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Extreme Marketplace Exclusion in Subsistence Marketplaces: A Study in a Refugee Settlement in Nakivale, Uganda

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Largely excluded from marketing literature are individuals in *subsistence marketplaces*. This term refers to an approach that begins at the micro-level and is bottom-up, encompassing a range of low-income consumers and entrepreneurs (Viswanathan 2013). Indeed, these marketplaces are often characterized by exclusion. But marketplace exclusion reaches even starker levels in subsistence contexts born out of violence, flight, and abject conditions for survival, such as in refugee settlements. Understanding such exclusion is especially critical as a refugee’s average length of stay in exile is approximately 20 years (Betts et al. 2014).

We aim to understand how refugees are excluded from the marketplace. These experiences are so drastic as to stretch extant conceptualizations to cover extreme marketplace exclusion. The fundamental contribution of this paper is therefore to delineate extreme marketplace exclusion via refugee contexts. We explain such exclusion by integrating current research and providing empirical support for our conceptualization. Our synthesis of extant literature identifies elements of extreme marketplace exclusion and their interplay. We then describe our methods and present findings about the nature of extreme marketplace exclusion in our research context. We conclude with a discussion covering theoretical and practical implications.

Elements of Extreme Marketplace Exclusion

Literature on exclusion has primarily focused on ‘social’ exclusion (Sen 2000), examining it as a vicious cycle with multiple, reciprocal, cause-and-effect elements which intensify exclusion (Levitas et al. 2007). Marketplace exclusion may have varying degrees, with ‘deep exclusion’ characterizing exclusion across multiple dimensions (Levitas et al. 2007). Similar to deep exclusion, extreme marketplace exclusion involves multiple forces. Unlike deep exclusion, however, we study exclusion in a subsistence marketplace context intensified by violence, psychological stress, economic strain, and social instability. Specific to a refugee context, our research focuses on how elements relate to form extreme marketplace exclusion, locating it vis-a-vis deep exclusion. Importantly, the marketplace does not only involve economic transactions, but melds social, cultural, political and economic realities (Granovetter 1990). Research remains to offer a theoretical model to account for these multiple elements of marketplace exclusion. We now identify and delineate four elements of this type of marketplace exclusion: geographic isolation, social ostracism, abject poverty and loss of marketplace literacy.

Studies in rural subsistence marketplaces (e.g., China: Wang and Tian 2013) in refugee settlements (Rose 2001) show *geographic isolation* as a key contributor to marketplace exclusion. Many settlements lack sufficient infrastructure, geographically isolated from public facilities including schools, hospitals, and markets (De Montclos and Kagwanj 2000). Even more drastic, refugees’ geographic isolation may stem from legal restrictions enforcing segregation from the local community (Taylor 1996).

Refugees in their host countries often face the most severe form of *social ostracism*, as they bear the stigma of fleeing their home country, and are perceived as unwelcome exploiters of the host country’s resources (Sartorius et al. 2013). Refugees must endure the turmoil of resettlement, separation from family and culture (Schweitzer, Greenslade, and Kagee 2007), and exclusion due to cultural/language barriers (Taylor and Stanovic 2004). Refugees are therefore often unable to understand cultural aspects of marketplaces (Taylor and Stanovic 2014). *Abject poverty*, arising from loss of income and assets, and displacement, make markets inaccessible and products unaffordable, severely inhibiting consumption capability (Deaton 1972). Poverty is rampant among refugees who have lost their livelihoods in their home countries (Sartorius et al. 2013). Refugees mostly survive on government or international aid with limited alternative means to their survival. The social and psychological conditions refugees face make it extremely difficult for them to start a new livelihood. This is coupled with the lack of economic opportunities made available to them until their legal status is settled, which can take many years (White 2007).

*Loss of marketplace literacy* due to relocation makes it difficult to engage in marketplace interactions (Viswanathan et al. 2009). Loss of such literacy can lead to poor consumption decisions, sometimes making individuals vulnerable to deception at the hands of sellers. Whereas in most subsistence contexts, consumers cope with the lack of basic literacy by developing marketplace literacy via interpersonal relations (Viswanathan et al. 2009), refugees face a new, unfamiliar and extremely harsh setting, where social relations are strained (Wker 2007). The loss of marketplace literacy is accentuated for those with low literacy and income, whose functional literacy in the marketplace domain is socially embedded. For those with higher literacy, there is still an effect due to situational loss of marketplace literacy (Viswanathan et al. 2010). The psychological stresses of leaving home countries and resettlement may further impair refugees’ cognition, characteristic of low-income consumers living in scarcity conditions (Shah, Mullahanathan, and Shafir 2012). Given the link between marketplace literacy and self-confidence (Viswanathan et al. 2009), we consider emotions and cognitions. Emotions are drastic in refugee contexts, even more so than other subsistence marketplaces and a violent past (and sometimes present) combined with deep fear of the future fixes individuals in the immediate present, accentuating cognitive elements.

Context and Methods

**Context.** We conducted our study in Nakivale, a refugee settlement in rural Uganda housing over 84,000 refugees managed by the United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees (UNHCR). Upon arrival, refugees are given construction materials to build shelter. Residents are allocated based on ethnicity due to potential conflict among refugees of different nations. Between the time of arrival and time spent building, they sleep under a large tent. The UNHCR distributes a limited supply of food each month, but it is gradually reduced after six months with the expectation that refugees find work. Employment is often difficult to obtain, however. Mbarara, a mid-sized town approximately 45 minutes away from Nakivale by car, offers employment opportunities, but no formal transportation to the town exists. We also note these refugees vary widely in their educational achievements, different from traditional subsistence marketplaces where low literacy and low income often co-occurs (Hodes and Goldberg 2002). Images depicting the severe circumstances of the marketplace can be found in the Appendix.

**Methods.** We employed qualitative techniques including observations, depth interviews, and marketplace-learning interventions. Pertaining to field observations, two immersions took place in person (one in June 2015 and again in July 2016), and virtually from January.
to May, 2015 via Skype meetings. The UNHCR and non-profit organiza-
tions on the ground facilitated access. In particular, we worked with a group of entrepreneurial refugees mentored and developed into a team by one of our partner organizations. These refugees acted as both participants and facilitators. We observed settlement facilities, various local marketplaces, the land, and a nearby town. Interviews ranged from 30 to over 90 minutes and tape recorded for coding purposes. The first part of each semi-structured interview was phenomenological (Thompson, Locander, and Pollio 1989), and the second transitioned into a structured discussion of informants’ marketplace experiences. Refugee participants and translators received 3,000 shillings for participation, the equivalent to one U.S. dollar.

Findings

We examine four elements of extreme marketplace exclusion: abject poverty (economic), geographic isolation (physical), social ostracism (social), and loss of marketplace literacy (cognitive-emotional). Importantly, extreme marketplace exclusion impacts both consumption and employment.

Elements of Extreme Marketplace Exclusion

Abject poverty: In terms of economic conditions, refugees face extreme poverty. Finding food of some quality and clean water is challenging. Kevin, a middle-aged refugee employed at an UNHCR facility, states that the “Sometimes [the] water has color, sometimes it smells, and good water doesn’t have all those elements.” Lacking even basic necessities leaves refugees with few spending options. A young man describes his experience of abject poverty and how he spends in the local marketplace.

David: We have nowhere to borrow from.
Interviewer: Do you buy things in the market?
David: … not much. We get soap and cooking oil.

Our informant explains how he has no accessible credit institutions to borrow funds. Due to his scarce financial resources, he buys only necessities for the immediate present. Unlike traditional subsistence contexts, any earned/inherited family assets are completely lost upon migration.

Geographic Isolation. Although refugees can travel to towns nearby, the lack of resources and mobility barriers are often insurmountable. Daniel, a 24-year-old man who fled Congo and lived in the settlement since 2010, explains how this particular element impacts his work as an artist.

Daniel:… as an artist, I want to buy [tools] I [need]…. [but] there’s no place they sell [the art materials]…. once I sent some-
one to buy [the materials in Kampala]…. [but] he doesn’t know the quality that I need…. he may just buy what [sellers] tell him.

Due to long distances and high transportation costs, he cannot even travel to the preferred marketplace in Kampala (260 kilometers away) to purchase materials either. He also cannot send others to buy on his behalf since they do not know how to purchase quality materials at reasonable prices.

Social Ostracism. Another element in understanding extreme marketplace exclusion is social ostracism. Social ostracism is associated with extreme marketplace exclusion as consumers, entrepreneurs, and employees. Individuals who fled their country can endure a much more extreme form of ostracism than those in traditional subsistence contexts. This element of extreme marketplace exclusion arises from cultural factors, and interestingly, are not confined to national/ethnic differences. Many respondents explain how sellers from the home country or of different origin often exclude refugees via discrimination. One informant illustrates this:

Daniel: … clearly I can speak English and those sellers can speak English, but when in Mbarara, they know I’m not Ugandan – and they can change and instead they don’t speak English… just to make a complication. Here, I used a different language, I do not negotiate and sometimes they increase price.

Daniel explains how social ostracism manifests in the marketplace. The exclusion he experiences cannot be neatly categorized into being indirectly ignored or directly rejected (Lee and Shrum 2012). The shopkeepers clearly acknowledge him (he is not ignored), and they do not explicitly refuse his shopping ability (he is not directly rejected). Instead, shopkeepers acknowledge him in an attempt to coerce a ‘penalty price’ for not being Ugandan. Consequently, the sellers exclude the refugees from fully participating in the marketplace.

Loss of Marketplace Literacy. Another element leading to extreme marketplace exclusion is the loss of marketplace literacy, defined as encompassing skills, self-confidence, and awareness of rights and capturing know-why, know-how, and know-what as consumers and entrepreneurs (Viswanathan et al. 2009). We note that refugees may range in income and literacy levels in their home country, with the refugee status drastically lowering the former while maintaining the latter for relatively higher incomes and education levels. We focus on cognitive and emotional dimensions.

Concrete thinking in the here and now arising from difficulty with abstractions is likely to be accentuated with geographic isolation, abject poverty, and social ostracism. Similarly, pictographic thinking and a rudimentary dependence on senses is also particularized in the immediate. Veronica, a 20-year-old woman, illustrates her present-state orientation explaining, “I don’t have savings…” and when discussing leisure activities, “Never I have the time to think of that.” Mary, a 43-year-old woman, explains how difficult it is to fall asleep. She elaborates, “I don’t get sleep thinking how will I push the next day and make living for my children.” Cognitively, fathoming a future is difficult for these women. Emotionally, Veronica describes how she cannot engage in leisure activities. Ray even explains how he attempts to actively repress his emotions just to function saying “Such [bad feelings] you cannot permit. You know we are human beings, yeah? When something is very bad, you [will] have some emotions, but maybe [they] can cause you trauma…”

The cognitive predilections of being in the here and now arising from low literacy and the immediacy of basic needs are further accentuated by severe emotional trauma.

Interplay between Elements of Extreme Marketplace Exclusion

The economic, geographic, social and cognitive-emotional realms of life described all amplify and reinforce extreme marketplace exclusion. In a context of abject poverty, geographic isolation precludes opportunities outside the settlement, narrowing refugees to the abject poverty there and extreme marketplace exclusion. Social ostracism combines with geographic isolation to reinforce such exclusion. And the individual level cognitive and emotional aspects associated with marketplace literacy further narrow individuals to the immediate present, and reinforce the inability to overcome extreme marketplace exclusion. In a sense, these are the levers of marketplace exclusion. We offer Figure 1 as a theoretical framework to illustrate how these elements relate to each other.
Discussion

Our findings offer contributions to the areas of exclusion, marketplace exclusion, and subsistence contexts. First, we study marketplace exclusion in a refugee context where these subsistence consumers face the most severe challenges, demonstrating extreme marketplace exclusion as a novel phenomenon. Second, we describe how this phenomenon operates in this context, delineating its elements informed by prior research. Third, we illustrate how the elements of extreme marketplace exclusion are interlinked and reinforce each other, creating a vicious cycle of exclusion from the marketplace. In doing so, we integrate aspects of exclusion from previous studies in refugee contexts and explain it from the marketplace perspective.

Implications

Theoretically, we study a qualitatively different level of marketplace exclusion and the elements associated with it. Specifically, abject poverty, geographic isolation, social ostracism, and loss of marketplace literacy are elements leading to extreme marketplace exclusion. Even compared with studies of deep exclusion, the severe nature of extreme marketplace exclusion is distinctly unique. Despite potentially having valued skills and education, refugees are often excluded from the marketplace’s workforce due to the elements we outline. Our work also highlights how individual cognitive and emotional aspects associated with marketplace literacy accentuate marketplace exclusion. These individual elements combine with elements rooted in the external environment to lead to the complex phenomenon of extreme marketplace exclusion. Future research should focus on extreme marketplace exclusion in a variety of contexts to better understand how the elements of such exclusion manifest in the harshest of human conditions, ranging from areas devastated by natural disasters to war. Moreover, future work should examine the coping strategies consumers employ in such drastic exclusion circumstances. For example, even when faced with extreme exclusion, our participants still navigate their realities to pursue and attain belongingness and acceptance. The specific tactics these consumers leverage to achieve belonging experiences have yet to be closely examined but hold important implications for studying consumers’ agency and resilience.

In term of practical implications, we highlight the importance of providing refugees with capacity-building learning experiences that address skills, self-confidence, and awareness of rights. In this regard, the role of marketplace literacy education is particularly relevant to extreme marketplace exclusion. Rather than focus on access or financial resources, marketplace literacy education is related to capacity-building that begins with a deeper understanding of the marketplace (know-why) as a basis for know-how and know-what. Moreover, such education also addresses issues of self-confidence and identity, critically important in these settings. In conclusion, our study of what we term extreme marketplace exclusion provides a foundation to study consumers and employees in the harshest of subsistence contexts, with important theoretical and practical implications.
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EXTENDED ABSTRACT

One prevalent and increasingly lucrative prosocial practice is for brands to donate some portion of sales or profits to designated charitable causes via "cause marketing" campaigns (e.g., Krishna, 2011; Small & Cryder, 2016). Descriptions of such campaigns often highlight two attributes: the percent-of-profits (or percent-of-revenues) from each purchase that the brand will donate, and the maximum amount of money the brand will donate. For example, a 2014 campaign by Chipotle locations in Minnesota pledged that "50% of [its] proceeds up to $35,000 will benefit Como Park Zoo and Conservatory."

We examine how these numerical attributes of cause marketing campaigns influence perceptions of brands’ generosity. We anticipate that the percent-of-proceeds donated from each purchase will be a stronger predictor of generosity perceptions than maximum donations. Our rationale builds on research by Hsee and colleagues on attribute evaluability. Hsee and Zhang (2010) proposed that sensitivity to variation in the value of an attribute (i.e., the attribute’s evaluability) is partly a function of knowledge of the attribute’s distribution (e.g., its range or mean). In the cause marketing context, consumers are unlikely to recall typical values of the percent-of-proceeds and maximum donation attributes. Nevertheless, consumers are likely to be more sensitive to variation in the percent-of-proceeds attribute than variation in maximum donations, because the former attribute has a clear upper bound (100%), but the latter attribute does not.

A novel implication of our reasoning is that cause marketing campaigns may allow brands to appear highly generous without actually being highly generous (by donating a high percent-of-proceeds and a low maximum donation). In what follows, we investigate that implication and more broadly examine whether the percent-of-proceeds attribute is in fact more predictive of generosity perceptions than the maximum donation attribute. We explore whether this effect holds over a range of percentages. To test our evaluability account, we manipulate the number of different cause marketing campaigns participants encounter (and thus the evaluability of the campaigns’ numerical attributes). In addition, we attempt to rule out several alternative accounts (e.g., that the percent-of-proceeds attribute is more influential because it is the first attribute presented or because it is especially memorable).

Experiment 1

Our first experiment aimed to document initial evidence of consumers’ greater sensitivity to the percent-of-proceeds attribute of cause marketing campaigns than to the maximum donation attribute. We also investigated whether this effect is an artifact of the order in which the two attributes are presented. Typically, the percent-of-proceeds attribute appears first (e.g., when companies pledge to donate X% up to $Y). If people are indeed more sensitive to variation in the percent-of-proceeds attribute, it could be because they simply paid greater attention to the first numerical information they encountered. We therefore counterbalanced which attribute appeared first.

Participants and Procedure

We recruited 600 adults (49% female; mean age: 33) via Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) to participate in exchange for a small payment. We told participants that we were interested in how consumers form impressions of companies based on limited information. In all conditions, we described a clothing retailer with annual profits of $10 million that had conducted a donation campaign over the past year to help raise money for local charities.

We either described the retailer as donating 1% of its profits from each purchase, up to a maximum amount of $26,000 (Lower%/Higher$ condition) or donating 30% of its profits from each purchase, up to a maximum amount of $25,000 (Higher%/Lower$ condition). Because we noted that the retailer has annual profits of $10 million, it should be clear to participants that the retailer would ultimately donate the maximum amount. We emphasized this fact by noting that the retailer “ultimately donated that maximum amount.” Thus, normatively, the retailer should be viewed as (slightly) more generous when they donate $26,000 than when they donate $25,000.

We also investigated whether this effect is an artifact of the order in which the campaign attributes were presented. Half of the participants were randomly assigned to view the percent-of-proceeds attribute first (e.g., in the Lower%/Higher$ condition, the retailer pledged to “donate 1% of its profits from each purchase, up to a maximum amount of $26,000”). The other half of participants were randomly assigned to view the maximum donation attribute first (e.g., in the Lower%/Higher$ condition, the retailer “pledged to donate up to a maximum amount of $26,000, based on 1% of its profits from each purchase”).

We then asked participants to indicate on 0-10 scales (where 0=not at all and 10=very) the extent to which they found the retailer to be generous. Next, we asked participants two open-ended recall questions: “What percentage of profits from each purchase did the company donate?” and “What was the total amount of money the company ultimately donated?” Finally, participants provided demographic information.

Results and Discussion

We first conducted a factorial ANOVA treating generosity ratings as the dependent variable and numerical campaign attributes (Lower%/Higher$ vs. Higher%/Lower$) and attribute presentation order as independent variables. We found a significant main effect of numerical campaign attributes (F(1,596) = 12.30, p < .001). As predicted, perceived generosity was significantly greater when the company donated a higher percentage of profits and lower maximum amount than when the company donated a lower percentage of profits and higher maximum amount (M = 6.69, SD = 2.57 vs. M = 5.93, SD = 2.73; t(598) = 3.49, p < .001, d = .29). We observed this difference despite the fact that participants were assured that the retailers would ultimately donate their maximum amount. Normatively, we would expect the Lower%/Higher$ campaign to be viewed at least as generous as the Higher%/Lower$ campaign, if not slightly more generous.

There was no main effect of attribute presentation order (F(1,596) = .12, p = .73), and no interaction between numerical campaign attributes and attribute presentation order (F(1,596) = 1.65, p = .20). This suggests that greater sensitivity to the percent-of-proceeds attribute is not an artifact of attribute presentation order.

We also examined whether the percent-of-proceeds attribute was more memorable than the maximum donation attribute. Participants were not significantly more likely to correctly recall the percent-of-proceeds donated from each purchase than the maximum...
donation amount (90% vs. 87%; p = .10, Fisher’s Exact Test). If we focus only on the 486 participants who correctly recalled both attributes, perceived generosity was still greater when the retailer donated a higher percentage of profits and lower maximum amount than when the retailer donated a lower percentage of profits and higher maximum amount ($M = 6.76, SD = 2.57$ vs. $M = 6.04, SD = 2.71$; $t(484) = 3.05, p < .01, d = .27$).

Experiment 1 provides initial evidence that, when presented with a description of a cause marketing campaign, consumers’ perceptions of the brand’s generosity are more sensitive to the percent-of-proceeds to be donated than to the maximum donation amount. As a result, in this experiment, the brand was viewed as significantly less generous when it was objectively more generous. We found that this was not driven by the order in which the two key attributes were described or differences in the memorability of the two attributes.

**Experiment 2**

Our explanation for the greater perceived generosity of the Higher%/Lower$ brand is that the percent-of-proceeds attribute is easier to evaluate and thus more influential. However, it is possible that the effect may have been driven by reactions to the 1% figure in particular, rather than the greater evaluability of (all) percentages. That is, the 1% of profits donated in the Lower%/Higher$ condition may have appeared to be an insultingly trivial gesture. Experiment 2 therefore examined whether generosity perceptions are more sensitive to the percent-of-proceeds attribute even when that percentage is not trivially low.

**Participants and Procedure**

We recruited 600 adults (52% female; mean age: 34) via MTurk to participate in exchange for a small payment. People who had already participated in Experiment 1 were not eligible to participate in this experiment. As in Experiment 1, we told participants that we were interested in how consumers form impressions of companies based on limited information. In all conditions, we described a clothing retailer with annual profits of $10 million that plans to conduct a donation campaign during the current fiscal year to help raise money for local charities.

We randomly assigned participants to one of four conditions. Half of participants were randomly assigned to either a Lower%/Higher$ condition (retailer donates 1% of profits from each purchase, up to a maximum amount of $26,000) or a Higher%/Lower$ condition (retailer donates 25% of profits from each purchase, up to a maximum amount of $25,000). We increased these percentages by 20% for the other half of participants. That is, the other half of participants were randomly assigned to a Lower%/Higher$ condition (retailer donates 21% of profits from each purchase, up to a maximum amount of $26,000) or a Higher%/Lower$ condition (retailer donates 45% of profits from each purchase, up to a maximum amount of $25,000).

Next, we asked participants to rate the extent to which they viewed the retailer as generous on a 0-10 scale, where 0 = not at all generous and 10 = very generous. We also asked participants to recall the percent-of-proceeds and maximum donation values from the campaign they had read about (two open-ended questions). As in Experiment 1, participants were not significantly more likely to correctly recall the percent-of-proceeds value than the maximum donation value ($90% vs. 87%; p = .11, Fisher’s Exact Test). Finally, participants provided demographic information.

**Results and Discussion**

Consistent with Experiment 1, generosity ratings were significantly greater in the Higher%/Lower$ condition than in Lower%/Higher$ condition ($M = 6.53, SD = 2.65$ vs. $M = 5.13, SD = 2.57$; $t(302) = 4.66, p < .001, d = .54$). Generosity ratings were also significantly greater in the Higher%/20% condition than in the Lower%/20% condition ($M = 6.72, SD = 2.70$ vs. $M = 5.97, SD = 2.70$; $t(294) = 2.37, p = .019, d = .28$).

These patterns suggest our results were not merely driven by aversive reactions to a somewhat trivial donation of 1% of profits. Instead, these results suggest that generosity perceptions are generally more sensitive to the percent-of-proceeds attribute, even when that percentage is not trivially low.

**Experiment 3**

One implication of our conceptual framework is that providing information about other cause marketing campaigns should increase the evaluability of both the percent-of-proceeds attribute and the maximum donation attribute; it should especially increase the evaluability of the maximum donation attribute (cf. Hsee, 1996). When maximum donations become more evaluable, the objectively less generous campaign should no longer be viewed as more generous.

**Participants and Procedure**

We recruited 297 adults (49% female, mean age: 33) via MTurk to participate in exchange for a small payment. People who had already participated in prior experiments were not eligible to participate in this experiment. As in previous experiments, we told participants that we were interested in how consumers form impressions of companies based on limited information. In all conditions, we described a clothing retailer with annual profits of $10 million that plans to conduct a donation campaign during the current fiscal year to help raise money for local charities.

We randomly assigned participants to one of three conditions. In two separate evaluation conditions, participants either learned of a cause marketing campaign that donates 1% of its profits from each purchase, up to a maximum amount of $40,000 (SE:Lower%/Higher$) or donates 20% of its profits from each purchase, up to a maximum amount of $10,000 (SE:Higher%/Lower$). In a third joint evaluation condition (JE), participants viewed both campaigns. The two campaigns were presented as the efforts of two different clothing retailers.

In all three conditions, participants read that all donations would be made at the end of the fiscal year. We included this information to rule out the potential interpretation that the Higher%/Lower$ campaign could reach its target amount faster and donate faster than the Lower%/Higher$ campaign. In other words, we did not want the assumed speed of donation to be confounded with the numerical attributes of the campaign.

We then asked participants to indicate the extent to which they found the company to be generous on a 0-10 scale, where 0 = not at all generous and 10 = very generous. Next, we asked participants to recall the percent-of-proceeds and maximum donation values from the donation campaign(s) they had read about (open-ended questions). As before, the percent-of-proceeds and maximum donation attributes were about equally likely to be recalled accurately, in both the separate evaluation and joint evaluation conditions ($ps > .45$).

**Results and Discussion**

Figure 1 displays perceived generosity by condition. Consistent with previous experiments, in the separate evaluation conditions, perceived generosity was significantly greater in the SE:Higher%/Lower$ condition than in the SE:Lower%/Higher$ condition ($M = 5.99, SD = 2.82$ vs. $M = 5.21, SD = 2.59$; $t(197) = 2.03, p = .044, d = .29$). However, in the joint evaluation condition, where participants could see both campaigns, the numerical attributes of the cam-