant. In other words, there was no difference in amount of recall among the messages.

In order to determine whether the legitimacy factor had any effect on the recall of the messages, a 2×2 chi-square test between the recall results of the legitimate and illegitimate requests was computed. These results are presented in Table 4. The chi-square was not significant; $\chi^2(1) = 0.18$.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

In order to see whether the orientation of the appeals had any effect on the amount of recall, another chi-square

TABLE 4
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE
RECALL TEST CONSIDERING THE LEGITIMACY FACTOR

Messages	Recall	Recalled Partially (75%, 50%, or 25%)	Did Not Recall (0%)	Total
Legitimate	26 (25)	51%	25 (26)	49% 51
Illegitimate	19 (20)	47.5%	21 (20)	52.5% 40
Total	45	49%	46	51% 91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(1) = 0.18$$

test was computed. The results are shown in Table 5. The chi-square result $\chi^2(1) = 0.18$ was not significant.

INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

There is another way to analyze these results and that was by analyzing legitimate-victim-oriented messages against all others, and illegitimate-target-oriented messages against all others. Results of these analyses can be seen in Tables 6 and 7. These chi-squares showed that there was no significant difference in amount of verbatim recall between either the victim-oriented-legitimate messages and all other; or the target-oriented-illegitimate messages and all others.

INSERT TABLES 6 AND 7 ABOUT HERE

Since none of the chi-squares on the recall results showed a significant difference, one can conclude that neither orientation of the appeals, nor the legitimacy factor significantly affected the amount of verbatim recall across the messages in the present study.

Meaning Recall

Although the subjects in the present study could not recall the messages verbatim, it is possible that they could

TABLE 5
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE SUBJECT ON THE
RECALL TEST CONSIDERING THE APPEALS

Recall Messages	Recalled Partially (75%, 50%, or 25%)		Did Not Recall (0%)		Total
Victim-Oriented	24 (23)	51%	23 (24)	49%	47
Target-Oriented	21 (22)	48%	23 (22)	52%	44
Total	45	49%	46	51%	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(1) = 0.18$$

TABLE 6
ANALYSIS OF VICTIM-ORIENTED, LEGITIMATE APPEALS
AGAINST ALL OTHER APPEALS FOR VERBATIM RECALL

Messages	Verbatim Recall	Recalled Partially (75%, 50%, 25%)	Did Not Recall (0%)	Total
Victim-Oriented, Legitimate		12 (12)	13 (13)	25
All Others		33 (33)	33 (33)	66
Total		45	46	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(1) = 0$$

TABLE 7
ANALYSIS OF TARGET-ORIENTED, ILLEGITIMATE APPEALS
AGAINST ALL OTHER APPEALS FOR VERBATIM RECALL

Messages	Verbatim Recall	Recalled Partially (75%, 50%, 25%)	Did Not Recall (0%)	Total
Target-Oriented, Illegitimate		7 (9)	11 (9)	18
All Others		38 (36)	35 (37)	73
Total		45	46	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(1) = 1.10$$

recall the general meaning. With this possibility in mind, a post hoc analysis was undertaken. For this analysis, each of the messages was broken down into the four functional components. These functional components were again:

(1) state the problem, (2) make the request of the subject, (3) guide to target, (4) state what must be done. The components and some examples are as follows:

1 - What is the matter? (State the problem)

Example: a. My knee is killing me.

b. I'm in a terrible state.

2 - Would you help me? (Make the request of the subject)

Example: a. Would you do something for me?

b. Would you do me a favor?

3 - What is to be done? (Guide to target)

Example: a. Call my husband.

b. Mail this envelope for me.

c. Call my employer.

4 - Why? (State what must be done?)

Example: a. To pick me up.

b. I have to go to Safeway.

c. I have to catch a plane.

In order to score the results, the responses given on the recall test were broken down into four parts according to the functional components. A score of one was given to the correct meaning recall for each component of the

message. Then the scores for each subject were totalled. Table 8, first of all, gives the number and percentage of the 91 subjects who got each component correct. As we see in Table 8, 82 percent of the subjects recalled the first part of the message, "What is the matter?"; 70 percent of the subjects recalled the second part of the message, "Would you help me?"; 96 percent of the subjects recalled the third part "What is to be done?"; and finally, 79 percent of the subjects recalled the general meaning of the fourth part of the message, "Why?" These rather high percentages of recall show that even though the subjects did not recall the exact wordings of the messages, they had some idea about the message.

TABLE 8
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGES OF THE RECALL FOR
EACH PART OF THE MESSAGES IN EXPERIMENTS
I AND II COMBINED

(Problem) What Is The Matter?	(Request) Would You Help Me?	(Guide) What Is To Be Done?	(Reason) Why?
75 (82%)	64 (70%)	87 (96%)	72 (79%)

In order to determine whether there was a significant difference among the meaning recall results of the combined eight messages, a chi-square test was performed. Results of the chi-square $\chi^2(6) = 9.39$ as shown in Table 8 were not significant. Thus, there was no significant difference in

amount of meaning recall among the messages.

INSERT TABLE 9 ABOUT HERE

In another chi-square as shown in Table 10, two levels of recall were analyzed against two levels of legitimacy and two types of appeal. Results of the test were close to significant; $\chi^2(3) = 7.76$, $P > .10$.

INSERT TABLE 10 ABOUT HERE

In order to see if legitimacy factor had any effect on the amount of meaning recall, a chi-square test was computed. Results are given in Table 11. Results of the chi-square were significant; $\chi^2(1) = 6.6$, $P < .01$.

INSERT TABLE 11 ABOUT HERE

In another chi-square, amount of recall was analyzed against the two appeals. Results are shown in Table 12. Results of the chi-square $\chi^2(1) = 0.71$ were not significant.

INSERT TABLE 12 ABOUT HERE

There is another way to analyze these results and that was by analyzing legitimate-victim-oriented messages against all others, and illegitimate-target-oriented messages against all others. Results of these analyses can be seen in Tables 13 and 14. The first chi-square showed a significant difference between victim-oriented-legitimate messages and all others; $\chi^2(1)=5.33$, $P < .05$; while the second one showed that there was no significant difference in amount of meaning recall between target-oriented-illegitimate messages and all others.

INSERT TABLES 13 AND 14 ABOUT HERE

Recognition Test

In the present study, subjects were also given a recognition test to see if recognition, as another memory measure, would be affected by message differences. Table 15 gives the frequency and percentage of the subjects on the recognition test for combined experiments I and II.

INSERT TABLE 15 ABOUT HERE

In order to determine whether there was a significant difference among the recognition results of the combined eight messages, a chi-square test was computed. Results of the chi-square $\chi^2(3) = 11.71$, $P < .01$ as shown in Table 15

TABLE 9
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF MEANING RECALL SCORES
FOR MESSAGES IN EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Messages	Recall Scores	5 All Correct (100%)	4 Mostly Correct (75%)	3 Half Correct (50%)	2 Slightly Correct (25%)	1 None Correct (0%)	Total
MESSAGE I-1: Victim-Oriented, Legitimate. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up.		17 63%	7 26%	3 11%	- -	- -	27
MESSAGE II-1: Victim-Oriented, Legitimate. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I have to catch a plane.		(12)	(11)	(4)			
MESSAGE I-2: Target-Oriented, Legitimate. Would you do some- thing for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up. My knee is killing me. I think I sprained it.		12 46%	10 39%	4 15%	- -	- -	26
MESSAGE II-2: Target-Oriented, Legitimate. Would you do some- thing for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state and I need this envelope mailed. I have to catch a plane.		(11)	(10)	(4)			
MESSAGE I-3: Victim-Oriented, illegitimate. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late.		6 30%	10 50%	4 20%	- -	- -	20
MESSAGE II-3: Victim-Oriented, illegitimate. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I have to go to Safeway.		(9)	(8)	(3)			
MESSAGE I-4: Target-Oriented, illegitimate. Would you do some- thing for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.		5 28%	9 50%	4 22%	- -	- -	18
MESSAGE II-4: Target-Oriented, illegitimate. Would you do some- thing for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. I have to go to Safeway.		(8)	(7)	(2)			
Total		40 44%	36 40%	15 16%	- -	- -	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(6) = 9.39$$

TABLE 10
 FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE MEANING RECALL
 TEST ACCORDING TO LEGITIMACY FACTOR AND
 ORIENTATION OF THE APPEALS FOR
 EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Messages Recall	Legitimate		Illegitimate		Total
	Victim- Oriented	Target- Oriented	Victim- Oriented	Target- Oriented	
Recalled	17	12	6	5	40
Completely	(12)	(11)	(9)	(8)	
Recalled	10	14	14	13	51
Partially	(15)	(15)	(11)	(10)	
Total	27	26	20	18	91

$\chi^2(3) = 7.76$ (close to significant), $P > .10$.

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

TABLE 11
 FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE MEANING RECALL
 TEST ACCORDING TO THE LEGITIMACY FACTOR
 FOR EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Messages	Meaning Recall	Recalled Completely (100%)	Recalled Partially (75%, 50%, 25% or 0%)	Total
Legitimate		29 (23)	24 (30)	53
Illegitimate		11 (17)	27 (21)	38
Total		40	51	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$\chi^2(1) = 6.6, P < .01$

TABLE 12
 FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE MEANING RECALL
 TEST ACCORDING TO THE APPEALS FOR
 EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Meaning Recall	Recalled Completely (100%)	Recalled Partially (75%, 50%, 25% or 0%)	Total
Messages			
Victim-Oriented	23 (21)	24 (26)	47
Target-Oriented	17 (19)	27 (25)	44
Total	40	51	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(1) = 0.71$$

TABLE 13
ANALYSIS OF VICTIM-ORIENTED, LEGITIMATE APPEALS
AGAINST ALL OTHER APPEALS FOR MEANING RECALL

Meaning Recall	Recalled Completely (100%)	Recalled Partially (75%, 50%, 25% or 0%)	Total
Messages			
Victim-Oriented, Legitimate	17 (12)	10 (15)	27
All Others	23 (28)	41 (36)	64
Total	40	51	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$\chi^2(1) = 5.33, P < .05$

TABLE 14

ANALYSIS OF TARGET-ORIENTED, ILLEGITIMATE APPEALS
AGAINST ALL OTHER APPEALS FOR MEANING RECALL

	Meaning Recall	Recalled Completeley	Recalled Partially (75%, 50%, 25%, or 0%)	Total
Messages				
Target-Oriented		5	13	18
Illegitimate		(8)	(10)	
All Others		35	38	73
		(32)	(41)	
Total		40	51	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(1) = 2.53$$

TABLE 15
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE FOR RECOGNITION OF THE
MESSAGES FOR COMBINED EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Messages	Recognition	Recognized Correctly	%	Did Not Recognize	%	Total
MESSAGE I-1: Victim-Oriented, Legitimate. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up.		17	63	10	37	27
MESSAGE II-1: Victim-Oriented, Legitimate. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I have to catch a plane.		(16)		(11)		
MESSAGE I-2: Target-Oriented, Legitimate. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.		21	81	5	19	26
MESSAGE II-2: Target-Oriented, Legitimate. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state and I need this envelope mailed. I have to catch a plane.		(16)		(10)		
MESSAGE I-3: Victim-Oriented, Illegitimate. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late.		6	30	14	70	20
MESSAGE II-3: Victim-Oriented, Illegitimate. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I have to go to Safeway.		(12)		(8)		
MESSAGE I-4: Target-Oriented, Illegitimate. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.		11	61	7	39	18
MESSAGE II-4: Target-Oriented, Illegitimate. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. I have to go to Safeway.		(11)		(7)		
Total		55	60	36	40	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$\chi^2(3) = 11.71, P < .01.$

were significant. This suggests that both legitimacy factor and orientation of the appeals affected the amount of recognition in the present study.

In another chi-square, two levels of recognition were analyzed against two levels of legitimacy and two types of appeals. These results are given in Table 16. Results of the chi-square $\chi^2(3) = 11.71$, $P < .01$ were significant.

INSERT TABLE 16 ABOUT HERE

In order to find out whether the legitimacy of the appeals alone had any effect on the recognition, a chi-square comparing the legitimate and illegitimate requests for combined experiments I and II was performed. These results are given in Table 17. Results of the chi-square, $\chi^2(1) = 6.81$, $P < .01$ showed a significant difference. The subjects recognized the legitimate requests better than the illegitimate ones.

INSERT TABLE 17 ABOUT HERE

In order to see whether the orientation of the appeals had any effect on the recognition, another chi-square test was performed. Results of the test are given in Table 18. Results of the chi-square $\chi^2(1) = 4.61$, $P < .05$

TABLE 16
 FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE RECOGNITION
 TEST ACCORDING TO LEGITIMACY FACTOR AND
 ORIENTATION OF THE APPEALS FOR
 EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Messages Recognition	Legitimate		Illegitimate		Total
	Victim- Oriented	Target- Oriented	Victim- Oriented	Target- Oriented	
Recognized	17	21	6	11	55
Correctly	(16)	(16)	(12)	(11)	
Did Not	10	5	14	7	36
Recognize	(11)	(10)	(8)	(7)	
Total	27	26	20	18	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$\chi^2(3) = 11.71, P < .01$

TABLE 17
RESULTS OF THE RECOGNITION TEST CONSIDERING THE
LEGITIMACY FACTOR FOR EXPERIMENTS
I AND II COMBINED

Recognition	Recognized Correctly	Did Not Recognize	Total
Messages			
Legitimate	38 (32)	15 (21)	53
Illegitimate	17 (23)	21 (15)	38
Total	55	36	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$\chi^2(1) = 6.81, P < .01$

were significant. Thus subjects recognized the victim-oriented appeals (example: "My knee is killing me . . .") better than the target-oriented (example: "Would you do something for me?")

INSERT TABLE 18 ABOUT HERE

There is another way to analyze these results and that was by analyzing legitimate-victim-oriented messages against all others, and illegitimate-target-oriented messages against all others. Results of these analyses can be seen in Table 19 and 20. These chi-squares showed that there was no significant difference in amount of recognition between either the victim-oriented-legitimate messages and all others; or the target-oriented-illegitimate message and all others.

INSERT TABLES 19 AND 20 ABOUT HERE

In order to see whether there was an interaction besides the legitimacy and orientation of the appeals on the recognition of the appeals on the recognition test, the obtained chi-squares on the legitimacy and the appeals were totaled and then subtracted from the chi-squares of the overall results in Table 17. Results can be seen in Table 21.

TABLE 18
RESULTS OF THE RECOGNITION TEST CONSIDERING THE
APPEALS FOR EXPERIMENTS I AND II COMBINED

Recognition	Recognized Correctly	Did Not Recognize	Total
Messages			
Victim-Oriented	23 (28)	24 (19)	47
Target-Oriented	32 (27)	12 (17)	44
Total	55	36	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$\chi^2(1) = 4.61, P < .05$

TABLE 19
ANALYSIS OF VICTIM-ORIENTED, LEGITIMATE APPEALS
AGAINST ALL OTHER APPEALS FOR RECOGNITION

Recognition	Recognized Correctly	Did Not Recognize	Total
Messages			
Victim-Oriented, Legitimate	17 (16)	10 (11)	27
All Others	38 (39)	26 (25)	64
Total	55	36	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(1) = 0.19$$

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF TARGET-ORIENTED, ILLEGITIMATE APPEALS
AGAINST ALL OTHER APPEALS FOR RECOGNITION

Recognition	Recognized Correctly	Did Not Recognize	Total
Messages			
Target-Oriented,	11	7	18
Illegitimate	(11)	(7)	
All Others	44	29	73
	(44)	(29)	
Total	55	36	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(1) = 0$$

The remainder x^2 of .29 suggests that all of the differences in recognition of the messages are due to the legitimacy factor and the orientation of the appeals--especially, their legitimacy.

TABLE 21
RESULTS OF THE INTERACTION ON THE RECOGNITION TEST

	<u>x^2</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>df</u>
Over-all Recognition	11.71	.01	3
Legitimacy Recognition	-6.81	.01	1
Orientation of the Appeals Recognition	-4.61	.05	1
Interaction	.29	N.S.	1

Helping Attitude and Message Content

The third variable in the present study was the response to the question in the questionnaire: "on the tape you just viewed, do you think you would have helped?" Table 22 illustrates the frequency and percentages of the subjects who said "they would help" or "they would not help" the lady in distress for both experiments I and II combined.

INSERT TABLE 22 ABOUT HERE

In order to determine whether amount of "projected" helping was significantly different among the messages, a

TABLE 22
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE HELPING
ATTITUDES TEST FOR EXPERIMENTS I AND II

	Helping Attitude	Said "They Would Help"	Said "They Would Not Help"	Total
Messages		%	%	
MESSAGE I-1: Victim-Oriented, <u>Legitimate</u> . My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up.		27	30	-
MESSAGE II-1: Victim-Oriented, <u>Legitimate</u> . I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I have to catch a plane.	(22)		(5)	
MESSAGE I-2: Target-Oriented, <u>Legitimate</u> . Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.		24	26	2
MESSAGE II-2: Target-Oriented, <u>Legitimate</u> . Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state and I need this envelope mailed. I have to catch a plane.	(22)		(4)	
MESSAGE I-3: Victim-Oriented, <u>Illegitimate</u> . My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late.		15	17	5
MESSAGE II-3: Victim-Oriented, <u>Illegitimate</u> . I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I have to go to Safeway.	(17)		(3)	
MESSAGE I-4: Target-Oriented, <u>Illegitimate</u> . Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.		10	11	8
MESSAGE II-4: Target-Oriented, <u>Illegitimate</u> . Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this envelope to the post office. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. I have to go to Safeway.	(15)		(3)	
TOTAL		76	84	15

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$\chi^2(3) = 18.89, P < .001.$

chi-square test was calculated. Results were highly significant $\chi^2(3) = 18.89$, $P < .001$. The results can be seen in Table 22.

In another chi-square, two levels of helping attitudes were analyzed against two levels of legitimacy and two types of appeals. These results are given in Table 23. Results of the chi-square $\chi^2(3)=18.89$, $P < .001$ were highly significant.

INSERT TABLE 23 ABOUT HERE

The χ^2 analysis of legitimacy and responses to the "Do you think you would have helped?" item as shown in Table 24 was highly significant $\chi^2(1)=16.25$, $p < .001$. Thus, subjects who heard the legitimate requests more often said they would help.

INSERT TABLE 24 ABOUT HERE

In order to see whether the orientation of the appeal had a significant effect on the helping attitudes, a chi-square in which types of appeals were tested against helping attitudes was performed. Results as shown in Table 25 were not significant $\chi^2(1)=2.89$. Thus, there was no significant difference in the amount of helping.

TABLE 23

FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE HELPING
ATTITUDES TEST ACCORDING TO LEGITIMACY FACTOR
AND ORIENTATION OF THE APPEALS FOR EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Messages	<u>Legitimate</u>		<u>Illegitimate</u>		Total
	<u>Victim-</u> Oriented	<u>Target-</u> Oriented	<u>Victim-</u> Oriented	<u>Target-</u> Oriented	
Said "They Would Help"	27 (22)	24 (22)	15 (17)	10 (15)	76
Said "They Would Not Help"	- (5)	2 (4)	5 (3)	8 (3)	15
Total	27	26	20	18	91

Note: Numbers in parantheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(3)=18.89 \quad P < .001$$

TABLE 24
RESULTS OF THE HELPING ATTITUDE FOR EXPERIMENTS
I AND II CONSIDERING LEGITIMACY

Helping Attitudes	Said "They Would Help"	%	Said "They Would Not Help"	%	Total
Messages					
Legitimate	51 (44)	96	2 (9)	4	53
Illegitimate	25 (32)	66	13 (6)	34	38
Total	76	84	15	16	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$\chi^2(1) = 16.25, P < .001$

There was no difference in subjects' response in terms of helping between those who heard the victim-oriented and those who heard the target-oriented appeals.

INSERT TABLE 25 ABOUT HERE

Sex Differences in Recall, Recognition,
and Helping Attitudes

Recall

In order to determine whether gender of the subjects has any effect on the amount of recall, the sex of the subjects was analyzed by amount of recall. These results are presented in Table 26. The calculated chi-square $\chi^2(1) = 0.71$ failed to show a significant difference between males and females in terms of recall.

INSERT TABLE 26 ABOUT HERE

In order to find out whether sex and legitimacy had any effect on the recall of the messages, a 2 (sex of the subjects) x 4 levels of recall (75%, 50%, 25%, or 0%) chi-square test between the recall results of males and females for legitimate and illegitimate requests was performed. These results are seen in Table 27. The chi-square was not significant, $\chi^2(3) = .15$. There was no significant differ-

TABLE 25
RESULTS OF THE HELPING ATTITUDE FOR EXPERIMENTS
I AND II CONSIDERING THE APPEALS

Helping Attitude	Said "They Would Help"	%	Said "They Would Not Help"	%	Total
Messages					
Victim-Oriented	42 (39)	89	5 (8)	11	47
Target-Oriented	34 (37)	77	10 (7)	23	44
Total	76	84	15	16	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(1) = 2.89$$

TABLE 26
 FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE RECALL TEST
 ACCORDING TO THEIR SEX FOR EXPERIMENTS
 I AND II COMBINED

Recall Gender	Recalled Partially (75%, 50%, 25%)	%	Did Not Recall (0%)	%	Total
Male	18 (20)	45	22 (20)	55	40
Female	27 (25)	51	24 (26)	49	51
Total	45	48	46	52	91

Note: numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(1) = 0.71$$

ence on the amount of recall between males and females for legitimate and illegitimate requests in experiments I and II.

INSERT TABLE 27 ABOUT HERE

In order to see whether gender of the subjects and the orientation of the appeals had any effect on the recall of the messages, a 2(gender of the subjects) x 4 levels of recall (75%, 50%, 25%, or 0%) chi-square test between the recall results of males and females for victim-oriented and target oriented appeals was computed. These results can be seen in Table 28. The chi-square was not significant, $\chi^2(3) = 1.53$. There was no significant difference on the amount of recall between males and females for orientation of the appeals.

INSERT TABLE 28 ABOUT HERE

Recognition

In order to test the effect of sex of the subjects on the recognition, a 2(sex of the subjects) x 2 levels of recognition (recognized correctly or did not recognize) chi-square test was computed. These results are seen in Table 29. The $\chi^2(1) = 0.75$ was not significant; that is, there was no sex differences in recognition of messages.

TABLE 27
 FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE RECALL TEST
 CONSIDERING THE LEGITIMACY FACTOR AND SEX
 OF THE SUBJECTS FOR EXPERIMENTS
 I AND II COMBINED

Messages	Recall	Recalled Partially (75%, 50%, or 25%)		Did Not Recall (0%)		Total
		Male	Female	Male	Female	
Legitimate		10	16	12	13	51
		(10)	(15)	(12)	(13)	
Illegitimate		8	11	10	11	40
		(8)	(12)	(10)	(11)	
Total		18	27	22	24	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(3) = .15$$

TABLE 28
 FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE RECALL TEST
 CONSIDERING ORIENTATION OF THE APPEALS AND
 SEX OF THE SUBJECTS FOR EXPERIMENTS
 I AND II COMBINED

Messages	Recall	Recalled Partially (75%, 50%, or 25%)		Did Not Recall (0%)		Total
		Male	Female	Male	Female	
Victim-Oriented	9 (9)	15 (14)	13 (11)	10 (12)		47
Target-Oriented	9 (9)	12 (13)	9 (11)	14 (12)		44
Total		18	27	22	24	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(3) = 1.53$$

INSERT TABLE 29 ABOUT HERE

In another test, both sex of the subjects and legitimacy of requests on recognition were considered. The chi-square $\chi^2(3) = 6.18$ for combined results of experiments I and II was not significant. Apparently, there is no difference between sexes even when legitimacy of the messages is added to the analysis. These results are given in table 30.

INSERT TABLE 30 ABOUT HERE

In another chi-square test, sex of the subjects and orientation of the appeals on recognition test were considered. Results can be seen in table 31. The $\chi^2(3) = 7.31$ again was not significant. In other words, there was no significant difference on the recognition between males and females for orientation of the appeals.

INSERT TABLE 31 ABOUT HERE

Helping Attitudes

In the present study, the 40 males and 51 females were analyzed to see which would be more likely to say they would help in an emergency situation. A chi-square test for

TABLE 29
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE
 RECOGNITION TEST ACCORDING TO THEIR SEX FOR
 COMBINED EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Recognition	Recognized Correctly	%	Did Not Recognize	%	Total
Gender					
Male	22	55	18	45	40
	(24)		(16)		
Female	33	65	18	35	51
	(31)		(20)		
Total	55	60	36	40	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$x^2(1) = 0.75$$

TABLE 30

FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE RECOGNITION
TEST ACCORDING TO THEIR SEX AND LEGITIMACY
OF THE REQUESTS FOR COMBINED
EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Recognition Messages	Recognized Correctly		Did Not Recognize		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Legitimate	14 (13)	24 (19)	8 (10)	7 (10)	53
Illegitimate	8 (9)	9 (14)	10 (8)	11 (8)	38
Total	22	33	18	18	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(3) = 6.18$$

TABLE 31
 FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS ON THE RECOGNITION
 TEST ACCORDING TO THEIR SEX AND ORIENTATION
 OF THE APPEALS FOR COMBINED
 EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Recognition Messages	Recognized Correctly		Did Not Recognize		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Victim-Oriented	11 (12)	12 (17)	12 (9)	12 (9)	47
Target-Oriented	12 (11)	20 (15)	6 (9)	6 (9)	44
Total	23	32	18	18	91

Note: Numbers in parantheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(3) = 7.31, P > .10$$

experiments I and II combined considering sex of the subjects and helping attitudes was performed. The chi-square result was not significant, $\chi^2(1) = 0.32$. The result as shown in Table 32 indicates that male and female subjects in the present study were equally willing to say they would help.

INSERT TABLE 32 ABOUT HERE

In order to find out whether the legitimacy of the requests would affect sex differences on the answers to the helping item, another chi-square test was run. These results are seen in Table 33. Results of the chi-square showed a significant difference $\chi^2(3) = 13.45$, $P < .01$. As a result, one can conclude that female subjects in the present study were more likely to say they would help when the request was legitimate, although legitimacy was not a factor in either of the measures of memory.

INSERT TABLE 33 ABOUT HERE

In order to find out whether orientation of the appeals would affect sex differences on the helping attitude results, a chi-square test was performed. These results are seen in Table 34. Results of the chi-square were not significant $\chi^2(3) = 2.20$.

INSERT TABLE 34 ABOUT HERE

TABLE 32

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE SUBJECTS WHO SAID
 "THEY WOULD HELP" OR "WOULD NOT HELP" ACCORDING
 TO THEIR SEX FOR COMBINED EXPERIMENTS I AND II

	Helping Attitude	"Said Would Help"	%	"Said Would Not Help"	%	Total
Gender						
Male		34 (33)	85	6 (7)	15	40
Female		42 (43)	82	9 (8)	18	51
Total		76	84	15	16	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(1) = 0.32$$

TABLE 33
 FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS WHO SAID "THEY WOULD HELP" OR "WOULD NOT HELP"
 CONSIDERING THE LEGITIMACY FACTOR AND SEX OF THE
 SUBJECTS FOR COMBINED EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Helping Attitude Message	"Said Would Help"		"Said Would Not Help"		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Legitimate	21 (20)	30 (24)	1 (3)	1 (5)	53
Illegitimate	13 (14)	12 (18)	5 (3)	8 (4)	38
Total	34	42	6	9	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$\chi^2(3) = 13.45, P < .01$

TABLE 34

FREQUENCY OF THE SUBJECTS WHO SAID "THEY WOULD HELP" OR "WOULD NOT HELP"
 CONSIDERING ORIENTATION OF THE APPEALS AND SEX OF THE
 SUBJECTS FOR COMBINED EXPERIMENTS I AND II

Helping Attitude Messages	"Said Would Help"		"Said Would Not Help"		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Victim-Oriented	19 (18)	23 (22)	3 (3)	2 (4)	47
Target-Oriented	15 (16)	19 (20)	3 (3)	7 (5)	44
Total	34	42	6	9	91

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the expected frequencies.

$$\chi^2(3) = 2.20$$

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Verbatim Recall

The first question is whether the subjects did in fact recall the messages the way they were delivered. The answer to this question as shown in Table 3 is no. Of the total of 91 subjects in both experiments, nobody recalled any of the messages exactly the way they were originally delivered. Forty-nine percent of the subjects recalled parts of the messages (75%, 50%, or 25%). The remaining 51 percent did not recall any part of the messages correctly. The chi-square of $\chi^2(9) = 12.45$, $P > .20$ showed no significant difference among the different messages and the verbatim recall scoring.

The second concern was whether the subjects recalled legitimate appeals more often than illegitimate ones. Once again the answer is negative. Table 4 showed that there was no difference between the recall results of legitimate and illegitimate requests.

Our final concern for verbatim recall was to see whether there was any difference in the recall of the messages if they are victim-oriented or target-oriented. Table

5 showed that there was no difference between the amount of recall of either orientations.

It appears therefore, that there were no significant differences on the verbatim recall. The subjects did not recall the legitimate requests better than the illegitimate ones, nor did they recall victim-oriented appeals better than target-oriented appeals.

Meaning Recall

Turning next to the results of the "meaning recall," the results were quite different. As shown at the foot of the first column in Table 9, 44 percent of the subjects ($N = 40$) recalled the meaning of the messages correctly. The poorest subjects got at least half of the message meaning (16 percent). This was quite different from the verbatim recall procedure. The x^2 was not significant, however, so at least the different messages were not better or worse than one another.

In order to test the legitimacy and orientation hypotheses for the meaning procedure, two levels of meaning recall were analyzed against two levels of legitimacy and two types of appeals. Results of the chi-square were close to significant $x^2(3) = 7.76$, $P > .10$ (see Table 10).

To analyze this further, a x^2 was computed for legitimate requests against illegitimate ones. The x^2 was significant, $x^2(1) = 6.6$, $P < .01$. In other words, subjects recalled the meaning of the legitimate requests better than

the illegitimate ones (see Table 11).

Finally, a chi-square was computed for just the orientation of the messages. This χ^2 was not significant (see Table 15).

Thus, one can conclude that more subjects recalled legitimate requests than illegitimate ones when a more liberal recall measure was used. The orientation of the appeals still did not cause any change in the amount of meaning recall. Although a crude test, one can see that there was no interaction between the legitimacy and the appeals. When the legitimacy χ^2 is subtracted from the "total" χ^2 , the remainder is very small.

Recognition

The analysis here is similar to the recall analysis. Our first question was whether there was a significant difference between the legitimate-illegitimate and victim-target orientation for the combined messages. These results were presented in Table 15. The χ^2 was significant $\chi^2(3) = 11.71$, $P < .01$. In other words, both legitimacy and orientation of the appeals made significant difference on the amount of recognition in the present study, although differences among messages were included here.

Continuing our analysis, we did a χ^2 for legitimacy-illegitimacy alone, and for target-victim orientation alone. The legitimacy chi-square was, $\chi^2(1) = 6.81$, $P < .01$. The orientation chi-square, was, $\chi^2(1) = 4.61$, $P < .05$. Thus in

this case both legitimacy and orientation were significant factors.

To obtain a rough indication of interaction, the obtained chi-squares for both legitimacy and orientation of the appeals were totaled and subtracted from the chi-square of the over-all results. Results can be seen in Table 21. As one can see, the remainder of .29 suggests that all of the differences in recognition were due to the legitimacy and the orientation of the appeals.

Helping Attitudes

Table 22 gave the number and percentage of the subjects on the helping attitude test for experiments I and II. The first noticeable result in Table 22 is the very high level of compliance with the request in the present study. Eighty-four percent of the subjects ($N = 76$) said they would have helped the lady regardless of the legitimacy or orientation of the appeal. Compare to Langer and Abelson (1972) study, the level of compliance with the requests in the present study was higher. This difference is probably due to the differences between these two studies. In the Langer and Abelson(1972) study, first experiment, the confederate standing at the top of a stairway, requested a favor from the subjects to make a phone call for her. In order that each trial to be counted as helping, the subject was supposed to go and make the phone call at the bottom of the

stairs, receiving no answer and proceeding back up the stairs and telling the confederate that there was no answer. In the second experiment, for each trial the confederate standing in front of the Post Office, was supposed to approach the subjects and ask them to mail an envelope for her. Thus to be considered as complying with the request, the subjects were expected to show a behavior. While in the present study, the subjects did not actually have to exhibit any kind of behavior. All they needed to do was to just say yes they would help or no they would not help. It is obvious that there is a difference between actually doing something and saying you would do something should the situation arise. To what extent they would really help in this given situation, is not known. It should be noted that the amount of help was not a major factor for the investigator of this study.

In order to determine whether there was a significant difference among the "projected" helping results of the combined eight messages, a chi-square test was performed. Results as shown in Table 22, show a highly significant difference $\chi^2(3) = 18.89, P < .001$. This suggests that both legitimacy factor and orientation of the appeals affected the amount of "projected" help in the present study, although, once again, message differences are included.

The following step was to see whether the subjects were more often willing to say yes they "would help" when

the request was legitimate. Results of the chi-square as shown in Table 24 were again highly significant, $\chi^2(1) = 16.25$, $P < .001$.

Results of the chi-square as shown in Table 25, $\chi^2(1) = 2.89$ for the amount of help and orientation of the appeals did not show a significant difference. In other words, the subjects did not very much care about the type of the appeals for "projected" help.

Sex Differences

One obvious place to look for different reactions to the messages was in the area of sex differences. Several chi-square analyses showed that gender of the subjects did not cause any significant difference in amount of recall or recognition. The only significant difference between sexes was observed in helping attitude and legitimacy. Here, female subjects were more likely to say they would help when the request was legitimate. This result confirms the results of the Langer and Abelson's study (1972) and Innes (1974) study considering sex differences and helping behavior. (See Table 35 for results of sex differences.)

INSERT TABLE 35 ABOUT HERE

Langer and Abelson (1972) reported that female subjects were more likely to comply with a legitimate request

TABLE 35
SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS CONSIDERING
SEX DIFFERENCES

Dependent Variables	Recall	Recognition	Helping Attitude
Messages			
All Messages	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Combined			
Legitimacy	N.S.	N.S.	SIG. $\chi^2(3) = 13.45$ $P < .01$
Orientation of the Appeals	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

rather than an illegitimate request (by a female confederate) when the appeal was victim-oriented. The data from their two experiments combined showed that when the favor was legitimate, victim-oriented, 75 percent of the subjects ($N = 30$ out of 40) complied; but when illegitimate, victim-oriented, only 27.5 percent ($N = 11$ out of 40) complied. As one can see there is a differential effect close to 50 percent. Similar results but with higher overall results level of helping were obtained for female subjects in Innes (1974) study in Scotland.

In sum, from the two major factors of the study, orientation of the appeals and legitimacy, the first one did not prove to be an important factor in recall. While the legitimacy showed to have a great influence on the memory. As one can see in Table 36, significant differences were observed on the amount of meaning recall, recognition and helping attitudes when legitimacy factor was taken into the analyses. In other words, what made the differences in results was the legitimacy not orientation of the appeals. Maybe because two different types of orientation (victim and target-orientation) were not as clear as two types of legitimacy (legitimate and illegitimate) for subjects. Amount of verbatim recall did not significantly change with the variation of orientation and/or legitimacy. When looser criteria such as meaning recall, and recognition were used, some significant differences were

observed. However, results of the present study confirmed Langer and Abelson's only as legitimacy was concerned. Orientation of the appeals was not an influence.

INSERT TABLE 36 ABOUT HERE

TABLE 36
SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

Dependent Variables	Verbatim	Meaning	Recognition	Helping
Messages	Recall	Recall		Attitudes
All Messages Combined	N.S.	N.S.	SIG. $\chi^2(3) = 11.71$ $P < .01$	SIG. $\chi^2(3) = 18.89$ $P < .001$
Legitimacy	N.S.	SIG. $\chi^2(1) = 6.6$ $P < .01$	SIG. $\chi^2(1) = 6.81$ $P < .01$	SIG. $\chi^2(1) = 16.25$ $P < .001$
Orientation of the Appeals	N.S.	N.S.	SIG. $\chi^2(1) = 4.61$ $P < .05$	N.S.
Victim-Oriented-Legitimate against All others	N.S.	SIG. $\chi^2(1) = 5.33$ $P < .05$	N.S.	N.S.
Target-Oriented-Illegitimate Against all others	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

SUMMARY

The present study was an attempt to test the hypothesis derived from a study by Langer and Abelson (1972) which was partially replicated cross-culturally by Innes (1974). Our specific hypothesis was that legitimate requests for help using victim-oriented appeal and illegitimate requests for help using target-oriented appeal would be remembered better than legitimate-target-oriented messages and illegitimate-victim-oriented one. Two important factors of the study, legitimacy and orientation of the appeal were directly taken from the Langer and Abelson study and defined as they were used there. In this laboratory study, 160 students drawn from Speech Communication 1113 at the University of Oklahoma served as subjects. The stimulus materials of the study were recorded on video tape and were shown to the subjects in eight different classes. The dependent variables used in the present study were (a) recall, (b) recognition, and (c) helping attitudes. Findings of the study are summarized below.

1. In verbatim recall, the subjects did not recall the legitimate requests better than the illegitimate ones, nor did they recall victim-oriented appeals better than the target-

oriented appeals.

2. When a more liberal measure, meaning recall was used, more subjects recalled legitimate requests than illegitimate ones. The orientation of the appeals still did not cause any change in the amount of meaning recall. Results did not show an interaction between the legitimacy and the appeals.

3. Results of our analyses in recognition test showed that subjects recognized legitimate requests better than the illegitimate ones. In terms of the appeals, they recognized the victim-oriented appeals more than the target-oriented ones.

4. Legitimacy factor showed to be an influence in helping attitudes. Subjects more often said they would help when the request was legitimate. 84% of the subjects (N=76) said they would help regardless of the type of appeal.

5. Additionally, gender of the subjects was also analyzed in terms of recall, recognition and helping attitudes. Results of the analysis showed that gender of the subjects did not cause any significant difference in amount of recall or recognition. The only significant difference between sexes was observed in helping attitudes and legitimacy. That was, female subjects were much more sensitive than the males to say they would help when the request was legitimate.

References

- Andrew, D.M. and Bird, C. (1938). A comparison of two new-type questions: recall and recognition. Journal of Educational Psychology, 29, 175-193.
- Baker, Larry D. & Reitz, Joseph H. (1978). Altruism toward the blind: Effects of sex of helper and dependency of victim. Journal of Social Psychology, 104, 19-28.
- Barcaly, Richard J. (1973). The role of comprehension in remembering sentences. Cognitive Psychology, 4, 229-254.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Berkowitz, Leonard. (1972). Advances in experimental social psychology. New York: Academic Press.
- Berkowitz, Leonard. (1968). Responsibility, reciprocity, and social distance in help-giving: An experimental investigation of English social class differences. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 4, 46-63.
- Berkowitz, Leonard. (1969). Resistance to improper dependency relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7, 415-418.
- Best, John W. (1959). Research in Education. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bock, J. K. & Brewer, W. F. (1974). Reconstructive recall in sentences with alternative surface structure. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 103, 837-843.
- Bransford, John D., Barclay, Richard J. & Franks, Jeffery. (1972). Sentence memory: A constructive versus interpretive approach. Cognitive Psychology, 3, 193-209.

- Bransford, Johan D. & Franks, Jeffery J. (1971). The abstraction of linguistic ideas: A review. Cognition, 1, 211-249.
- Brown, John. (1976). Recall and recognition. London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bryan, J. H., & Test, M. A. (1967). Models and helping: Naturalistic studies in aiding behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6, 400-407.
- Cofer, N. Charles. (1975). The structure of human memory. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Conrad, R. (1960). Serial order intrusions in immediate memory. British Journal of Psychology, 51, 45-48.
- Darley, J. M., & Lantane', B. (1970). Norm and normative behavior: Field studies of social interdependence. In J. MacCauley and L. Berkowits (Eds.), Altruism and Helping Behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Darley, John M. & Latane, Bibb. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8, 377-383.
- Darley, John M. & Batson, Daniel C. (1973). From Jerusalem to Jericho: A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27, 100-108.
- Darley, John M. and Teger, Allan I. (1973). Do groups always inhibit individuals responses to potential emergencies? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26, 395-399.
- Davis, R., Sutherland, N. S. & Judd, B. R. (1961). Information content in recognition and recall. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 61, 422-429.
- Ellis, Henry C. (1978). Fundamentals of Human Learning, Memory, and Cognition. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Co. Publishers.
- Feldman, Robert H. L. & Rezmovic, Victor. (1979). A field study on the relationship of environmental factors to helping behavior. Journal of Social Psychology, 108, 283-284.

- Feldman, Roy E. (1968). Response to compatriot and foreigner who seek assistance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10(3), 202-214.
- Ferguson, G. A. (1976). Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Field, Mildred. (1974). Power and dependency: Legitimation of dependency conditions. Journal of Social Psychology, 92, 31-37.
- Fillenbaum, Samuel. (1966). Memory for gist: Some relevant variables. University of North Carolina, 271-227.
- Fitch, Margaret E. (1982). The effect of message structure on inference making in recall. Unpublished dissertation, University of Oklahoma, Norman.
- Foss, Robert D. & Crenshaw, Nell C. (). Risk of embarrassment and helping. Social Behavior and Personality, 6(2), 243-245.
- French, Patrice. (1981). Semantic and syntactic factors in the perception of rapidly presented sentences. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 10(6), 581-591.
- Greenwald, Anthony G. (1975). Does the good Samaritan parable increase helping? A comment on Darley and Batson's no-effect conclusion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32(4), 578, 583.
- Gruder, Charles L., Romer, Daniel, & Korth, Bruce. (1978). Dependency and fault as determinants of helping. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 14, 227-235.
- Hall, John F. (1971). Verbal learning and retention. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company.
- Hirata, Suchiro. (1980). Effect of the presentation of context on recall and comprehension. Journal of Child Development, 16, 21-29.
- Hollingworth, H. L. (1913). Characteristic differences between recall and recognition. American Journal of Psychology, 24, 532-544.
- Hormstein, H. A. (1970). The influence of social models on helping. In J. MacAuley and L. Berkowitz (Eds), Altruism and Helping Behavior. New York: Academic Press.

- Hornstein, Harvey A., Fisch, Elisha & Holmes, Michael. (1968). Influence of a model's feeling about his behavior and his relevance as a comparison other on observers' helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 22-26.
- Horowitz, Irwin A. (1968). Effect of choice and locus of dependence on helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8, 373, 376.
- Hovland, C. I., Lumsdaine, A. A. & Sheffield, F. D. (1949). Experiments on Mass Communication. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hovland, C. I., Mandell, W., Campbell, E. H., Brock, C., Luchins, A. S., Cohen, A. R., McGuire, W. J., Janis, I. L., Feierabend, R. L., & Anderson, N. H. (1957). The order of presentation in persuasion. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Innes, J. M. (1974). The semantics of asking a favor: An attempt to replicate cross culturally. International Journal of Psychology, 9, 57-61.
- Jecker, Jon & Lardy, David. (1969). Liking a person as a function of doing him a favour. human relations, 22, 371-378.
- Johnson, Marcia K., Bransford, John D. & Solomon, Susan K. (1973). Short reports: Memory for tacit implications of sentences. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 98, 203-205.
- Johnson, Ronald E. (1970). Recall prose as a function of the structural importance of the linguistic units. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 9, 12-20.
- Katz, E., & Danet, B. (1966). Petitions and persuasive appeals: A study of official client relations. American Sociological Review, 31, 811-821.
- Kausler, Donald H. (1966). Readings in Verbal Learning. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kolers, P. A. (1966). Interlingual facilitation of short-term memory. Journal of Verbal Hearing and Verbal Behavior, 5, 314-319.

- Korte, Charles. (1975). Helpfulness in Dutch society as a function of urbanization and environmental input level. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 966-1003.
- Korte, Charles & Kerr, Nancy. (1975). Response to altruistic opportunities in urban and nonurban settings. Journal of Social Psychology, 95, 183-184.
- Langer, Ellen J. (1978). Rethinking the role of thought in social interaction. In J. Harvey, W. Ickes and R. Kidd (Eds.) New directions in attribution research. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Pub., 36-53.
- Langer, E. J. & Abelson, R. P. (1972). The semantics of asking a favor: How to succeed in getting help without really dying. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24, 26-32.
- Langer, E., Blank, A., & Chanowitz, B. (1978). The mindlessness of ostensibly thoughtful action: The role of "placebic" information in interpersonal interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 635-642.
- Latane, Bibb and Rodin, Judith. (1969). A lady in distress: Inhibiting effects of friends and strangers on bystander intervention. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 5, 189-202.
- Latane, Bibb & Darley, John M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 215-221.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M., Group. (1969). Inhibition of bystander intervention. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 5, 189-202.
- Loftus, Geoffrey R. & Loftus, Elizabeth F. (1976). Human memory the processing of information. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Macanlay, J. & Berkowitz, L. (1970). Altruism and Helping Behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- MacDougall, R. (1904). Recognition and recall. Journal of Philosophy, 1, 299-333.
- McHugh, P. (1968). Defining the situation of meaning in social interaction. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

- McNulty, John A. (1965). An analysis of recall and recognition processes in verbal learning. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 4, 430-436.
- Mehler, Jacques. (1963). Some effects of grammatical transformations on the recall of English sentences. Journal of Verbal Hearing and Verbal Behavior, 2, 346-351.
- Merrens, Matthew R. (1973). Nonemergency helping behavior in various sized communities. Journal of Social Psychology, 90, 327-328.
- Meyer, Bonnie J. & McConkie, George W. (1973). What is recalled after hearing a passage. Journal of Educational Psychology, 65, 109-117.
- Michom, John A., Eljkmann, EG. G. J., & Deklerk, Len F. W. (1979). Handbook of psychonomics. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company, V. 1.
- Murdock, Bennet B. (1961). The retention of individual items. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 62, 618-625.
- Murray, Edward J. & Vincenzo, Joseph. (1975). Bystander intervention in a mild need situation. Journal of the Psychonomic Society, 133-135.
- Mussen, Paul & Rosenzweig, Mark R. (1973). Psychology: An Introduction. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Muter, Paul. (1978). Recognition failure of recallabel words in semantic memory. Memory and Cognition, 6, 9-12.
- Newman, Joseph & McCauley, Clark. (1977). Eye contact with stranger in city, suburb, and small town. Environment and Behavior, 9, 547-557.
- Page, Richard A. (1977). Noise and helping behavior. Environment and Behavior, 9, 311-333.
- Paris, S. G. & Carter, A. Y. (1973). Semantic and constructive aspects of sentence memory in children. Developmental Psychology, 9, 109-113.
- Pezdek, Kathy. (1978). Recognition memory for related pictures. Memory & Cognition, 6, 64-69.
- Piliavin, Irving M. & Rodin, Judith. (1969). Good Samaritanism: An underground phenomenon? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13, 289-299.

- Postman, Leo, Jenkins, William O. & Postman, Dorothy L. (1948). An experimental comparison of active recall and recognition. Comparison of Active Recall and Recognition, 511-519.
- Postman, L. (1950). Choice behavior and the process of recognition. American Journal of Psychology, 63, 443-447.
- Puff, C. Richard. (1982). Handbook of research methods in human memory and cognition. New York: Academic Press.
- Rommetveit, R. & Blakar, R. M., (Eds.) (1979). Studies of language, thought and verbal communication. New York: Academic Press.
- Rushton, Philippe J. (1978). Urban density and altruism: Helping strangers in a Canadian city, suburb, and small town. Psychological Reports, 43, 487-990.
- Sachs, J. D. S. (1967). Recognition memory for syntactic and semantic aspects of connected discourse. Perception and Psychophysics, 2, 437-442.
- Sachs, Jacqueline S. (1974). Memory in reading and listening to discourse. Memory and Cognition, 2, 95-100.
- Savin, Harris B. & Perchonock, Ellen. (1965). Grammatical structure and the immediate recall of English sentences. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 4, 348-353.
- Schopler, John & Matthews, Marjorie Wall. (1965). The influence of the perceived causal locus of partner's dependence on the use of interpersonal power. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 609-612.
- Schreiber, Elliott. (1979). Bystander intervention in situations of violence. Psychological Reports, 45, 243-246.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. & Fleishman, John A. (1978). Personal norms and the mediation of legitimacy effects on helping. Social Psychology, 41, 306-315.
- Schwartz, Shalom & David, Amit Ben. (1976). Responsibility and helping in an emergency: Effects of blame, ability and denial of responsibility. Sociometry, 39, 406-415.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. (1973). Normative explanations of helping behavior: A critique, proposal, an empirical test. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9, 349-364.

- Staub, Ervin. (1970). A child in distress: The influence of age and number of witnesses on children's attempts to help. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 14, 130-140.
- Staub, E. (1971). A child in distress: The influence of implicit "rules" of conduct on children and adults. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17, 137-144.
- Thompson, William R. & BeBold, Richard C. (1971). Psychology: A systematic introduction. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
- Tims, Albert R., Swart, Christopher & Kidd, Robert F. (1976, Spring). Factors affecting pre-decisional communication behavior after helping requests. Human Communication Research, 2, 271-280.
- Valentine, Mary E. & Ehrlichman, Howard. (1979). Interpersonal gaze and helping behavior. Journal of Social Psychology, 107, 193-198.
- Walster, Elaine, & Piliavin, Jane Allyn. (1972). Equity and the innocent bystander. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 165-189.
- Weisberg, W. Robert. (1980). Memory, thought and behavior. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Winer, B. J. (1962). Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

I would very much appreciate your spending about ten minutes to help me collect information for my dissertation. Your responses will be anonymous. No information can be traced back to you. Please return your completed questionnaire to me when you finish.

Thank you in advance for your help.

On the tape you just viewed, do you think you would
have helped?

(a) Yes _____

(b) No _____

If yes, why?

If no, why?

If this incident was actually happening, what percent of
the passerbys do you think would help? _____%

Write word-for-word, if possible, the woman's request for help as you remember it. If you cannot repeat it word-for-word, write it as well as you can remember.

Below are eight different requests for help. First read all of them carefully and then go back and rate them separately for "legitimacy" on the scales provided. Legitimacy is defined as the extent to which the appeal is perceived by the target as appropriate and not presumptuous.

For each message separately, please circle the number which best reflects your rating. On this page you should have four different ratings.

In the following four situations, suppose that a woman about 25 years old is limping down the stairs. She stops another woman who is walking down the stairs and says:

MESSAGE 1: My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up.

CLEARLY LEGITIMATE <u>2</u>	CLEARLY NOT LEGITIMATE <u>0</u>	QUESTIONABLE <u>1</u>
--------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------

MESSAGE 2: Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.

CLEARLY NOT LEGITIMATE <u>0</u>	QUESTIONABLE <u>1</u>	CLEARLY LEGITIMATE <u>2</u>
------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------

MESSAGE 3: My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late.

QUESTIONABLE <u>1</u>	CLEARLY LEGITIMATE <u>2</u>	CLEARLY NOT LEGITIMATE <u>0</u>
-----------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------

MESSAGE 4: Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my employer and tell him I'll be late. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.

CLEARLY LEGITIMATE <u>2</u>	CLEARLY NOT LEGITIMATE <u>0</u>	QUESTIONABLE <u>1</u>
--------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------

Please rate "Legitimacy" on the following four messages. Instructions are the same as on previous page.

In the following four situations, suppose that a woman about 44 years old is in front of a post office with a self-stamped envelope in her hand. She approaches the first companionless female passerby and says:

MESSAGE 1: I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this to the post office. I have to catch a plane.

CLEARLY LEGITIMATE <u>2</u>	CLEARLY NOT LEGITIMATE <u>0</u>	QUESTIONABLE <u>1</u>
--------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------

MESSAGE 2: Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this to the post office. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. I have to catch a plane.

CLEARLY NOT LEGITIMATE <u>0</u>	QUESTIONABLE <u>1</u>	CLEARLY LEGITIMATE <u>2</u>
------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------

MESSAGE 3: I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this to the post office. I have to go to Safeway.

QUESTIONABLE <u>1</u>	CLEARLY NOT LEGITIMATE <u>0</u>	CLEARLY LEGITIMATE <u>2</u>
-----------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------

MESSAGE 4: Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this to the post office. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. I have to go to Safeway.

CLEARLY NOT LEGITIMATE <u>0</u>	QUESTIONABLE <u>1</u>	CLEARLY LEGITIMATE <u>2</u>
------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------

Which one of the four following messages did you just hear? Please circle the number of the message that you think you heard.

MESSAGE 1: Would you do something for me, please do me a favor and call my husband and tell him that my knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Please come to pick me up.

MESSAGE 2: My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up.

MESSAGE 3: My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it. Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up.

MESSAGE 4: Would you do something for me? Please do me a favor and call my husband and ask him to pick me up. My knee is killing me, I think I sprained it.

Which one of the four following messages did you just hear? Please circle the number of the message that you think you hear.

MESSAGE 1: I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Please do me a favor and take this to the post office. I have to catch a plane.

MESSAGE 2: I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this to the post office. I have to catch a plane.

MESSAGE 3: Would you do something for me? I'm in a terrible state and I need this envelope mailed. Do me a favor and take this to the post office. I have to catch a plane.

MESSAGE 4: Would you do something for me? Do me a favor and take this to the post office. I'm in a terrible state, and I need this envelope mailed. I have to catch a plane.

Please provide some general information about yourself. None of this information is personal. Circle the answer which best describes you. DO NOT SIGN OR INITIAL THIS PAGE.

1. SEX

- a. Male
- b. Female

2. AGE

- a. 18-19
- b. 20-21
- c. 22-24
- d. 25-29
- e. 30-39
- f. 40 and over

3. ETHNIC BACKGROUND

- a. White
- b. Black
- c. Hispanic
- d. Asian or Pacific Islander
- e. American Indian or Alaskan Native
- f. Other

4. APPROXIMATE SIZE OF YOUR HOMETOWN

- a. Under 2,500
- b. 2,500-9,999
- c. 10,000-49,999
- d. 50,000-100,000
- e. 100,000

5. WHERE DO YOU LIVE?

- a. Residence Halls
- b. Sorority or Fraternity
- c. Off-Campus in Norman
- d. Off-Campus Outside Norman

Your comments about the tape would be very helpful and appreciated. Please write whatever comes to your mind. Your comments are obviously anonymous.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ORIGINAL SAMPLE

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION IN THE PRESENT
STUDY ACCORDING TO THEIR SEX, AGE, ETHNIC
BACKGROUND, SIZE OF HOMETOWN AND
LOCATION OF RESIDENCE

TABLE 37

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	68	42.5
Female	92	57.5
Total	160	100

TABLE 38

Age	Frequency	Percentage
18 - 19	101	63
20 - 21	29	18
22 - 24	15	9
25 - 29	10	6
30 - 39	3	2
40 and over	2	2
Total	160	100

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS CONTINUED:

TABLE 39

Ethnic Background	Frequency	Percentage
White	146	91
Black	7	4
Hispanic	-	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	2
Total	160	100

TABLE 40

Size of Hometown	Frequency	Percentage
Under 2,500	10	6
2,500 - 9,999	23	14
10,000 - 49,999	42	26
50,000 - 100,000	41	26
Over 100,000	44	28
TOTAL	160	100

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS CONTINUED:

TABLE 41

Location of Residency	Frequency	Percentage
Residence Halls	84	53
Sorrority or Fraternity	15	9
Off-Campus in Norman	50	31
Off-Campus Outside Norman	11	7
Total	160	100

APPENDIX C

A SELECTION OF THE PRINCIPAL REASONS GIVEN BY
THE SUBJECTS FOR THE HELPING
ATTITUDES QUESTION

After each group of subjects (N = 20) saw a message on the video tape, they were asked the question below:

On the tape you just viewed, do you think you would have helped? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____

Here Are Some Of The Principal Reasons Given
By the Respondents

Experiment I

Message 1

Nineteen out of twenty (95 percent) of the respondents who saw message 1, said yes.

Yes answers

- * Why not? Why shouldn't I help someone. Especially for a request that appears reasonable. I also like helping people.
- * Because the lady was evidently in a great need of help.
- * The lady looked like she couldn't walk very good, and I would have been glad to spend a few minutes of time to help her.
- * Because the lady hurt her leg and really didn't need to be walking on it.
- * Because I could see the lady needed help.
- * Because it was a very simple task, and the woman seemed to be having a lot of trouble.
- * Although she didn't sound very convincing, I would have helped because I know that if I were in that situation, I would expect someone to help.
- * I would have felt bad if I did not.
- * Because what goes around comes around.
- * She was obviously in pain and a few minutes of my time to make a phone call for her certainly wouldn't hurt me.
- * Because I like to help people.

No Answers

- ** The only person who answered no, said that he did not want to get involved.

Message 2

Eighteen out of twenty (90 percent) of the subjects who saw message 2 said yes:

Yes Answers

- * Because I would feel sorry for her. And it would not be that much trouble for me, whereas it could hurt her even more to try to get to a phone.
- * She looked nice.
- * I simply believe in helping people who are in need. If someone were to require my assistance, then I would oblige them.
- * Because I always feel like I should and would help people in need.
- * Because it would take very little effort to make a simple phone call.
- * Because I am a very nice guy.

No Answers

- ** From two subjects who answered no to this question, one of them did not say why; and the other one believed that the woman in help was not friendly.

Message 3

Eighteen out of twenty (90 percent) of the subjects who saw message 3, said yes.

Yes answers

- * Because there was someone in trouble and that person needed my help.
- * If I was not pressed for time, I can spare three

- * Really it would depend on whether or not I had time, but I know that if I could help somebody else--and what she asked was not very much--I would definitely put some thought into it.

No answers

- ** Who cares if she had to go to Safeway. That was not a valid cause for her panic. May be if she was going to Safeway to buy medicine for her sick child and it was April 14th, and those were tax forms.
- ** Going to Safeway is not a good excuse.
- ** The store could wait if the package was that important.
- ** I don't think I am responsible for that lady's problem. No telling what was in the envelope.

Message 4

Fourteen out of twenty (70 percent) of the subjects who saw message 4, said yes. Six subjects (30 percent) out of twenty said no.

Yes answers

- * It did not seem like a very hard thing to do.
- * The lady obviously needed help if she would walk up to a stranger and ask for assistant.

No answers

- ** Because all she had to do was to pull up next to a mail box instead of me.
- ** Because I would feel awkward for some stranger to come up to me and ask me to do such a favor.
- ** I'm sure I would have had important business of my own to take care of since I run on a tight schedual.
- ** I wouldn't help because you could be being set up for something like mailing something illegal.

saw message 2, said yes. Six subjects out of twenty (30 percent) who saw this message, said no.

Yes answers

- * I would if I were not busy.
- * Because if I were headed in the direction of the post office, I would just help out. Being that she had proper postage.
- * It wouldn't have hurt me or being out of my way to help this lady out. I think most people would have helped her because it was not that big of deal.
- * It really depends on if I was going to the post office myself.

No answers

- ** The post office was so close and she could have mailed the letter herself. May be the envelope contained a bomb, that is why she did not want to mail it herself.
- ** I wouldn't help somebody that I don't know.
- ** Because the lady should have mailed it earlier. She was just being lazy.
- ** If the envelope was already stamped it wouldn't take very long time to drop it in the mail box during the time that she tried to explain her situation.
- ** I wouldn't mind helping but I could get in trouble because of her.

Message 3

Fifteen subjects out of twenty (75 percent) who saw message 3, said yes. Five subjects out of twenty (25 percent) said no.

Yes answers

- * Absolutely I can take a minute of time for anybody.

** I wouldn't call an employer that I didn't know.

Experiment II

Message 1

Eighteen out of twenty (90 percent) of the subjects who saw message 1, said yes.

Yes answers

- * Because I believe all people are basically good. I feel like it would be the right thing for me to do.
- * Because she was in hurry and would not have probably asked unless she really was in a hurry.
- * I would have helped because I was right by the post office and I would not have had to go out of my way.
- * Because at one time-or-another I probably needed help just as lady did. I know I would have appreciated someone helping me too.
- * It would be an easy favor to do for someone since the post office was so close.
- * I would not mind doing things for other people.
- * I do not see any reason why you shouldn't. I think it would be kind to help.
- * If I had time, sure.
- * Because the person was very nice and was very polite about asking.

No answers

- ** I would not help her because she is just in front of the post office. And I think she could have done it herself. Besides I am not aware of what the envelope contains.
- ** It would have taken her only two minutes to do it herself.

Message 2

Fourteen out of twenty (70 percent) of the subjects who

minutes to make a phone call.

- * The other person explained that she hurt her leg and wants me to call her employer, that she would be late. In this situation, I will help only if I'm convinced she is telling the truth.
- * Because I am a considerate person.
- * I have had few troubles before and I know the pain. If she was honestly hurting, I would lend a hand and call her employer.

No answers

- ** Because I would not want to get involved.
- ** If she could ask me to call the employer, definitely she could pick up the phone and call.

Message 4

Twelve out of twenty (60 percent) of the subjects who saw message 4, said yes.

Yes answers

- * It would make me feel good to do someone a good deed that would get them out of trouble.
- * Because I like to think of others first and help people in need.
- * Why not?
- * I wouldn't have any reason not to help.
- * Because she was injured.

No answers

- ** It's the lady's responsibility to call her own employer.
- ** Because I have been involved with many people that make up excuses to get out of doing what they are supposed to do. I end up getting caught in the middle.
- ** She did not look too sick.
- ** Her tone and concern in her voice was not sincere enough.