

# Pledge campaigns to encourage charitable giving: a randomised controlled trial

Sarah Cotterill, Peter John and Liz Richardson

Institute for Political and Economic Governance (IPEG)

School of Social Science

University of Manchester

[sarah.cotterill@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:sarah.cotterill@manchester.ac.uk)

0161 275 0792

Political Studies Association Annual Conference, Edinburgh, March 29th-April 1st  
2010, Public Administration Specialist Group Panel: Contemporary Challenges to  
Public Administration - further international comparisons

## Abstract

This paper reports on a randomised controlled trial on the effects of pledging. The research was undertaken in Manchester, in partnership with the Community HEART charity. 11,812 households in two electoral wards were sent information about an upcoming charity campaign to develop school libraries in South Africa: they were told that in a few weeks they would be asked to donate a children's book. Households were randomly assigned to receive differently worded requests. The trial tested: firstly whether asking people to pledge makes it more likely that they will later donate to a charitable campaign and secondly whether people are more likely to pledge and later donate if they are told their involvement will be made public. There is a limited amount of research on pledging and from the available research it is difficult to know whether pledging works or not: pledges are usually invited as part of a wider publicity campaign, making it difficult to identify the effect of the pledge on its own. In this paper we review the available literature on pledging, describe the research design and methods and present some very early results.

## **Introduction**

Pledging offers something special for the person who wants to do something positive for society. Partly the act of commitment feels good in itself. But there is a bigger advantage. By committing to do the act the person may feel they are more likely to carry it out. It appeals to the notion that people have good intentions to help the wider society, but they sometimes fall short of their altruistic objectives, forgetting to do something or feeling too busy as time passes. Pledging gets the person to where they want to be, acting as a kind of credible commitment. And there is good reason to think that this appeals to particular psychological processes (Bator and Cialdini 2000: 536). Compliance with the original commitment can be enduring, even if they are called upon to act by a different person and some substantial time later (McKenzie-Mohr & Smith 1999). So it is no surprise that charities and now public agencies adopt this strategy to encourage people to do things, like give money or carry out a civic act.

But of course it is hard to know whether such a tactic works or is just symbolic. We know that many people who pledge also carry out what they promise. What we do not know is whether citizens need the pledge to carry out the promised activity or whether they would have done it anyway (see Burn and Oskamp, 1986; Ludwig et. al., 2005; Mckenzie-Mohr and Smith, 2006), which makes a pledge campaign a waste of time for the charities or government organisations who implement it. If so, governments and organisations may as well spend their time asking people directly, using persuasion or providing information, rather than waste energy seeking advance commitments or pledges. People might be spared the guilt of being asked to pledge.

The claim of this paper is that only an experiment that randomises between asking for help and asking plus pledging can evaluate the independent effect of a pledge. To that end, we report such an experiment in Manchester, in partnership with the Community HEART charity, testing whether asking for pledges makes it more likely that people will later donate to charity. The paper first discusses the current policy interest and research literature on pledging, making references to psychological studies. It then moves on to outline the study design and discuss the lessons from the implementation of the experiment in the field.

## **Pledging in the UK<sup>1</sup>**

There are a number of pledge schemes in the UK. “A pledge scheme is an invitation from an organisation to an individual to make a public commitment to a behaviour change [in relation to climate change]” (Defra, 2008: 3). By far the greatest volume of pledge schemes concern environmental issues, with many local authorities and others now running some form of pledge scheme where individuals can commit to one or more sustainable behaviours. Other individual pledge schemes include protest campaigns, promises to be vegetarian or vegan, schemes aimed at young people and a few local pledges. There are two national generic pledge sites, covering a wide range of pledges. PledgeBank allows users to set up pledges and then

---

<sup>1</sup> This section draws on a literature review on pledging, conducted by the authors for Communities and Local Government (Cotterill and Richardson 2009)

encourages other people to sign up to them ([www.pledgebank.com](http://www.pledgebank.com)). We Are What We Do puts forward 130 actions on a website that individuals can sign up to do ([www.wearewhatwedo.org/](http://www.wearewhatwedo.org/)).

Pledge schemes can be set up for a number of different purposes. Four common objectives of pledge schemes are:

- Reinforcing the need to change by increasing awareness and changing attitudes
- Changing behaviour
- Building a case to persuade others
- Collecting data on individuals

Source: Defra (2008)

There are few evaluation reports of pledge schemes, so it is hard to judge the success of the schemes in attracting people to make pledges. The following points are largely based on looking at the limited information available on pledging websites.

High profile campaigning and publicity can successfully promote the opportunities to pledge. When Manchester is My Planet was launched in 2005, £160,000 was spent on a high profile and intensive campaign over three months, including website, branding, pledge cards, posters, campaign resource packs and media coverage, designed to get 10,000 citizens to pledge on climate change. The campaign culminated in a major event at Manchester Town Hall to celebrate the achievement of the first 10,000 pledgers. The pledge campaign continued with a lower budget and numbers continued to increase, but at a slower rate, gaining a further 10,300 pledgers over the next two and a half years, to reach a total of 20,300.

The Energy Saving Trust attracted a total of 216,997 commitments to its *Save your 20%* campaign and CRED's *Community Carbon Reduction Programme* has attracted 53,611 pledges. Both have a clear focus on environmental sustainability and appear to be well-resourced and well-thought out campaigns with attractive websites.

The earliest pledge deadlines on Pledgebank are dated March 2005. In the four years since then, 1,039 pledges have been created. 445 were successful in attracting the number of pledgers required by the originator (including eight that are still open to pledgers) and 575 failed. There are currently 19 "live" pledges that are actively seeking signatures.

|                                    | Number of pledges | Deadline for signing |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Current pledges that need pledgers | 19                | 28/03/09 – 01/11/11  |
| Successful open pledges            | 8                 | 30/04/09 – 09/02/11  |
| Successful closed pledges          | 437               | 18/03/05 – 09/03/09  |
| Failed pledges                     | 575               | 14/08/05 – 22/03/09  |

If the pledges have been created at a steady rate throughout the life of the site – and we do not know if this is true – there have been on average 21 pledges posted a month. The number of signatures requested for the pledges that are live varies from 10 to 1,000 and the mode is 20.

The *We Are What We Do* site has an action tracker so individuals can keep a list of what they have pledged to do and go to the site to indicate each time they do the action. It also lists where the individual is in a scale of activity on the site. For example, for “Smile and Smile Back”: 6,468 individuals have signed up to do this and it has been completed 101,243 times, the most prolific person has done it 25,624 times, and some people who signed up have not done it at all. For “Take public transport whenever you can” 4,008 individuals have signed up to do this and it has been completed 32,557 times, the most prolific person has done it 2,000 times, and some people who signed up have not done it at all. The person who came in top at 2,000 times had also claimed to do a list of other actions at a similarly high rate. These inflated figures suggest a need to be sceptical about self-reported claims relating to completed pledges.

In addition to attracting pledgers, another objective of pledge schemes might be to raise awareness in a wider population, not just among those who pledge. This could be particularly important in sending out a positive message to those who have not yet pledged; for example, “30 per cent of residents in your area have already pledged to do x”. It is difficult to achieve a wide awareness this type of community activity. A study of incentives found that there was very low awareness among local residents of a Good Neighbour Scheme, where residents were asked to sign up to a local charter, although those who had heard of it thought it was helpful in a minor way. Almost 60 per cent of residents had never heard of it, and only 15 per cent had heard a lot about it, with the remaining 25 per cent being unsure of what it was. (Bastow et al 2007). A recent evaluation of Community Contracts found a similar low level of awareness among local residents: people in Community Contract areas often were not even aware of the obligations of residents under the Contract, let alone changing their behaviour (IPEG 2010).

## **The Psychology of Pledging**

Several theories from psychology suggest that in certain circumstances people who pledge are likely to act on their good intention. Cognitive dissonance theory tells us that people feel discomfort if there is an inconsistency or dissonance in their understandings and they have strong motivations to avoid holding inconsistent views. Inconsistency between an individual’s self view and their behaviour creates a dissonance which people want to resolve (Festinger 1957; Aronson 1969). Consistency is an important character trait, with people who behave inconsistently being widely regarded as unreliable and untrustworthy. There is a strong internal pressure on individuals to behave in a way that is consistent with how they see themselves. Individuals who commit themselves to a particular behaviour can come to see themselves in a way that is consistent with that behaviour, leading to long term change in their attitudes and behaviour. The commitment can act as a catalyst, providing the internal conviction for a new identity and leading to behaviour that corresponds with that conviction, which can last well beyond the duration of the

commitment. So, if an individual gives a commitment that they will volunteer, vote, recycle or not drop litter, it increases the likelihood that they will later act in a way that is consistent with those attitudes. “When individuals feel committed to a certain type of behaviour, they will often adopt an identity that is consistent with that behaviour, the result of which frequently is long-lasting behaviour change” (Bator and Cialdini 2000: 536). Their compliance with the original commitment can be enduring, even if they are called upon to act by a different person and some substantial time later (McKenzie-Mohr & Smith 1999). The likelihood of a commitment leading to long-lasting change will vary according to the nature of the pledge: change is more likely if the commitment is voluntary, made in public and relates to an issue the pledger is already concerned about. Of course the quest for consistency may also lead people not to pledge or donate because they do not see this as consistent with their usual behaviour.

### **Research on Pledging**

A number of research studies have examined whether making a pledge or commitment makes it more likely that the pledged action will be carried out. The results of these studies are somewhat conflicting. The largest number of studies on commitments have focussed on doorstep recycling. Securing pledges through direct personal contact worked better than securing pledges through indirect contact or educational information alone, but the studies did not compare pledge and non-pledge methods (Reams and Ray 1993; Bryce et al. 1997). Asking for a pledge or commitment works equally well in encouraging recycling as receiving a persuasive leaflet (Burn and Oskamp 1986) or being offered a reward (Katzev and Pardini 1987). A more recent report compared canvassing campaigns with and without pledges and found that the pledge made no significant difference (Thomas 2006). Overall, the message from recycling research is that asking people to pledge to recycle can raise recycling rates if it is done through a personal approach on the doorstep, and it will raise recycling at a similar rate to other alternative approaches, but it is not clear whether it is the personal contact or the pledging that persuades households to recycle.

There are some studies which have found that pledging is successful, but the pledge was part of a wider promotional campaign, making it difficult to assess the particular contribution made by the pledge. A pledge campaign to encourage cyclists to wear helmets was successful in raising the use of helmets, but participants were provided with information and a voucher while being asked to pledge, so it is difficult to separate out the different effects (Ludwig 2005). Similarly, use of car safety belts rose among those who signed a pledge, but they were also provided with a card to hang in their car as a reminder and entered into a prize draw, so, again, it is hard to separate out the pledge effect (Geller 1989).

A US research paper examined the impact of pledging on voter registration and voter turnout. In one experiment, students were contacted by telephone with information about how to register to vote. Half were then randomly allocated to a treatment group and were asked whether they were planning to register to vote. The other half were allocated to a control group and not asked the additional question. The proportion who did register was higher among the treatment group, who were asked for a commitment, than in the control group, who received information about registration but were not asked for a commitment. A further experiment where students were asked to state whether they would turn out and vote had similar results:

a higher proportion of the group who were asked for a commitment voted, compared with a control group who received information about voting (Greenwald et al 1987). This suggests that being asked for a commitment can have a positive effect on voter registration and voter turnout, but it does not compare the commitment approach with any other method of mobilisation.

A US campaign to encourage voter turnout asked young people at rock festivals to complete one of two postcards, “I will rock the system by exercising my right to vote” or “I will vote because...”. The two differently designed postcards were used at different times, so there was no random allocation of the two groups. The cards were posted back to the young person a week before the presidential election. People who had entered their own pledge were more likely to see it through and turn out to vote than those who had completed the generic pledge (Burgess et al 2000). This does not say whether pledging works, but does indicate that people are more likely to carry out the action if they have been allowed to personalise the pledge.

Research with 142 smokers who all completed a written pledge to abstain from smoking for one hour a day over a month found that whether people were heavy, moderate or light smokers made no difference to them keeping to the pledge. There was no control group. People were more likely to successfully keep their pledge if they had already expressed a desire to quit smoking or reduce their level of consumption. There was no difference between males and females, but younger smokers (under 21) found it harder to stick to the pledge (Hallaq 1976). This suggests that people are more likely to keep to a pledge if it is something they were already thinking about before they were asked to pledge.

Action for Sustainable Living (AfSL), a Manchester based charity which uses pledges as part of their work to encourage sustainable behaviour, conducted phone and email interviews with 104 of the 2,400 people who had previously pledged to sustainable behaviour as part of a face-to-face meeting with an AfSL staff member or volunteer. 95 per cent of people said that as a result of their contact with AfSL they were now doing more than before to reduce their environmental impact, and 30 per cent were doing much more (Boyd 2008). The pledging was undertaken as part of a one to one meeting providing information and advice about sustainability, so it is hard to separate out the particular effect of the pledge. People found it easier to stick to their pledge if it was easier to implement – e.g. 79 per cent of pledgers managed to take all their unwanted clothes to charity shops – but on the most challenging pledges like “generate my own energy” none of the pledgers had achieved it. People are more likely to choose pledges that are less challenging. Less challenging pledges are more likely to be implemented than pledges that are more challenging.

### **Developing a successful pledge campaign**

Community-based social marketing (CBSM) is an approach, which brings together psychological theory with theories of marketing to develop practical tools to foster sustainable behaviour (McKenzie-Mohr and Smith 1999 and see review of CBSM in Jackson, 2005). Community-based social marketing has been adopted in a number of projects relating to sustainable behaviours including water use, recycling, composting and energy use. CBSM has found that people are more likely to stick to

their commitments if they are written down and made in public. Group commitments can be effective in well-established and cohesive groups where individuals care how they are viewed by others. Actively involving the person in the issue helps to increase commitment. Using community “block leaders” – local people who already engage in the behaviour – is an effective and cheap way of seeking commitment; asking people who have already committed to approach their neighbours can be effective in changing the behaviour of both. Commitments should be voluntary, and only sought for behaviours in which people express an interest. Within the Community-Based Social Marketing perspective, commitment approaches work best when combined with other tools to change behaviour, and commitment on its own is unlikely to work. The other tools that encompass the community-based social marketing approach are prompts, social norms, good quality communication, incentives and removing external barriers.

The design and evaluation of any behaviour change scheme are crucial: the lessons from community-based social marketing are that the following four steps should be taken before introducing a new pledge campaign:

- 1) Selecting behaviours and identifying barriers. It is important to: identify the target population and understand their background attitudes and behaviour; identify the behaviours to be targeted by the scheme and prioritise which behaviours to focus on; and identify the potential barriers to behaviour change.
- 2) Designing the programme. Select which other behaviour change tools might be most useful to use alongside the pledge: prompts or retrieval cues such as stickers, lapel badges, window posters, fridge magnets; building social norms (e.g. discussion forums and street parties); communication (e.g. through local radio, leaflets and websites) to satisfy the need for well-placed positive messages from a credible source; incentives (e.g. prizes and rewards); removing any external barriers where possible. It is important to check that the right behaviours are being targeted and the messages are appropriate to the population through focus groups or surveys and utilising existing data or local knowledge; and to link the message to personal experience as far as possible to appeal to people in a way that evokes their emotion, triggers their imagination and is immediate to them.
- 3) Pre-test/pilot the pledge campaign and compare with a control group.
- 4) Implementation and evaluation.

(adapted from McKenzie-Mohr and Smith 1999 and Bator and Cialdini 2000)

## **Research Design and Methodology**

Our approach was to design a trial that would evaluate a pledge, and also create some of the extra conditions that have been highlighted in the literature, in particular that a pledge will be more successful if it is public. We addressed this issue by varying the treatment groups accordingly. A sample population of individuals were randomly assigned to one of three groups. Members of all three groups were sent

information advertising an upcoming charity campaign to develop school libraries in South Africa: they were told that in a few weeks they would be asked to donate a second hand children's book. Treatment group one was asked to return a pledge card promising to make a donation. Treatment group two was asked to return a pledge card and advised that a list of donors will be publicly advertised. The control group simply received a campaign letter without being asked to pledge. Some weeks later all participants were asked to donate a book. The outcome measure was whether a book donation was received. The project is illustrated in Appendix 1.

### *Research objectives*

We were interested to discover whether making a pledge encourages people to carry out a civic activity: are those who make a pledge to do something more likely to later carry out the activity, compared to people who were not asked to pledge? We expect that households who are invited to make a pledge are more likely to later donate a book, because they will feel they have made a commitment or promise and want to see it through. We set this out more explicitly below:

H<sub>1</sub> The pledge group will donate more books than the control group.

H<sub>2</sub> The pledge group and the pledge&publicity group (combined) will donate more books than the control group.

Households who are advised their donation will be made public will be encouraged to donate because their generosity will be advertised to their peers, (but a minority might be discouraged by the publicity).

H<sub>3</sub> The pledge&publicity group will donate more books than the pledge group.

### *Community HEART*

The research was undertaken in partnership with the Community HEART charity. Community HEART is a UK registered charity which supports local self-help initiatives in South Africa (registered charity number 1052817). They collect children's books in the UK and transport them to South Africa, where they are used to set up school libraries. Further details can be found at <http://www.community-heart.org.uk/projects/books/books.htm>

### *The Intervention*

All households were sent two letters about the book collection. The initial letter was sent in late January 2010, addressed to "The Residents" and sent on University of Manchester letterhead, including the logo of Community HEART. It contained some information that was identical across all three groups: details of Children's Book Week, to be held Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> February – Saturday 6<sup>th</sup> March 2010; a request to donate a book for schools in South Africa; information about Community Heart; a statement saying the resident would be contacted again with details of local drop-off points. The initial letter to the Control group contained no additional information. The initial letter to the Pledge group contained all the above information and asked the residents to pledge to donate a book. They were given information on how to pledge, by phone, email or postcard, and were provided with a pledge card.

The initial letter to the Pledge plus publicity group included all the same information as the Pledge group, plus an additional statement, “A list of everyone who donates a book will be displayed locally”.

We sent a second letter to each household four weeks later, in mid-February 2010. All households in the control group plus households who were in either of the pledge groups but had not pledged were sent a letter reminding them of the children’s book collection and advising them of the local drop-off points for their book. The letter was addressed to The Residents unless they had been in touch for some reason to give their name. All those who had pledged were sent a letter thanking them for their pledge, reminding them of the children’s book collection and advising them of the local drop-off points for their book. The letter was addressed to them by name if they had given their name when pledging. Where people had pledged by email or pledge card, their pledge was returned to them as a reminder. All letters to the Pledge&Publicity Group additionally included the statement “A list of everyone who donates a book will be displayed at the drop-off points afterwards, to say thank you”.

All households were encouraged to put their book in a bookbag which accompanied the second letter. Each bookbag was labelled with the dates of the children’s book week, the local drop-off points, a unique identifier for each household and a space for the resident to write their name and address. The second letter asked households who wanted to donate more than one book, to put them in a carrier bag, and place the bookbag inside their own bag. Spare bookbags were available at the drop-off points.

Three local drop-off points were available in each electoral ward (six in total). They were chosen for their geographic spread across the ward and to offer variety to appeal to different people. They were a library, school and café in one ward and a library, community centre and children’s centre in another. Posters were displayed in each drop-off point during the week prior to the book collection to reinforce the message and encourage book donations.

### *Outcome Measurement*

There are two outcome measures of interest: pledging and book donation. Pledging was measured by whether a pledgecard, email or phone call was received from a household promising to donate a book. If a pledgecard was returned with a different address than it had been sent to, it was listed as a pledge from the original address. We assume that either the householder has moved elsewhere and used a card from their previous address, or that the householder has passed their card onto a friend or relative who can donate.

All book donations that were received in a bookbag were attributed to the household, using the unique identifier on the bookbag. Any book donations that included an address were similarly attributed to the appropriate household. Donations with addresses outside our study area were assumed to be from passers-by or people who had heard about the scheme (e.g. staff or users of the drop-off points). Donations without any identification could potentially be from a) householders in our study who chose to remain anonymous; b) households in our study who did not understand the instructions or forgot; c) households in our study who had already filled our bookbag

and were donating additional books; d) people who were not part of the study but had heard about it, saw the collection box, staff or users of the drop-off points).

Households were not informed that they were taking part in a research study. All three groups were blind to the fact that their book donations or pledges were being monitored. No personal data was collected during the study other than those people who chose to provide their names or contact details. All data was kept securely, destroyed once the mailings had been completed and not used for any other purpose. Staff at the drop-off points and any resident who asked about the university's involvement was honestly informed that this was a research study looking at the effectiveness of different messages in encouraging charitable giving. Staff were asked to encourage people to use the bookbags, so we could identify where donations came from. The data entry of the book donations was done by a researcher who was blind to the study in the sense that she had no earlier involvement in the project and was unaware which group households were in or whether they had made an earlier pledge.

### *Pilot study*

A pilot study was undertaken in one of the two electoral wards in September 2009. The purpose of the pilot was to test out the letters, pledgecards and drop-off arrangements; to see if a larger experiment was viable. It included 163 households in 8 randomly selected postcodes. The households were randomly allocated to one of three groups: a control group who were sent 2 letters asking for a donated book or mobile phone; a pledge group who were sent similar letters with a pledgecard; a second pledge group who had postage paid on their pledgecard. As a result of the pilot, some changes were made to the final study: the working of the letters and pledgecards were refined; the opportunity for phone and email pledges were added, as well as pledgecards; larger book bags were provided; postage was not paid on the pledgecards; residents were asked for one book, and also advised of how to donate more than one book if preferred; donations of mobile phones were not requested, because of concern at drop-off points about security and the growing number of adverts for recycling phones elsewhere for cash. The numbers were too small to make any estimates of response rates for the final study.

### *Sample population and randomisation*

We were given a list of all the postcodes and associated lower super output area codes in two electoral wards of Manchester. We used an address finder to identify all the addresses associated with these postcodes, excluding all business addresses. This resulted in 11,812 households, 5851 in one ward and 5961 in the other.

We asked two direct marketing companies what response we might get if we asked people on their lists to give a book for charity (i.e. without any pledge): Listlab guessed at a response rate between 1% and 5%. Cameo Lifestyles guessed at 0.5% – 3%. In the pilot 3% of the pledge group donated books and 0% of the control group (but the numbers were too small to make any assumptions based on this). We undertook power calculations using the DSS Calculator ([http://www.dssresearch.com/toolkit/spcalc/power\\_p2.asp](http://www.dssresearch.com/toolkit/spcalc/power_p2.asp)). We estimated that in one of the wards, with approximately 1900 in each group, we would have 99% of statistical power to detect a 2% difference between a control group of 1.5% and a treatment group of 3.5%. If the difference was closer, with the same group sizes, we

would have 71.1% of statistical power to detect a 1% difference between a control group of 1.5% and a treatment group of 2.5%. We eventually undertook the research in two wards, so the number of households is double those our estimates were based on.

The two datasets were separately randomised by Professor David Torgerson at York Trials Unit into three treatment groups - divided equally using the SPSS random selection function. We checked that within each group the randomisation had been executed properly and the groups were more or less equal according to lower super output area.

Table 2. Allocation of Households to Group

| Group                  | Ward D | Ward W |
|------------------------|--------|--------|
| Control (0)            | 1950   | 1987   |
| Pledge (1)             | 1950   | 1987   |
| Pledge & Publicity (2) | 1951   | 1987   |
| TOTAL                  | 5851   | 5961   |

*Data and Variables Used in the Analysis*

Household Level Variables: Group (Control, Pledge or Pledge & Publicity); Pledge (No pledge made, Pledged); Pledgetype (No pledge made, Pledgecard, Phone, Email - create separate dummies for each type, with 1 for the group 0 for all else); Other levels of variable: Ward, Super Output area, Drop off point

The outcome variables are Book (No donation, Book donated) and Pledge.

We will undertake some preliminary descriptive statistics including frequencies, cross tabs and correlations, plus independent samples T-Tests:

|                         | Comparison Group 1 | Comparison Group 2        |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| T-Test 1 (tests $H_1$ ) | Control            | Pledge                    |
| T-Test 2 (tests $H_2$ ) | Control            | Pledge + Pledge&Publicity |
| T-Test 3 (tests $H_3$ ) | Pledge             | Pledge&Publicity          |

We will run these tests on the whole dataset and also separately for each of the two electoral wards. We think it is appropriate to use a one-tailed test for tests 1 and 2 because we are confident that we do not expect the pledge to reduce participation. We are less confident about test 3 and may therefore use a two-tailed test, which is appropriate when our hypothesis is that there could be a difference in any direction.

We will undertake Use Multilevel Logistic Regression in Stata, using the combined dataset.

Dependent variable - Book (binary)

Independent variables –

Household level: Group (need to create dummies – 3 groups)

Level 1 (SOA): % on benefits (or similar)

Level 2 (Ward): Ward

NB Level 1 and 2 are contiguous. The level 1 and level 2 variables are control variables.

Intention to treat analysis was adopted: all of the households who were included in the initial randomisation were included in the analysis, regardless of whether or not they received the intervention. We know that 81 letters were returned to us by Royal Mail because the property was empty, 51 letters were returned that were wrongly addressed, and 4 were sent back by residents who were not interested. These addresses are spread across all three groups and there is no pattern to them that can adversely affect the experiment.

## **Preliminary Results**

The book collection week is underway at the time of writing, so we can only report interim results. Further findings will be presented at the conference.

### **1. Pledges received**

Overall the numbers pledging are higher than we anticipated. So far, we have received 374 pledges (4.8% of those asked to pledge). There is a higher response among those who have been promised publicity (199 pledges – 5.1% of those offered publicity) than those who were not (175 pledges – 4.5% of those asked to pledge). We are still receiving pledges.

### **2. Enquiries about Book Collections**

Eight people have contacted us who want to arrange their own book collections: 2 primary schools, a church, a parent wants to organise a collection in daughter's school, a parents' support group in a Surestart centre, a nursery, staff in a mental health trust and Body Shop staff. We have put all these people in contact with Community HEART.

## **Acknowledgements**

The research study is part of the Rediscovering the Civic and Achieving Better Outcomes in Public Policy project (see [www.civicbehaviour.org.uk](http://www.civicbehaviour.org.uk)), funded by the Economic and Social Research Council, Department of Communities and Local Government and the North West Improvement Network, grant reference: RES-177-025-0002. The authors wish to thank Community HEART, staff at the drop-off points, volunteers and colleagues at the University of Manchester who helped with the book collection.

## References

- Aronson, E. (1969) "The Theory of Cognitive Dissonance: A Current Perspective." In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, ed. L. Berkowitz, vol. 4, pp. 1–34. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Bastow, S., Beck, H., Dunleavy, P. and Richardson, L (2007) 'Incentives Schemes and Civil Renewal', in Brannan, T, John, P and Stoker, G. (eds) *Re-Energising Citizenship, Strategies for Civil Renewal*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bator, R. J. and Cialdini, R.B. (2000) 'The Application of Persuasion Theory to the Development of Effective Proenvironmental Public Service Announcements', *Journal of Social Issues* 56, 3 527 – 541, p536.
- Boyd, A. (2008) *Action for Sustainable Living (Manchester) evaluation report to Defra*.
- Burgess, D. Haney, B, Snyder, M., Sullivan, J. L. & Transue, J. E. (2000) 'Rocking the Vote: Using Personalised Messages to Motivate Voting Among Young Adults', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64 29–52.
- Bryce, W. J. et al. (1997) 'Commitment Approach to Motivating Recycling: New Zealand Curbside Trial', *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 31, 1 27–52.
- Burn, S. M. and Oskamp, S (1986) *Increasing Community Recycling with Persuasive Communication and Public Commitment*, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 1, 29-41.
- Cotterill, S. and Richardson, L. (2009) *Can Pledging Increase Civic Activity: A Literature Review on Developing Community Pledgebanks*. London: CLG <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/1328160.pdf>
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) (2008) *Best Practice Guide to Designing and Operating Climate Change Pledge Schemes*.
- Festinger, L. (1957) *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Geller, E.S. et al. (1989) 'Promoting Safety Belt Use on a University Campus: An Integration of Commitment and Incentive Strategies', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 1 3–19.
- Greenwald et al. (1987) 'Increasing Voting Behavior by Asking People if They Expect to Vote', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 2 315–318.
- Hallaq, J. H. (1976) 'The pledge as an instrument of behavioural change', *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 98, 147–148.
- IPEG (2010) *An Evaluation of the Community Contracts Pilot Programme, report to the Department of Communities and Local Government*, London: CLG. <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/communities/evaluationcommunitycontracts>

- Jackson, T. (2005) *Motivating Sustainable Consumption*. Centre for Environmental Strategy, University of Surrey.
- Katzev, R.D. and Pardini, A.U. (1987) 'The comparative effectiveness of reward and commitment approaches in motivating community recycling', *Journal of Environmental Systems*, 17, 2, 93–114.
- Ludwig, T. D. et. al. (2005) *Using Social Marketing to Increase the Use of Helmets Among Bicyclists*. *Journal of American College Health*. 54, 1 51-58
- McKenzie-Mohr, D. & Smith, W. (1999) *Fostering Sustainable Behavior: An Introduction to Community-Based Social Marketing*. Gabriola Island, Canada: New Society Publishers.
- Policy Studies Institute (2008) *London Student Pledge Evaluation*
- Reams, M. A. & Ray, B. H. (1993) 'The Effects of 3 Prompting Methods on Recycling Participation Rates – a Field Study', *Journal of Environmental Systems*, 22, 4 371–379
- Thomas, C. Open University (2006) *Recycle for Hampshire – Campaign Evaluation Report*.

Appendix 1 Implementation of the Book collection

