

Interest in Another's Consideration of One's Needs in Communal and Exchange Relationships

Margaret S. Clark and Parastu Dubash

Carnegie Mellon University

and

Judson Mills

University of Maryland, College Park

Received: January 23, 1997; revised: October 6, 1997; accepted: October 17, 1997

Three studies found support for the hypothesis that interest in another's consideration of one's needs is greater when a communal relationship is desired with the other than when an exchange relationship is desired. This hypothesis was based on the assumption that monitoring of the extent to which the other considers one's own welfare will be high in a mutual communal relationship. Interest in another's consideration of one's needs was measured in Study 1 by participants' glances at lights indicating whether or not another was selecting problem hints for the participant, in Study 2 by participants' ratings of their interest in the length of time another spent selecting a task for them, and in Study 3 by participants' ratings of interest in the time another spent selecting a gift for them and whether an identical gift was bought for someone else at the same time. In each study, scores on the measure of interest in the other's consideration of one's needs were higher when a communal relationship was desired. In Study 3, evidence was found that interest in another's consideration of one's needs is greater when the uncertainty about a communal relationship is greater. © 1998 Academic Press

The present studies are part of a program of research on the differences between communal and exchange relationships. The three studies reported focus on the extent to which people monitor how much consideration a relationship partner is giving to their needs. The research also deals with how, when a communal

This research was supported by National Science Foundation Grant SBR 9630898.

Correspondence regarding this article and reprint requests may be addressed to Margaret S. Clark, Department of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213 or to Judson Mills, Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

relationship is desired, uncertainty about the nature of the relationship influences people's monitoring of the other's consideration of their own needs.

Almost two decades ago Clark and Mills (1979) distinguished communal relationships from exchange relationships based on the rules governing the giving and receiving of benefits. In communal relationships, often exemplified by relationships between family members, friends, or romantic partners, members feel a special obligation for the other's welfare. Thus, in communal relationships, benefits are given in response to needs or to demonstrate concern for the other. Benefits given do not create a specific debt on the other's part to repay with a comparable benefit. In exchange relationships, often exemplified by relationships between acquaintances or business associates, a benefit is given with the expectation of receiving a comparable benefit in return or in repayment for a benefit received previously.

To date, many studies have supported the distinction. For instance, when a communal relationship is desired, as opposed to when an exchange relationship is desired, people have been found to monitor the other's needs more (Clark, Mills, & Powell, 1986; Clark, Mills, & Corcoran, 1989), to respond more positively to the other's expressions of emotions (Clark & Taraban, 1991; Clark, Ouellette, Powell, & Milberg, 1987), to help the other more (Clark et al., 1987), to respond with greater positive affect after having helped the other (Williamson & Clark, 1989; Williamson and Clark, 1992), and to respond with more negative affect after having refused to help the other (Williamson, Clark, Pegalis & Behan (1996). In contrast, when an exchange relationship is desired, as opposed to when a communal relationship is desired, people have been found to monitor inputs into a joint task for which there will be a joint reward more (Clark, 1984; Clark et al., 1989), to react more positively to being paid back for a favor (Clark & Mills, 1979), to react more positively to a request for a repayment (Clark & Mills, 1979) and to feel more exploited if a repayment does not follow a favor (Clark & Waddell, 1985).

The present studies on monitoring a partner's consideration of one's own needs are important for two closely related reasons. First, we see this research as an important step toward clarifying a misunderstanding of our theoretical distinction. Although it was never a part of our own theoretical distinction, some have equated our distinction between communal and exchange relationships with a distinction between selfish and unselfish relationships—with communal relationships being unselfish and exchange relationships being selfish (e.g. Batson, 1993; Brown, 1986).¹ One likely source of this misunderstanding is the nature of our empirical

¹ As we pointed out in a reply to Batson's article (Clark & Mills, 1993), we do not share this belief. Both communal and exchange relationships assume a willingness to meet one's obligations to the other person. Exploiting the other by failing to meet one's obligations in either type of relationship is truly selfish behavior. The motivations for following the communal rule or the exchange rule may be either selfish or unselfish. If one is motivated to help one's spouse complete a difficult task because it will make one's spouse feel good, one is behaving communally for unselfish reasons; if one does so because one would feel guilty if one failed to help him, one is behaving communally for selfish

research program on the communal/exchange distinction to date. It has emphasized the fact that people who desire communal relationships attend more to the other's needs, help the other more, react more positively to helping the other, and react more negatively to having refused to help the other than do people who desire an exchange relationship. In other words, our research program has emphasized that people in communal relationships attend to other people's needs more than do people in exchange relationships. But the communal norm is not that one should respond to the other's needs and not expect the other to respond to one's own needs (although that may happen in some one-sided communal relationships such as that between a parent and a newborn infant).

Most communal relationships are mutual. Thus in most friendships, romantic relationships and family relationships, at the same time one feels obligated to consider the other's welfare, one also feels that the other should take into consideration one's own needs. The other should respond to those needs, to the best of the other's ability, if and when such needs arise. We felt that demonstrating this aspect of communal relationships was important to reduce misunderstanding of the distinction.

The second reason for investigating people's monitoring of the other's consideration of their needs is simple. Our theory predicts that such monitoring should be higher when mutual communal relationships are desired than when exchange relationships are desired and we had not yet tested this aspect of the theory.² In mutual communal relationships, when there is any uncertainty about the relationship and particularly when such uncertainty is high, participants should look for clues suggesting that the other, like the self, wishes to follow communal norms. This should lead to interest in information indicating the other's degree of consideration of one's own needs. Such consideration is an indication of the other's desire to maintain or to form a mutual communal relationship. In contrast, in exchange relationships there is no special reason to be interested in the other's consideration of one's needs. The rules governing exchange relationships do not involve a concern for needs. Thus, in exchange relationships, interest in the other's consideration of one's needs should not be particularly high.

Three studies were conducted to test the hypothesis that interest in another's consideration of one's needs will be greater when a communal relationship with the other is desired than when an exchange relationship is desired.³ In the first

reasons. If one follows an exchange rule in order to get something one really wants for oneself, one is following an exchange rule for one's own self interest. If one paid someone more for a service than one originally agreed to do so because the service they gave to one was so good, one is following an exchange rule for more unselfish reasons.

² An exception to this general rule may occur when one does not want a communal relationship with another person and suspects that the other desires a communal relationship with oneself, as when the other appears to have a romantic interest in oneself which one does not share. In such a case, the person might monitor the other's consideration of his or her needs in order to know how great the romantic interest is to determine whether steps should be taken to discourage the interest.

³ The mean number of hints prepared was 4.56 in the Communal-Uncertain condition 4.19 in the Communal-Certain condition, and 4.47 in the Exchange condition.

study, interest in consideration given to one's needs was measured by the number of glances at lights indicating whether or not the other was spending time selecting problem hints for the person. More glances at the lights were predicted when a communal relationship was desired than when an exchange relationship was desired.

STUDY 1

Method

Overview. In a study ostensibly of work-team performance, participants were led to believe that they would play the role of a worker solving a puzzle while another student would be the supervisor. As in past research, desire for a communal or exchange relationship was induced by leading half the participants to believe the other was an attractive female who had signed up to meet new people (Communal condition) and the remaining half to believe the other was an attractive female who had signed up so her husband could meet her afterwards (Exchange condition). The participant was left alone in a room to wait while the supervisor was supposedly dividing time between selecting hints for the participant and working on a task irrelevant to the participant. Two small lights in the participants' room supposedly indicated whether the other was selecting hints for the participant or was working on a task irrelevant to the participant. The number of times each participant turned around to glance at the lights was used as a measure of interest in the other's consideration of the participant's welfare.

Participants. The participants were 38 college students, 24 males and 14 females. They received credit toward fulfilling a psychology course requirement. Each was randomly assigned to either the Communal condition or the Exchange condition. The female experimenter was unaware of the condition to which they had been assigned.

Procedure. Participants signed up for a study called "Applications and Effectiveness of Work Teams." The sign-up sheet contained two slots for each session, one of which had been filled in with a female name. When the participant arrived, the study was introduced as a study of supervisor-worker roles and relationships. The experimenter mentioned that the participant's partner had already arrived and had been randomly assigned to be the supervisor. The participant would be the worker. (This information explained why the participant and the partner would be given different tasks during the session.)

The participant was asked to fill out a background questionnaire about past supervisor and worker experiences, and was told that the questionnaire would be shown to the partner, along with a photo of the participant. If the participant's university photo ID was not available, the experimenter took a Polaroid photo of the participant. After the participant completed the background questionnaire, it and the participant's photo were placed in a folder, ostensibly to be given to the partner. The participant was then given a folder with the partner's responses to the questionnaire and a Polaroid photo of a moderately attractive female, identified as the partner.

The difference between the Communal and Exchange conditions was introduced by means of the partner's written responses to a item in the questionnaire asking, "Why did you sign up for this experiment?" In the Communal condition, the partner's response was: "It sounded interesting and it was scheduled at a convenient time. More importantly I thought it might be a good way to meet new people." In the Exchange condition, the partner's response was: "It sounded interesting and it was scheduled at a convenient time. More importantly my husband can pick me up right after this experiment." Evidence that this procedure is effective in manipulating desire for a communal or exchange relationship has been reported by Clark (1986; Clark & Waddell, 1985).

After reading the partner's questionnaire, the participant was told that the worker's task would be to solve a puzzle. The supervisor (i.e., the participant's partner) would be allocating time to two different tasks. One was to select five hints for the worker (i.e., the participant) from a list of ten hints. The ten hints were described as relatively equivalent in usefulness for solving the puzzle. However, it was mentioned that different hints in different combinations might be more helpful for different people. (This instruction was intended to convey the idea that the particular hints and the particular combination of hints selected might be important for the participant.) The supervisor's second task was to evaluate two puzzles, different from the puzzle the participant would receive. These evaluations would have no implications for the participant. The experimenter said it was entirely up to the supervisor to determine how to divide her time between these two tasks.

The participant was told that, to insure high motivation on the worker's task, if the puzzle was solved in ten minutes, he or she would receive five dollars, in addition to the research credit. The experimenter mentioned that the participant would not begin the puzzle until the supervisor worked on her tasks, which would take fifteen minutes. While waiting, the participant was to relax and remain seated, and could read magazines left in the room. On her way out of the room, the experimenter casually mentioned that, in case the participant might wonder about the little red and green lights on the wall behind the participant, those lights had been used in the past by the experimenter to keep track of how much time the supervisor spent working on selecting hints for the worker (green light) or working on the evaluation task (red light). (There were appropriate labels attached to the lights.) The lights were turned on by buttons in the other room which the supervisor pressed to indicate which task was being done. The experimenter explained that the timing was now done by an automatic timer so that she did not need to be in the participant's room to time the lights herself. However, the lights still worked.

The experimenter left the room and observed the behavior of the participant from an adjacent room through a one way window. After 1 minute, the red light came on and stayed on for 10 minutes. Then the red light went off and the green light came on and stayed on for 4 minutes. The number of times the participant turned around to glance at the lights was recorded by the experimenter.

At the end of the 15 minute period, the experimenter returned to the room and gave the participant a puzzle along with five handwritten hints. The experimenter told the participant to read through the list of hints the supervisor had selected, set the stopwatch, and begin solving the puzzle when ready. The experimenter left the room for about two minutes. After reentering the room and stopping the timer so it would not look like the participant was losing time to solve the puzzle, the experimenter mentioned that there was something more to the study and asked if the participant had any idea what it might be. No participant indicated suspicion about the procedure or mentioned anything inconsistent with the ostensible purpose of the study. The participant was given a thorough explanation of the purpose of the study and, in addition to the promised experimental credit for participating, received one dollar.

The data from two males who were run through the procedure were not included in any analyses. One failed to read the information designed to manipulate the desire for a communal or exchange relationship. The other said he thought the experimenter had said that the lights did not work.

Results. The dependent measure was the number of times the participant glanced at the lights indicating whether the partner was working on the task of selecting hints for the participant or working on the irrelevant task. The mean number of glances at the lights was greater in the Communal condition ($M = 4.78$) than in the Exchange condition ($M = 2.11$).

Because the distribution of scores on the measure of number of glances was skewed (skew = +1.59) and the variances in the two conditions were not equal ($SD = 4.53$ for the Communal condition; $SD = 2.22$ for the Exchange condition, $F_{max} = 4.17, p < .05$), the scores were submitted to a logarithmic transformation ($x = \text{LOG}_{10}[x + 1]$). Following the transformation, the variances no longer differed significantly ($SD = .35$ for the Communal condition; $SD = .34$ for the Exchange condition; $F_{max} = 1.05$) and the skew was reduced (skew = $-.014$).

A 2 by 2 analysis of variance of the transformed scores was conducted with relationship condition and participant sex as factors. The main effect of communal versus exchange relationship was significant, $F(1, 32) = 4.91, p < .04$. Neither the main effect of participant sex nor the interaction between the relationship and participant sex approached significance.

Discussion. The results of Study 1 are in accord with the hypothesis that interest in consideration by another of one's needs is greater when a communal relationship is desired than when an exchange relationship is desired. As expected, those in the Communal condition glanced at the lights indicating whether or not the other was working on the task of selecting puzzle hints for oneself significantly more often than did those in the Exchange condition.

It might be thought that the difference between the Communal and Exchange conditions occurred, not because those in the Communal condition were more interested in consideration given by the other to their needs, but rather because they were more interested in anything about the other, and the lights were the only source of additional information about the other. If such an interpretation was

correct, then it would be expected that interest in other kinds of information about the other should also be greater in the Communal condition than the Exchange condition. However, that is inconsistent with the results of earlier studies which have shown that monitoring of the other's inputs into a joint task was greater in exchange relationships than in communal relationships (Clark, 1984; Clark et al., 1989).

STUDY 2

To further investigate the effect of relationship type on interest in consideration given by another to one's needs, a second study was conducted. Instead of measuring interest in consideration given to one's needs by means of the number of glances at lights as in Study 1, in Study 2 it was measured by ratings of interest in knowing how much time the partner had spent selecting a task for the participant. The use of a rating form permitted the measurement of interest in other kinds of information, which could be used to check on whether interest in all kinds of information about the other was higher in the Communal condition than in the Exchange condition.

In addition to manipulating desire for a communal or exchange relationship as in Study 1, the second study attempted to manipulate certainty about the communal relationship with the other, by varying information regarding the partner's desire for a communal relationship with the person within the Communal condition. It was predicted that ratings of interest in thought given to one's needs would be greater in the Communal-Uncertain Condition than in the Communal-Certain Condition. The rationale for this prediction is straightforward. When a person desires a communal relationship with another, we assume that the reason that person will be motivated to monitor the other's consideration of his or her needs is that the person wishes to know whether that other desires to form (or to maintain) a similar communal relationship. The less certain one is about the communal nature of one's relationship with the other, the greater should be the monitoring of the other's consideration of one's own needs.

Study 2 also included ratings which could be used to check on the effectiveness of the manipulation of desire for a communal versus an exchange relationship, and on the effectiveness of the attempt to vary certainty about the other's desire for a communal relationship with the person.

Method

Overview. As in Study 1, the participants were led to believe they would be the worker in a study of work-team performance while another student would be the supervisor. Desire for a communal or exchange relationship with the other was varied as in Study 1. In an attempt to vary certainty about the communal relationship, the participants read what the other had presumably answered about how well she would get along with the participant. In some cases, the answer was positive, supposedly made after the other had seen the participant's photograph (Communal-Certain Condition); in other cases the answer was neutral, suppos-

edly made before the other had seen the participant's photograph (Communal-Uncertain Condition). In a change from Study 1, the supervisor was supposedly dividing her time between studying the participant's background sheet to choose a task for the participant and a second, irrelevant task. The participants rated their interest in knowing how much time the supervisor spent choosing their task, along with other things about the supervisor.

Participants. The participants were 49 male college students who received credit toward a psychology course requirement. Males were run because they were more abundant in the population of potential participants. Participants were randomly assigned to one of 3 experimental conditions: Communal-Certain, Communal-Uncertain, Exchange. As in Study 1, the female experimenter was unaware of the assignment to conditions.

Procedure. The participants signed up for a study called "Applications and Effectiveness of Work Teams." The sign-up sheet specifically stated that pairs with one male and one female were desired to keep the numbers of males and females equal in the study. The sign up sheet contained two slots for each session, one of which had already been filled in with a female name. When the participant arrived for the study, the experimenter mentioned that the participant's partner had not yet arrived, but when she arrived she would be working in an adjacent room. The study was introduced as a study of supervisor roles and relationships. The experimenter said that the participant had been randomly assigned to be the worker and the partner to be the supervisor. The participant was asked to fill out a background questionnaire about past supervisor and worker experiences. He was led to expect that it would be shown to the partner, along with his photo. If the participant's university photo ID was not available, the experimenter took a Polaroid photo of the participant. The experimenter left, ostensibly to check on the arrival of the participant's partner.

In the Communal-Certain condition, the experimenter took the participant's photo with her when she went to check on the participant's partner, apparently to show it to the partner. In the Communal-Uncertain condition, the participant's photo was left in the room. In the Exchange condition, half of the time the experimenter took the participant's photo with her and half of the time she left it in the room.

About two minutes later, the experimenter returned to the participant's room and picked up the Polaroid camera which had been left in the room. She left, as if to take a photo of the participant's partner. Two minutes later she returned, replaced the camera, and left once again. Returning to the room after the participant had completed his background questionnaire, she placed it in a folder she was carrying. She gave the participant the partner's folder containing a background questionnaire and a Polaroid photo of a moderately attractive female.

In the Communal-Certain condition, the experimenter told the participant she would give his background questionnaire to his partner to read, mentioning that his photo had already been given to the partner. In the Communal-Uncertain condition, the experimenter put the participant's photo in the folder with the

participant's questionnaire and told him she would give his questionnaire and photo to the partner. In the Exchange condition, the instructions were consistent with whether the experimenter had taken the participant's photo with her when she first left the room ostensibly to check on the partner or had left the participant's photo in the room.

As in Study 1, the difference between the Communal and Exchange conditions was introduced by means of the written responses to a question in the questionnaire which asked, "Why did you sign up for this experiment?" The partner's responses in the Communal and Exchange conditions were exactly the same as in Study 1.

In a change from Study 1, the partner's questionnaire contained a item designed to manipulate certainty about the other's desire for a communal relationship with the participant. It asked, "How well do you think you'll get along with your partner?" In the Communal-Certain Condition, the partner supposedly had already seen the participant's photo, and the partner's response to this question was: "I think it's very likely that if my partner and I had a chance to talk and work together, we could become good friends." In the Communal-Uncertain Condition, the partner supposedly had not seen the participant's photo and the partner's response was: "I can't tell yet, I haven't met my partner." In the Exchange condition, the partner's response was the same as in the Communal-Uncertain condition.

Returning after a few minutes, the experimenter explained that the supervisor (i.e., the participant's partner) had been given two tasks. One was selecting a task for the participant from a list of tasks after reading his background questionnaire. The supervisor's second task was not relevant to anything on which the participant would be working.

The experimenter then explained that she was interested in the types of information workers want to know about their supervisors. The participant was given a form which asked for ratings of the importance of knowing different things about your supervisor. Interest in each listed item was to be rated on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 7 (very important). The verbal and written instructions indicated that the participant actually would be given some or all of the items of information. The amount of information about the supervisor the participant would receive would be determined randomly, and which of the items would be received would be determined using the participant's ratings of interest. The participant was encouraged to vary responses to the different items and to use the entire scale. He also was assured that the ratings would be kept confidential.

Ratings were made of the importance of knowing the following items about the supervisor: how long your supervisor studied your background sheet to choose the task for you; which task the supervisor chose for you; how long the supervisor thinks the task will take; supervisor's rating of how easy he/she is to work with; supervisor's rating of own intelligence; the number of hints the supervisor has prepared; and supervisor's rating of his/her motivation to help you.

The experimenter left the participant alone to complete the rating form. Upon

returning, the experimenter collected the rating form and gave the participant a second form containing questions about impressions of the partner, with the explanation that it would be used to control for impressions which existed prior to the actual interaction. Two of the questions were: Do you expect that your partner might want a relationship with you in a social context? Do you expect that you might want a relationship with your partner in a social context? Each question was answered on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (definitely). The experimenter left the room while the second form was answered.

Upon returning to the room, the experimenter asked if the participant had any ideas about the purpose of the study. The comments of one person indicated suspicion about the procedure and his data were not included in any analyses. One other person's data were excluded because he did not read the information on the partner's background sheet that was designed to manipulate the desire for a communal or exchange relationship.

Results. A check on the effectiveness of the manipulation of desire for communal or exchange relationship is provided by responses to the question, "Do you expect that you might want a relationship with your partner in a social context?" The means of the responses to this question were 3.63 for the Communal-Certain condition ($n = 16$), 3.69 for the Communal-Uncertain Condition ($n = 16$), and 2.71 for the Exchange condition ($n = 17$). The difference between the mean of 3.66 for the two Communal conditions combined and the mean of 2.71 for the Exchange condition was significant, $t(47) = 2.42, p < .02$. The difference between the Communal-Certain and the Communal-Uncertain conditions did not approach significance. Responses to the question about wanting a social relationship with the partner provide evidence that the manipulation of desire for a communal or exchange relationship was successful.

Responses to the question "Do you expect that your partner might want a relationship with you in a social context?" provide a check on the attempt to vary certainty about the other's desire for a communal relationship with the person. For this question the means were 3.19 ($SD = 1.68$) for the Communal-Certain Condition, 3.69 ($SD = 1.01$) for the Communal-Uncertain condition, and 2.47 ($SD = 1.50$) for the Exchange condition. The difference between the Communal-Certain and Communal-Uncertain conditions did not approach significance, indicating that the attempt to vary certainty about the other's desire for a communal relationship with the person was not successful. The difference between the mean of 3.44 ($SD = 1.39$) for the two Communal conditions combined and the mean of 2.47 ($SD = 1.50$) for the Exchange Condition was significant, $t(47) = 2.25, p < .03$.

The primary dependent measure was the rating of interest in knowing the time the partner spent selecting the task for the participant. The means for this measure are shown in Table 1. As can be seen from Table 1, interest in time the partner spent choosing the task was greater in the Communal conditions than in the Exchange condition, as predicted. The difference between the mean of 4.25 ($SD = 1.72$) for the two Communal conditions combined and the mean of 3.24

TABLE 1
Means of Ratings of Interest in Receiving Different Types of Information
about Supervisor (Study 2)

Measure	Relationship		
	Communal		Exchange
	Uncertain	Certain	
Time spent selecting task	4.50	4.00	3.24
Motivation to help	5.56	5.00	5.71

Note. Ratings were made on a scale from 1 to 7 with higher ratings indicating greater interest.

($SD = 1.25$) for the Exchange condition was significant, $t(47) = 2.14$, $p < .04$. The difference between the Communal-Certain and Communal-Uncertain conditions, which was in the predicted direction, did not approach significance.

In addition to the primary dependent measure, there was another item for which we originally expected a difference between the Communal and Exchange conditions, i.e., the item about knowing the supervisor's motivation to help you. For that item, the means for the Communal-Certain, Communal-Uncertain, and Exchange conditions were 5.00 ($SD = 1.86$), 5.56 ($SD = 1.03$), and 5.71 ($SD = 0.92$), respectively, and the differences did not approach significance.

For the ratings of interest in knowing the other kinds of information, there were no differences which approached significance for any of the items, with one exception. For the item about interest in knowing the supervisor's rating of how easy he/she is to work with, the ratings were significantly higher in the Communal-Uncertain condition ($M = 5.75$, $SD = 1.24$) than in the Communal-Certain condition ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 1.71$), $t(30) = 2.13$, $p < .04$; the difference between the two Communal conditions combined ($M = 5.19$, $SD = 1.58$) and the Exchange condition ($M = 5.12$, $SD = 1.45$) was not significant.

Discussion. The results of Study 2 provide additional support for the hypothesis that interest in consideration given by another to one's needs is greater when a communal relationship is desired with the other than when an exchange relationship is desired. Ratings of interest in knowing how long the partner spent studying the participant's background sheet to choose the task for the participant were significantly greater in the Communal conditions than in the Exchange condition.

The findings of Study 2 supplement those of Study 1 in several ways. First, Study 2 found a significant difference between the Communal and Exchange conditions using a different measure of interest in consideration of one's needs than that used in Study 1. Second, Study 2 included a check on the manipulation of desire for a communal or exchange relationship which provided evidence that the manipulation was successful. Third, Study 2 demonstrated that it is not simply the case that interest in everything about the other is greater in the Communal condition than in the Exchange condition. Interest in knowing which task the supervisor had chosen, the length of the task, the supervisor's rating of how easy

he/she is to work with, the supervisor's rating of own intelligence, the number of hints the supervisor prepared, and the supervisor's rating of his/her motivation to help did not differ between the Communal and Exchange conditions.

As mentioned above, we initially thought that interest in the supervisor's ratings of her motivation to help would be higher in the Communal than in the Exchange condition because such ratings would be considered evidence regarding the other's consideration of the participant's needs. We are uncertain as to why ratings of interest in her motivation to help were not higher in the Communal conditions. However, we see some possible reasons why the results on this measure might not have come out as expected. First, the participants may not have expected the supervisor's rating of her own motivation to help to be revealing of her true motivation. They may have expected it to be to be high in all cases since that would be the socially desirable and polite rating to give. Second, if they expected their supervisor's ratings to be revealing, all participants might have been interested in these ratings because participants in all conditions, being anxious about completing the upcoming task, might have wanted to know how motivated (or unmotivated) their supervisor was to help them.

Although we did not expect it, it might be thought that interest in knowing the number of hints the supervisor prepared for the person should have been greater in the Communal conditions than in the Exchange condition—the reason being that the number of hints prepared for the person might indicate how much the other cared about the person's welfare. Although it might initially seem reasonable to suspect that interest in knowing the number of hints would be higher in the Communal condition, there are several reasons why we did not expect this. First, it should be kept in mind that the "hints" measure in Study 2 was unlike the "hints" measure in Study 1 in a number of ways. In Study 2, unlike Study 1, the hints question asked whether participants wished to know about how many hints they would receive, not how much time the supervisor had chosen to spend picking a particular combination of hints to suit their particular background. There was no particular reason for participants to feel that their supervisor had much latitude in giving them hints and the number of hints given. After all, nothing was said to the participants, prior to their filling out the final questionnaire, about their receiving hints.

Also, we would note that there are two reasons why interest in the number of hints to be received might also be high, perhaps equally high, in the Exchange condition. One is that, as mentioned above, all participants did have to solve their task and all may have wanted to know how many hints they would be to assess how easy or difficult their task was likely to be given. Another is that because exchange norms call for paying persons back after they have given one a benefit, participants in the Exchange condition may have wanted to know how many hints they would be given so that they could assess their debt to the supervisor. In contrast, the time the supervisor spent choosing the task is uninformative concerning the magnitude of benefit the other provided to the person, while indicating the degree of concern for the person's needs.

Although the difference between the Communal-Certain condition and the Communal-Uncertain condition for the ratings of interest in knowing the time the supervisor spent choosing the task for the person was in the predicted direction with greater interest in the Communal-Uncertain condition than in the Communal-Certain condition, the difference between these two conditions did not approach significance. This is not surprising in view of the fact that the evidence from the check on the manipulation of certainty about the other's desire for a communal relationship indicates that the manipulation was not successful. If the Communal-Certain condition and the Communal-Uncertain condition did not differ in the degree of certainty about the other's desire for a communal relationship, then no difference in interest in consideration given to one's needs would be expected.

The only significant difference between the Communal-Certain condition and the Communal-Uncertain condition occurred for the ratings of interest in the supervisor's rating of how easy he/she is to get along with, with more interest in the Communal-Uncertain condition. Since those in the Communal-Certain condition read comments attributed to the other indicating how well the other expected to get along with the participant ("I think it's very likely that if my partner and I had a chance to talk and work together, we could become good friends"), it is understandable that those in the Communal-Certain condition were less interested in the other's rating of how easy she was to get along with than were those in the Communal-Uncertain condition who had not read such comments.

STUDY 3

In Study 3, interest in consideration given by another to one's needs was measured in third way—by ratings of interest in knowing the amount of time the other spent selecting a gift for oneself. The common saying regarding gifts is: "It's the thought that counts." That saying expresses the idea that what is important about a gift is that it indicates the giver's concern for the recipient (implicitly assuming a communal relationship). Time spent selecting a gift is an indication of the consideration given to the recipient's needs.

The third study attempted to vary certainty about a communal relationship with the other in a different manner than in Study 2. Rather than attempting to manipulate certainty about a communal relationship by varying information about a specific person previously unknown to the participant, Study 3 had the participant select someone with whom he or she would like to have a close relationship (assumed to be an uncertain communal relationship) and someone with whom he or she had had a close relationship for a long time (assumed to be a certain communal relationship), along with someone with whom they do not have a close relationship (assumed to be an exchange relationship).

In addition to time spent selecting the gift, another indication of the consideration given to the recipient's needs is whether an identical gift was bought for someone else at the same time. The purchase of an identical gift for someone else at the same time suggests that less thought was given to one's own needs. It was predicted that interest in knowing the time spent selecting a gift for oneself and

whether an identical gift was bought for someone else at the same time would be greater if the other was someone with whom the person had or would like a communal relationship than if the other was someone with whom the person had an exchange relationship, and greater if the communal relationship was uncertain than if it was certain.

Interest in knowing the cost of the gift was not expected to be associated with relationship type. Interest in the cost of the gift should be high in communal relationships because the cost of the gift indicates the other's concern for one's needs. However, it also should be high in exchange relationships because, it indicates both the value of what is to be received and, in that context, the degree of specific debt owed to the other or being repaid by the other.

Method

Overview. Participants were asked to suppose they knew they were going receive a gift from someone and did not know anything about it other than: a) the gift was from someone with whom they would like to have a close relationship, or b) the gift was from someone with whom they have had a close relationship for a long time, or c) the gift was from someone with whom they do not have a close relationship. For each relationship type, participants rated how interested they would be in knowing the cost of the gift, the time spent selecting the gift, and whether an identical gift was bought for someone else at the same time.

Participants. The participants were 172 college students who responded to the study booklet while waiting for a psychology experiment. Ninety six of the participants were females, 62 were males and 14 failed to indicate their sex on the booklet.

Procedure. The cover page of the study booklet which was headed, "Thinking about Gifts" contained the following instructions:

This study deals with things people may think about when receiving a gift. People may wonder about various things, such as where the gift was purchased or how much it cost. This study deals with how much people would like to know about such things. You will be asked about different situations in which you know you are going to receive a gift from someone and don't know anything else about the gift. For each situation, you will answer questions about how interested you would be in knowing various things about the gift. Before proceeding, please read and sign the following statement of Informed Consent.

On one page of the booklet the instructions were, "Suppose you know you going to receive a gift from someone you just met recently, whom you find very attractive and with whom you would like to have a close relationship." (This was assumed to be a communal-uncertain relationship).

On another page the instructions were, "Suppose you know you are going to receive a gift from someone with whom you have had a close relationship for a very long time." (This was assumed to be a communal-certain relationship).

On another page the instructions were, "Suppose you know you are going to receive a gift from someone with whom you do not have a close relationship, who

TABLE 2
Means of Ratings of Interest in Different Aspects of Selection of Gift for Oneself (Study 3)

Measure	Relationship		
	Communal		Exchange
	Uncertain	Certain	
Time spent selecting gift	6.60	5.72	3.56
Whether identical gift bought	6.78	5.63	3.16
Cost of gift	5.09	4.42	4.08

Note. Ratings were made on a scale from 0 to 10, with higher numbers indicating greater interest.

works in the same place as you and who has frequently asked you to cover for them at work.” (This was assumed to be an exchange relationship).

The order of the three pages in the booklet was counterbalanced.

On each of the three pages, after the specific instructions about selecting the other person and a reminder to the participant to assume that he or she does not know anything else about the gift, the following questions were asked: How interested would you be in knowing where the gift was bought? How interested would you be in knowing when the gift was bought? How interested would you be in knowing the cost of the gift? How interested would you be in knowing the amount of time which was spent selecting the gift? How interested would you be in knowing whether an identical gift was bought for someone else at the same time your gift was bought? For each question, answers were made by circling a number from 0 (Not At All Interested) to 10 (Extremely Interested). The first two questions were included as filler items to deflect attention from the measures of interest in another's consideration of one's needs.

Results. Means for the ratings of interest in aspects of the gift selection for the communal-uncertain, communal-certain, and exchange relationships are presented in Table 2. As can be seen from Table 2, the ratings of interest in time spent selecting the gift for oneself were higher for the communal relationships than for the exchange relationship, and higher for the communal-uncertain relationship than for the communal-certain relationship, as predicted. The same pattern occurred for the ratings of interest in whether an identical gift was bought for someone else at the same time, as can be seen from Table 2.

An analysis of variance of the ratings of interest in time spent selecting the gift was conducted, with relationship, participant sex, and order as factors. It revealed a significant main effect of relationship, $F(2,310) = 5.89, p < .01, MSE = 4.39$. None of the other effects were significant. The difference between the mean for the communal-uncertain relationship ($M = 6.60$) and the mean for the communal-certain relationship ($M = 5.72$) was tested with a planned comparison and was significant, $t(310) = 3.89, p < .001$. The difference between the mean for the communal-certain relationship and for the exchange relationship ($M = 3.56$) was also significant by a planned comparison, $t(310) = 9.56, p < .001$.

An analysis of variance of the ratings of interest in whether an identical gift was bought for someone else at the same time, with relationship, sex, and order as factors, found a significant main effect of relationship, $F(2,310) = 8.07, p < .001, MSE = 7.08$. None of the other effects were significant. The difference between the mean for the communal-uncertain relationship ($M = 6.78$) and the mean for the communal-certain relationship ($M = 5.63$) was significant by a planned comparison, $t(310) = 3.99, p < .001$. The difference between the mean for the communal-certain relationship and for the exchange relationship ($M = 3.16$) was also significant by a planned comparison, $t(310) = 8.54, p < .001$.

An analysis of variance of the ratings of interest in the cost of the gift, with relationship, sex and order as factors, revealed that the main effect of relationship did not approach significance, $F(2,310) = .85, MSE = 4.01$; none of the other effects were significant.

Discussion. As predicted, interest in knowing the time spent selecting a gift for oneself and whether an identical gift was bought for someone else was greater if the relationship with the giver was communal than if the relationship was exchange, and greater if the communal relationship was uncertain than if it was certain. Interest in knowing the cost of the gift did not differ significantly between communal and exchange relationships. Interest in the cost of the gift was expected to be high in both communal and exchange relationships, albeit for different reasons. In communal relationships cost indicates the other's concern for one's welfare; in exchange relationships cost indicates the degree of specific debt owed or being repaid. Of course, in both types of relationships cost indicates the value of the gift to be received which, independent of the relationship, may be of interest because people like to know the value of their possessions.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The results of the three studies provide good support for the hypothesis that interest in consideration given by another to one's needs is greater when a communal relationship is desired than when an exchange relationship is desired. Interest in consideration given to one's needs was measured in three different ways in the three studies. In Study 1 it was measured by the number of glances at lights indicating whether or not the other was selecting problem hints for oneself, in Study 2 by ratings of interest in the length of time the other spent selecting a task for oneself, and in Study 3 by ratings of interest in the time spent selecting a gift for oneself and whether an identical gift was bought for someone else at the same time.

In Studies 1 and 2, the desire for a communal or exchange relationship with the other was manipulated as in past research by information about the other's availability or unavailability for a communal relationship. In Study 3, participants selected someone with whom they would like to have a close relationship (assumed to be an uncertain communal relationship), someone with whom they have had a close relationship for a long time (assumed to be a certain communal

relationship) and someone with whom they do not have a close relationship (assumed to be an exchange relationship).

The pattern of results was the same in each study, with greater interest in consideration of one's needs in the communal relationship than the exchange relationship. Studies 2 and 3 found evidence that interest in everything about the other is not greater in a communal relationship than an exchange relationship. In the third study, interest in consideration given to one's needs was not only greater for the certain communal relationship than for the exchange relationship but was greater for the uncertain communal relationship than the certain communal relationship, providing evidence that interest in the other's consideration of one's needs is greater, the greater the uncertainty about a communal relationship.

The hypothesis about interest in consideration given by another to one's needs in communal and exchange relationships was based on the assumption that people want communal relationships with friends and romantic partners to be mutual. If the person has or desires a mutual communal relationship with another, particularly if the person is uncertain about how the other regards the relationship, the person will be interested in knowing the other's motivation to follow communal norms in the relationship. Consideration given to one's needs is a clue to the other's motivation to follow communal norms in the relationship with the person. Since the norms of exchange relationships do not involve concern about needs, interest in consideration given to one's needs should not be as great in an exchange relationship as in a communal relationship.

We have emphasized that attending to another's consideration of one's own needs is something that occurs when there is at least some uncertainty about the communal nature of one's relationship with the other. From this, one might infer that interest in another's consideration of one's own needs is something that occurs primarily as communal relationships are forming, when one would expect uncertainty to be high. However, we believe the phenomenon of heightened monitoring of another's consideration of one's own needs when communal relationships are desired but uncertain is a phenomenon likely to be observed in ongoing, long term relationships as well. Communal relationships vary in strength. Some communal relationships are stronger than others, meaning that in some communal relationships participants feel a greater sense of responsibility for the other's needs than do participants in other communal relationships. Uncertainty about the exact strength of one's communal relationship with another may often lead people in ongoing communal relationships to monitor their partners' consideration of their own needs.

This research provides additional evidence for the distinction between communal and exchange relationships and furnishes a more complete account of the monitoring of the behavior of the other in different types of relationships. Previously it was found that persons having or desiring exchange relationships monitor the other's inputs into a joint task for which there will be a joint reward more than those having or desiring communal relationships (Clark, 1984; Clark et al., 1989). Previous research has also shown that members of communal relation-

ships monitor the other's needs to a greater extent than do members of exchange relationships (Clark et al., 1986; Clark et al., 1989). The present research furnishes evidence that members of communal relationships monitor the other's concern for one's own needs to a greater extent than in exchange relationships.

Viewed from a broader perspective, the present results make an empirical contribution to an issue which has arisen concerning the communal/exchange distinction. The assumption by Clark and Mills that in communal relationships there is a concern for the welfare of the other and benefits are given in response to the other's needs has been interpreted by some commentators to mean that communal relationships transcend selfish concerns and are special relations untainted by the crass considerations of social exchange (Hatfield, Traupmann, Sprecher, Utne, and Hay, 1985).

In recent writings, Clark and Mills (1993, Mills and Clark, 1994) have noted that the reason a person might follow the communal norm in a relationship can be considered separately from the consequences of following the communal norm. The consequences of following the communal norm are that one is concerned about the welfare of the other and motivated to benefit the other when the other has a need. The reason for following the communal norm can be considered selfish in the sense that the person may follow the communal norm in a relationship to achieve some other goal.

The goal of following the communal norm may be to have a mutual, caring relationship with the other, in which one's own needs will be satisfied. The motivation to enter into a mutual communal relationship may be based on a desire for reciprocation on the other's part, on wanting the other to follow the communal norm with respect to oneself and be concerned about one's welfare. Such a desire for a mutual communal relationship should lead to interest in information about the degree to which the other is concerned with meeting one's needs.

The results of the present studies indicating that monitoring of the other's concern for one's needs is high in communal relationships, particularly if there is uncertainty about the communal relationship, are consistent with a desire for a mutual communal relationship which could be considered a selfish motivation. The present studies lend empirical support to the idea that motivation in communal relationships may, at times, not be altogether selfless.

REFERENCES

- Batson, C. D. (1993). Communal and exchange relationships: What is the difference? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **19**, 677-683.
- Brown, R. (1986). *Social psychology (2nd edition)*. New York: Free Press.
- Clark, M. S. (1984). Record keeping in two types of relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **47**, 549-557.
- Clark, M. S. (1986). Evidence for the effectiveness of manipulations of communal and exchange relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **12**, 414-425.
- Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. (1979). Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **37**, 12-24.
- Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. (1993). The difference between communal and exchange relationships: What it is and what it is not. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **19**, 684-691.

- Clark, M. S., Mills, J., & Corcoran, D. (1989). Keeping track of needs and inputs of friends and strangers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **15**, 533–542.
- Clark, M. S., Mills, J., & Powell, M. (1986). Keeping track of needs in communal and exchange relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **51**, 333–338.
- Clark, M. S., Ouellette, R., Powell, M., & Milberg, S. (1987). Recipient's mood, relationship type, and helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **53**, 94–103.
- Clark, M. S., & Taraban, C. B. (1991). Reactions to and willingness to express emotion in two types of relationships. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **27**, 324–336.
- Clark, M. S., & Waddell, B. (1985). Perceptions of exploitation in communal and exchange relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, **2**, 403–418.
- Hatfield, E., Traupmann, J., Sprecher, S., Utne, M., & Hay, J. (1985). Equity and Intimate Relations: Recent Research. In W. Ickes (Ed.), *Compatible and incompatible relationships*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Mills, J., & Clark, M. S. (1982). Exchange and communal relationships. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Mills, J., & Clark, M. S. (1994). Communal and exchange relationships: Controversies and research. In R. Erber and R. Gilmour (Eds.), *Theoretical frameworks for personal relationships*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, Associates.
- Williamson, G., & Clark, M. S. (1989). Providing help and desired relationship type as determinants of changes in moods and self-evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **56**, 722–734.
- Williamson, G., & Clark, M. S. (1992). Impact of desired relationship type on affective reactions to choosing and being required to help. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **18**, 10–18.
- Williamson, G. M., Clark, M. S., Pegalis, L., & Behan, A. (1996). Affective consequences of refusing to help in communal and exchange relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **22**, 34–47.