Charity Norms, Normative Social Influence, and Prosocial Behavior: Existing in Harmony

First M. Last

Florida International University

Commented [L1]: The title page here is essentially the same one from Paper I. DO NOT change it to “Paper II”, “Method”, etc. However, you should revise mistakes from Paper I title page if applicable.

Commented [L2]: Notice that this example paper is only for you to see what a good paper looks like. You CANNOT directly copy anything from it. Copying from example papers will be regarded as Plagiarism behavior.

Method

Participants

One-hundred and fifty-two participants that consisted of Florida International University (FIU) students (90.8%, *N* = 138), as well as non-FIU friends and family (9.2%, *N* = 14) were selected to take part in this study. Out of the 152 participants, 50% were male (*N* = 76) and 46.7% were female (*N* = 71), while 3.3% (*N* = 5) went unreported. The pool of participants consisted of 46.1% Hispanics (*N* = 70), 28.9% Caucasians (*N* = 44), 11.2% African Americans (*N* = 17), 4.6% Asian Americans (*N* = 7), 1.3% Native Indians (*N* = 2), and 7.9% were other (*N* = 12). Finally, the ages of these participants ranged from 17 to 72 (*M* = 24.64, *SD* = 8.47).

Materials and Procedures

The materials for this study consisted of three different, five-part questionnaires and pens handed out to participants. To begin the study, participants were randomly selected at FIU MMC campus and researchers obtained their oral consent to participants. Participants were made aware of the benefits and risks that would come from their participation and they were randomly given one of the three questionnaires. Each of the questionnaires consisted of a Facebook profile centered around a man named Michael Bezjian advocating for a charity called "Unlikely Heroes' on his birthday. In each profile, comments were made by Michael's friends announcing how much they donated. The difference between three questionnaires is the average amount that these friends donate: high ($45-$50), middle ($25-$30), or low ($5-$10) dollar condition, which serves as the independent variable in the present study.

Participants started on Part I Facebook Profile on the questionnaire. At the top of Part I they were asked to carefully read everything on the profile as they would not be able to refer to it when answering questions in the rest of the questionnaire. After participants were done going

Commented [L3]: Level I heading format: centered, title case, and bold.

Method not Methods

Commented [L4]: Level 2 heading, left aligned, title case, and bold.

Commented [L5]: When a number starts a sentence, spell out the number

Commented [L6]: Indicate N for each percent you reported

Commented [L7]: Italicize statistical symbols throughout the paper, do not italicize numbers/values

Commented [L8]: Do not mention your 3 participants throughout the paper.

Commented [L9]: IV helps a lot, you can tell the author knows what IV is. There is only one, with three levels.

Describe your IV manipulation, scenario, levels, differences between three levels, and random assignments IN DETAILS so that readers/researchers can replicate your study based on your description

over the profile they moved on to Part II. In Part II participants were hypothetically given $100. Questions 1 and 2 of Part II focused on how much of $100 participants would donate as well as how much they thought other participants would contribute. The hypothetical donation could range from as little as $0 to as much as the full $100. Question 3 however, gave participants the option of donating anywhere from 0-100 hours of the participants time to the charity again.

Once participants moved on to Part III, they were asked to rate their impressions of Michael Bezjian, his Facebook profile, his friends, and the charity on an interval scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The first 5 questions in Part III focus on the participants' impression of Michael's character. For example, question 2 asked participants' view on Michael's generosity. Questions 6-10 focus on the participants' impressions of Michael's friends' characters and generosity. For example, question 6 asked how participants thought of Michael's friends being warm. Next, questions 11 and 12 centered around the legitimacy of the charity. Finally, question 13 allowed participants to reflect on themselves as charitable beings.

In Part IV participants were asked to provide demographic information, however, they could leave blank any or all questions if they chose to. The questions focused on gender, race/ethnicity, having English as a first language, and FIU enrollment. Finally, in Part V participants were asked to recall what the average donation from Michael's friends were. Participants were given three choices, each on a nominal scale indicating the low ($5 to $10), middle ($25-$30), and high ($45-$50) conditions of the questionnaire. This manipulation check was implemented to verify whether participants were aware of research manipulation.

At the end of the participation, participants were debriefed on the study's theory underlying normative social influence, the main hypothesis, as well as the independent and dependent variables. There were many items in the questionnaire, however, the main ones to be

Commented [L10]: You know exactly what the DVs are here, and you know the range for each scale. This is VERY important. If you only tell me the scale was 1 to 6 but I won't know 1 represents. I need to see both scale AND labels for all DVs to make sense.

Commented [L11]: You can see the procedure, very clear, and step-by-step

Commented [L12]: Debriefing statement is very important, and a required element by IRB. Provide what you debriefed to your participants (purpose, variables, and hypothesis) briefly at the end of procedure.

Commented [L13]: Thought there are several DVs in the questionnaire, however, you need point out the 2 DVs in hypotheses at the end of Method section, telling the readers your focus.

focused on in the present study were the amount of money participants hypothetically donated and participants' perceptions of whether Michael was generous.

Results

A manipulation check was run with dollar condition (high, middle, and low) as independent variable and the amount of money participants recalled Michael's friends donating as dependent variable. The Chi-square test was analyzed to check manipulation and it was significant, χ^2 (4) = 166.87, $p < .001$. Majority of participants in the high condition recalled $45 to $50 donations (83%), most middle participants recalled $25 to $30 donations (86.7%), and most participants in the low condition recalled $5 to $10 donations (77.8%). This indicated that participants did pay attention to the amount of donation Michael's friends donated and read carefully on Facebook profile.

A One-way ANOVA was run to analyze the amount of money participants chose to donate on three conditions (high vs. middle vs. low). The result was significant, $F(2,149) = 12.61$, $p < .001$. A Turkey post hoc test showed that amount of money donated by participants in the high condition ($M = 28.68$, $SD = 14.55$) did not significantly differ from those in the middle condition ($M = 22.56$, $SD = 9.86$). However, participants in both the high and middle conditions donated more than those in the low condition ($M = 16.11$, $SD = 13.52$). These results indicated that participants were likely to donate more when presented with high dollar priming condition compared to those primed with low dollar amount. However, when comparing high and middle dollar conditions there is no significant difference on amount of money donated.

Another One-way ANOVA was run to analyze participants' perceptions of Michael's generosity with dollar condition as the independent variable (high, middle, and low). The result was significant $F(2, 149) = 5.36$, $p = .006$. A Turkey post hoc test showed that participants in the

Commented [L14]: Level 1 heading

Results section comes right after Method, no page break.

Commented [L15]: Chi-square is useful for data that is nominal in nature, looking at the percent of participants who recalled each condition, separately.

To type chi symbol, simply hold down the alt key, then while holding alt down use the number pad on the right side of the keyboard to key in 9 6 7 then release the alt. You should get this symbol.

If you do not have numeric keyboard (right side) on your laptop/computer, alternatively you can go - insert - equation - then in the equation box type **chi** and press space, then you will get a better looking chi symbol.

Do not use X to represent chi

Commented [L16]: Round up all values to two decimals, except p

Commented [L17]: As you can see, the author found significance, so a post hoc Tukey test was needed to compare means. But what if there was no significance? Then no need to run post hoc tests.

Commented [L18]: Watch your language when writing a research article. Whenever you use a comparison phrase, e.g., more, less, better, worse, higher, lower, it means SIGNIFICANTLY. You CANNOT write "more" if simply Group A mean value is more than Group B. You MUST reply on sig./p value of mean difference reported in SPSS to decide.

Pay attention that you need to be responsible for every word you wrote in a research article, that is, you say A is more than B with statistics evidence (sig. value) only.

Commented [L19]: Make sure you compare each group to another, even some comparisons are not significant. And report each condition's M and SD

Commented [L20]: Report accurate p value. Do not round up p values

Report p < .001 if SPSS gives you .000. Other than that, report accurate p.

high condition (M = 5.11, SD = 0.64) thought Michael was more generous than those in the middle condition (M = 4.67, SD = 0.91) and the low condition (M = 4.61, SD = 1.00). However, middle and low condition didn't differ from each other. These results showed that participants in the high condition are more likely to perceive Michael as generous than those in the middle or low condition.

Discussion

For Study One, it was hypothesized that participants in the high dollar condition would donate more and perceive others as more generous than those in both the low and middle condition. These hypotheses were partially supported by the results. The results indicated that participants primed with the high dollar condition were likely to donate more than participants primed with the low dollar condition, supporting part of the hypothesis. However, it was found that the amount donated did not differ significantly between the high and middle dollar conditions. When it came to how participants perceive the generosity of others, the results showed that those in the high condition perceived Michael to be more generous than those in the middle and low condition. However, participants in the middle and low condition showed no significant difference, leaving it partially supported. It could be that participants perceived middle and low condition as both low amounts, compared to high condition. This begs the question: will their donation behavior and perception of other people change if an initial amount of money is request by Michael? This is the focus of Study Two.

Commented [L21]: Level 1 heading.

Discussion section is right after Results section, no page break.

Commented [L22]: Your discussion for study one paper 2 does not need to be extensive, but I do want you to 1) reiterate hypothesis in a briefly (do not copy your paper 1 hypothesis); 2) note whether results supported them.

Commented [L23]: This focus here is actually a lead-in to Study Two, where you introduced a new IV. You wouldn't know the new IV at current paper 2 stage. But you can always go back and add it at the end of study one discussion in your Paper 3.

Appendix A Demographics

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	151	17	72	24.64	8.467
Valid N (listwise)	151				

Gender (1 = M, 2 = F)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	76	50.0	51.7	51.7
	Female	71	46.7	48.3	100.0
	Total	147	96.7	100.0	
Missing	System	5	3.3		
Total		152	100.0		

Race

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Caucasian	44	28.9	28.9	28.9
	Hispanic	70	46.1	46.1	75.0
	Native Indian	2	1.3	1.3	76.3
	African American	17	11.2	11.2	87.5
	Asian American	7	4.6	4.6	92.1
	Other	12	7.9	7.9	100.0
	Total	152	100.0	100.0	

Commented [L24]: Don't forget to add your appendices to the paper. I need to see one appendix for demographics, one for the chi square, and one for any of your two ANOVAs. Make sure they are properly labeled and that the numbers in your tables align with the numbers in your results section

Also note that normally you would not submit SPSS tables to a journal. You can submit tables and figures in APA format, but not SPSS tables. For this Paper II, though, I want to make sure you did the interpretation correctly and looked at the right tables, so I want you to include the actual SPSS output in a series of appendices. In Paper IV and final paper, you will have a chance to insert real APA-format tables!

Commented [L25]: To add these charts, simply go into your SPSS output. You can right-click on the table and then copy it. Then just paste it into your appendix!

DO NOT use screenshot or picture!

Appendix B Crosstabs and Chi Square

Commented [L26]: Each appendix starts its own page

Condition (1 = H, 2 = M, 3 = L) * Manipulation Check (1 = H, 2 = M, 3 = L) Crosstabulation

			Manipulation Check (1 = H, 2 = M, 3 = L)			
			High	Middle	Low	Total
Condition (1 = H, 2 = M, 3 = L)	High	Count	44	3	6	53
		% within Condition (1 = H, 2 = M, 3 = L)	83.0%	5.7%	11.3%	100.0%
	Middle	Count	0	39	6	45
		% within Condition (1 = H, 2 = M, 3 = L)	0.0%	86.7%	13.3%	100.0%
	Low	Count	6	6	42	54
		% within Condition (1 = H, 2 = M, 3 = L)	11.1%	11.1%	77.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	50	48	54	152
		% within Condition (1 = H, 2 = M, 3 = L)	32.9%	31.6%	35.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	166.869[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	164.678	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	74.333	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	152		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.21.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	1.048	.000
	Cramer's V	.741	.000
N of Valid Cases		152	

Appendix C ANOVA

Descriptives

Part II: Donation Amount (Money)

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
High	53	28.68	14.549	1.999	24.67	32.69	0	50
Middle	45	22.56	9.864	1.470	19.59	25.52	0	50
Low	54	16.11	13.517	1.839	12.42	19.80	0	50
Total	152	22.40	13.906	1.128	20.17	24.63	0	50

ANOVA

Part II: Donation Amount (Money)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4226.528	2	2113.264	12.609	.000
Within Groups	24971.992	149	167.597		
Total	29198.520	151			

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Part II: Donation Amount (Money)

Tukey HSD

(I) Condition (1 = H, 2 = M, 3 = L)	(J) Condition (1 = H, 2 = M, 3 = L)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High	Middle	6.124	2.624	.054	-.09	12.34
	Low	12.568*	2.503	.000	6.64	18.49
Middle	High	-6.124	2.624	.054	-12.34	.09
	Low	6.444*	2.613	.039	.26	12.63
Low	High	-12.568*	2.503	.000	-18.49	-6.64
	Middle	-6.444*	2.613	.039	-12.63	-.26

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.