

Interpersonal Attraction in Exchange and Communal Relationships

Margaret S. Clark
Carnegie-Mellon University

Judson Mills
University of Maryland

Communal relationships, in which the giving of a benefit in response to a need for the benefit is appropriate, are distinguished from exchange relationships, in which the giving of a benefit in response to the receipt of a benefit is appropriate. Based on this distinction, it was hypothesized that the receipt of a benefit after the person has been benefited leads to greater attraction when an exchange relationship is preferred and decreases attraction when a communal relationship is desired. These hypotheses were supported in Experiment 1, which used male subjects. Experiment 2, which used a different manipulation of exchange versus communal relationships and female subjects, supported the hypotheses that (a) a request for a benefit after the person is aided by the other leads to greater attraction when an exchange relationship is expected and decreases attraction when a communal relationship is expected, and (b) a request for a benefit in the absence of prior aid from the other decreases attraction when an exchange relationship is expected.

This research is concerned with how the effects of receiving a benefit and a request for a benefit differ depending on the type of relationship one has with the other person. Two kinds of relationships in which persons give benefits to one another are distinguished, exchange relationships and communal relationships. The stimulus for this distinction was Erving Goffman's (1961, pp. 275-276) differentiation between social and economic exchange.

In the present theorizing, the term *exchange relationship* is used in place of Goffman's term *economic exchange* because many of the benefits that people give and receive do not involve money or things for which a monetary value can be calculated. A benefit can be anything a person can choose to give to another person that is of use to the person receiving it.¹

In an exchange relationship, members as-

sume that benefits are given with the expectation of receiving a benefit in return. The receipt of a benefit incurs a debt or obligation to return a comparable benefit. Each person is concerned with how much he or she receives in exchange for benefiting the other and how much is owed the other for the benefits received.

Since all relationships in which persons give and receive benefits are social, another term is needed to describe relationships in which each person has a concern for the welfare of the other. The term *communal* seems to be the most appropriate. The typical relationship between family members exemplifies this type

This research was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Margaret S. Clark, Department of Psychology, Carnegie-Mellon University, Schenley Park, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.

¹ Benefits are not the same as rewards, when the term *rewards* refers to "the pleasures, satisfactions, and gratifications the person enjoys" (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959, p. 12). The receipt of a benefit usually constitutes a reward, however rewards occur for reasons other than the receipt of a benefit. For example, the rewards that a parent receives from a newborn infant would not fall within the definition of a benefit, since the infant does not choose to give them to the parent. The present theorizing is not concerned with "dependent" relationships in which one person receives benefits from another but does not give benefits to the other.

of relationship. Although it might appear to an observer that there is an exchange of benefits in communal relationships, the rules concerning giving and receiving benefits are different than in exchange relationships.

Members of a communal relationship assume that each is concerned about the welfare of the other. They have a positive attitude toward benefiting the other when a need for the benefit exists. They follow what Pruitt (1972) has labeled "the norm of mutual responsiveness." This rule may create what appears to an observer to be an exchange of benefits, but it is distinct from the rule that governs exchange relationships whereby the receipt of a benefit must be reciprocated by the giving of a comparable benefit. The rules concerning the giving and receiving of benefits are what distinguish communal and exchange relationships, rather than the specific benefits that are given and received.

From the perspective of the participants in a communal relationship, the benefits given and received are not part of an exchange. The attribution of motivation for the giving of benefits is different from that in an exchange relationship. In a communal relationship, the receipt of a benefit does not create a specific debt or obligation to return a comparable benefit, nor does it alter the general obligation that the members have to aid the other when the other has a need. In a communal relationship, the idea that a benefit is given in response to a benefit that was received is compromising, because it calls into question the assumption that each member responds to the needs of the other.

Experiment 1

The first study reported here was based on the assumption, similar to that made by Kiesler (1966) in her study of the effect of perceived role requirements on reactions to favor-doing, that the giving of a benefit will decrease attraction if it is inappropriate for the type of relationship one has with the other. A benefit given in response to a benefit received in the past or expected in the future is appropriate in an exchange relationship but is inappropriate in a communal relationship.

A benefit given specifically because it fulfills a need is appropriate in a communal relationship but not in an exchange relationship.

If two people have an exchange relationship and one person benefits the other, it is appropriate for the other to give the person a comparable benefit. The receipt of a benefit under these circumstances should lead to greater attraction. On the other hand, if two people have a communal relationship and one person benefits the other, it is inappropriate for the other to give the person a comparable benefit, since it leaves the impression that the benefit was given in response to the benefit received previously. The other is treating the relationship in terms of exchange, which is inappropriate in a communal relationship.

When a communal relationship does not yet exist but is desired, the receipt of a benefit should have the same effect as when a communal relationship is assumed to exist. A benefit from the other after the other has been benefited should reduce attraction if there is a desire for a communal relationship with the other. If an exchange relationship is preferred, the receipt of a benefit after the other is benefited should result in greater attraction. Experiment 1 was conducted to test these hypotheses.

The predictions concerning communal relationships might seem contrary to what would be expected from equity theory (Adams, 1963). On the basis of equity theory, one might expect that a benefit from another following aid to that other would increase liking in *any* relationship, because it would reduce inequity. However, the predictions are not inconsistent with a recent discussion of equity theory (Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978). According to Walster, Walster, and Berscheid:

Another characteristic of intimate relationships, which may add complexity, is that intimates, through identification with and empathy for their partners, come to define themselves as a *unit*; as *one* couple. They see themselves not merely as individuals interacting with others, but also as part of a partnership, interacting with other individuals, partnerships, and groups. This characteristic may have a dramatic impact on intimates' perceptions of what is and is not equitable. (pp. 152-153)

In Experiment 1 the desire for a communal relationship was manipulated by using un-

married males as the subjects and having the part of the other played by an attractive woman, who was described as either married or unmarried. It was assumed that people desire communal relationships with attractive others, but only with those available for such relationships. It was further assumed that the unmarried woman would be considered available for a communal relationship, whereas the married woman would not. Thus, it was assumed that the male subjects would desire a communal relationship with the attractive, unmarried woman but would prefer an exchange relationship with the attractive, married woman.

Method

Overview. Under the guise of a study of task performance, unmarried male college students worked on a task while a television monitor showed an attractive woman working on a similar task in another room. When the subject completed the task, he was awarded 1 point toward extra credit for finishing on time and given the opportunity to send some of his excess materials to the other, who supposedly had a more difficult task. Following receipt of the aid, the other completed her task and was awarded 4 points. Some of the subjects received a note from the other that thanked them (no-benefit conditions), whereas some received a note from the other that thanked them and gave them one of her points (benefit conditions). After receiving the note, the subjects were given information indicating that the other was either married (exchange conditions) or unmarried (communal conditions). Shortly thereafter, liking for the other and expectations concerning a future discussion with the other were assessed.

Subjects. The subjects were 96 unmarried, male students in introductory psychology courses who participated in order to earn extra course credit. They were randomly assigned to one of the four experimental conditions: exchange-benefit, exchange-no benefit, communal-benefit, communal-no benefit.

Procedure. Upon arriving for the experiment, the subject was greeted by the experimenter and told that another subject had already arrived and was in an adjacent room. The subject was seated so that he could see a video monitor that showed an attractive female. The experimenter mentioned that the person appearing on the monitor was the other subject, Tricia. The experimenter told the subject that before starting she would explain some things about the studies in which the subject would be participating, which she had already mentioned to Tricia.

The experimenter said that the first study was actually one of two she would ask them to participate in that day. Each of the two studies took less than half an hour. Although the studies were unrelated, she was asking people to participate in both

of them during one session. The first study involved having both subjects work on a vocabulary task. She suspected that people's approaches to solving this task varied when certain conditions were changed. In the condition to which he and Tricia had been randomly assigned, they would be able to see each other over closed-circuit television but not be able to talk to each other directly. To enhance credibility, there was a portable television camera in the room pointing at the subject. Through the use of videotape, what appeared on the monitor was the same for every subject. When the subject asked why he was watching the other person on the monitor, which typically happened, he was told that in the past it had been found that when people worked separately on these tasks in the same room their performance was often affected by the presence of the other person. This might have happened because people could talk to one another or because they could see one another, and the experiment was designed to separate those variables.

The experimenter explained that the second study would be quite different from the first, since it would involve much more contact with the other person. She would bring both participants into one room and ask them to talk over things that they had in common. She was interested in the way in which holding common interests helped people to get to know one another. The experimenter mentioned that in the past, people who had participated had sometimes gotten to know each other quite well.

Vocabulary task. The experimenter next pointed to a batch of letters printed on small cards in front of the subject and said that his task in the first study was to form 10 different four-letter words from the letters. She went on to say that there were two versions of this task and one was more difficult than the other. She had flipped a coin to determine which task each of them would be working on, and the subject would have the easier one, while Tricia would have the more difficult one. The subject's task was easier because he had 55 letters ranging from A to Z, whereas Tricia had only 45 letters ranging from A to L. The subject was to time himself on the task with a stopwatch. Although he and Tricia were not permitted to speak to each other directly, one type of communication was permitted: They would be allowed to send and request letters. Simple forms were available for this purpose. The experimenter would come into the room from time to time to see if the subject had any messages he wanted to send and would deliver them for him.

The experimenter explained that time was a factor in the first study and that an individual's motivation to do well on a task would obviously affect the time taken to complete the task. Therefore, she was taking precautions to insure that motivation to do well was kept at a high level. She would award points toward a possible extra credit for finishing the task in a minimum amount of time. The subjects were not told exactly what that amount of time would be or how the conversion to credit would be made, but just to finish as quickly as they could. The experimenter mentioned that the award-

ing of points to maintain motivation would obviously not be necessary in the second study.

The subject was told to start his stopwatch, begin working, and stop the watch when he had finished. The experimenter picked up another stopwatch and left, saying she would give Tricia the watch and start her on her task. The 55 letters that the subject had to work with allowed him to complete the task within 10 minutes. When approximately 10 minutes had elapsed, the experimenter returned and asked if the subject had any letters he wanted to send to Tricia. All subjects gave the experimenter some letters for Tricia. At this point, the experimenter looked at the subject's stopwatch and told him that he had finished the task in time to get 1 point toward extra credit. As she did so, she also filled out a form indicating the time the subject had taken to complete the task and that he had earned 1 point. She explained that if Tricia finished her task in time she would earn 4 points, since her task was more difficult. The experimenter went on to say that since she allowed participants in the study to send and request letters, she also allowed them to share points they earned. Thus, Tricia could send the subject some of her points if she wanted to do so. The experimenter left the room saying she would give Tricia the letters. Tricia continued to work on her task for about 5 minutes and then finished. The experimenter handed Tricia a form similar to that given the subject earlier. Tricia smiled, wrote a note on a slip of paper, folded it, and gave it to the experimenter.

Benefit manipulation. Within a few moments, the experimenter returned to the subject's room and turned off the monitor. She mentioned that Tricia had completed her task within the necessary time and had received 4 points. She handed the subject a folded note that she said Tricia had asked be given to him. In the no benefit condition, the note said, "Thanks for sending the letters." In the benefit conditions, the note said, "Thanks for sending the letters. The experimenter said it would be OK to give you one of my points. She said she would add it onto the points you've already earned before the end of today's session." Which message the note contained was unknown to the experimenter at the time she handed it to the subject. This was accomplished by having the experimenter pick the note out of a container of folded notes of both types.

Relationship manipulation. The experimenter told the subject that there was one more thing to be done before getting on to the next study. She said she was going to give Tricia some questionnaires to fill out and would then get some more forms for the subject. In the exchange conditions, the experimenter said:

Tricia is anxious to get on to the next part of the study, since she thinks it will be interesting. Her husband is coming to pick her up in about half an hour and she wants to finish before then.

In the communal conditions, she said:

Tricia is anxious to get on to the next part of the study, since she thinks it will be interesting. She's new at the university and doesn't know many people. She has to be at the administration building in about half an hour and she wants to finish before then.

Dependent measures. The experimenter then left the room for approximately 5 minutes. When she reappeared she brought two forms, mentioning that these were the forms she had told the subject about. She reminded the subject that the second study involved having the participants talk over things they had in common with each other. She said that before starting it was necessary to get some idea of what their expectations were in order to control for them, since they would vary from person to person. The subject was asked to fill out a form indicating what he expected the interaction would be like and, in addition, another form indicating what his first impressions of the other person were. The experimenter said that these forms would be kept completely confidential and left the room while they were filled out.

The first-impressions form, which was given to the subject on top of the form concerning expectations about the discussion, asked him to rate how well 11 traits applied to the other, on a scale from 0 (extremely inappropriate) to 20 (extremely appropriate). The traits were *considerate, friendly, insincere, intelligent, irritating, kind, open-minded, sympathetic, understanding, unpleasant, and warm*. The subject was also asked to indicate his degree of liking for the other, on a scale from 0 (dislike very much) to 20 (like very much). The other form asked the subject to indicate how friendly, spontaneous, relaxed, enjoyable, and smooth he expected the discussion to be, on scales from 0 to 20.

Suspicion check. After the subject had completed both forms, the experimenter casually mentioned that there was something more to the study and asked whether the subject had any idea what it might be. The responses of eight persons indicated suspicion of the instructions, and they were not included as subjects. Four persons thought the experiment was designed to test reactions to the note, one thought the points might have something to do with the ratings, two thought Tricia was a part of the experiment, and one questioned whether Tricia was actually married. Four of these persons were run under the exchange-benefit condition, two under the exchange-no-benefit condition, one under the communal-benefit condition, and one under the communal-no-benefit condition. In addition, 12 other persons were not included as subjects. Six could not finish the task within the 10 minutes allowed, one did not read the note before filling out the forms, two failed to follow instructions when filling out the forms, one discovered the concealed videotape recorder beneath the monitor, and two were married.

Finally, the true purpose of the experiment was fully explained, and the subject promised not to discuss it with anyone.

Results

A measure of liking for the other was calculated by summing the scores for each of the 11 traits and the direct measure of liking on the impressions questionnaire. The scores for the favorable traits and for the direct rating of liking were the same as the subject's ratings. The scores for the unfavorable traits were obtained by subtracting the subject's ratings for those characteristics from 20. The means for the experimental conditions for the measure of liking are presented in Table 1.

From the hypotheses, it would be expected that the scores on the measure of liking would be greater in the exchange-benefit condition than in the exchange-no-benefit condition and would be lower in the communal-benefit condition than in the communal-no-benefit condition. From Table 1 it can be seen that the results are in line with the predictions. An analysis of variance of the measure of liking revealed that the interaction between type of relationship and benefit was significant, $F(1, 92) = 8.35, p < .01$. Neither of the main effects approached significance. A planned comparison indicated that the difference between the exchange-benefit condition and the exchange-no-benefit condition was significant, $F(1, 92) = 4.17, p < .05$. A second planned comparison indicated that the difference between the communal-benefit condition and the communal-no-benefit condition was also significant, $F(1, 92) = 4.37, p < .05$.

A measure of anticipated pleasantness of the discussion was calculated by summing the ratings for the questions concerning how friendly, spontaneous, relaxed, enjoyable, and smooth the subjects expected the discussion to be. As expected, the means for this measure were greater for the exchange-benefit condition than for the exchange-no-benefit condition and were lower for the communal-benefit condition than for the communal-no-benefit condition. However, the

Table 1
Means for the Measure of Liking in Experiment 1

Relationship	Benefit from the other	
	Benefit	No benefit
Exchange	193	176
Communal	177	194

Note. The higher the score, the greater the liking. Scores could range from 0 to 240. $n = 24$ per cell.

interaction between the type of relationship and benefit was not significant. The main effects were also not significant.

Discussion

The results of Experiment 1 provide support for the hypothesis that when a communal relationship is desired, a benefit following prior aid decreases attraction. When the attractive woman they had aided was unmarried (communal conditions), the unmarried male subjects liked her less when she gave them a benefit than when she did not. When the attractive woman who was aided turned out to be married (exchange conditions), she was liked more when she gave the subject a benefit than when she did not. The results for the married woman are consistent with the hypothesis that the receipt of a benefit after the other is benefited leads to greater attraction when an exchange relationship is preferred.

It might be thought that the lower liking of the unmarried woman in the benefit condition than in the no-benefit condition could be explained by a difference in the anticipation of future interaction, a variable which has been shown to influence liking in previous research (Darley & Berscheid, 1967; Mirels & Mills, 1964). Such an interpretation would make the assumption that the repayment by the unmarried woman with whom the subject wished to interact suggested that she did not wish to interact with him. However, this assumption is reasonable only if the future interaction is of the kind referred to here as a communal relationship.

If the future interaction involved an explicit exchange of benefits, there is no reason the repayment would have suggested that the unmarried women did not wish to interact with the subject. Since an interpretation in terms of the anticipation of future interaction requires a distinction between different types of interaction similar to the distinction between communal and exchange relationships, it is not an alternative explanation but essentially the same interpretation in somewhat different language.

A different interpretation might be suggested that has to do with the role relationships of males and females. It might be argued that the male subjects subscribed to a "traditional" rule that males should give gifts to females, who should gracefully accept them and not attempt to repay their benefactor, and the unmarried woman who gave them a point violated this rule. Such an interpretation would assume that the males did not apply the same rule to their relationships with a woman who is married, which does not seem consistent with traditional values concerning the role of men vis-à-vis women. If the interpretation is restricted to the relation of men and women in romantic relationships, then it is not an alternative explanation, since romantic relationships are communal relationships.

That the desire for a communal relationship was induced by creating a situation in which there was a possibility of a romantic relationship with an attractive member of the opposite sex was not fortuitous. A romantic relationship that might lead to the development of a family relationship through marriage is a particularly appropriate situation for the study of communal relationships, since relationships between family members are the most typical kind of communal relationships. However, the distinction between communal and exchange relationships is not restricted to romantic relationships with members of the opposite sex. The same effect should occur in situations in which a communal relationship, such as friendship, is desired or expected with a member of the same sex.

It was assumed not only that the other

was perceived as available for a communal relationship in the communal conditions but also that she was regarded as an attractive partner for such a relationship. If the other is unattractive, a communal relationship with her should not be desired even if she is available for such a relationship. People do not desire communal relationships with people they dislike. An exchange relationship should be preferred with an unattractive other, and thus a benefit from such a person after he or she has been aided should lead to greater attraction.

Since the effect found in the first study involves the assumption that the benefit that the person received from the other is perceived as a response to the previous benefit that the other received, it should not occur if the other had not received something of value from the person. The receipt of a benefit when the other has not been aided previously should lead to greater liking when a communal relationship is expected or desired. The rule in communal relationships is to respond to a need rather than to reciprocate benefits. The giving of a benefit when no prior help has been received is appropriate for a communal relationship if there is or might be a need for the benefit.

Some evidence that the receipt of a benefit when the other is not aided previously produces greater liking when there is a communal relationship than when there is not is provided by the study by Kiesler (1966). She found that a partner on a cooperative task was liked more when he shared his winnings with the subject than when he did not share, whereas an opponent on a competitive task was liked about the same when he shared and did not share. Partnership on a cooperative task should create the expectation of a communal relationship, and in Kiesler's study the subject always lost, so the partner did not receive any aid from the subject prior to benefiting the subject. However, the possibility that the subject's losing could have been construed as a kind of aid for his opponent in the competitive conditions complicates the comparison of the cooperative and competitive conditions of Kiesler's study.

Experiment 2

The distinction between communal and exchange relationships also has implications for reactions to a request for a benefit. If it is true that in an exchange relationship any benefit given by one member to the other creates a debt or obligation to return a comparable benefit, a request for a benefit from another after one has been given aid by that other creates an opportunity to repay the debt. Thus, such a request following aid should be appropriate in an exchange relationship. Since it provides an opportunity to eliminate any tension caused by the presence of the debt, it should increase liking for the other.

The idea that the recipient of a benefit will like his or her benefactor more if he or she can return the benefit has been expressed before (Mauss, 1954). Several studies have shown that recipients of benefits like the donor more if they are able to repay the benefit than if they are not able to repay, whether the opportunity is provided by the donor's specifically requesting that the other repay the benefit (Gergen, Ellsworth, Maslach, & Seipel, 1975) or whether the opportunity to repay is provided but repayment is not specifically asked for (Castro, 1974; Gross & Latané, 1974).

In a communal relationship, to request a benefit after having given another person aid is inappropriate. It may imply that the original aid was not given with the intent of satisfying a need but rather with the expectation of receiving something in return, which may be taken as an indication that the other does not desire involvement in a communal relationship. Assuming that beginning or maintaining a communal relationship with another is desirable, such an implication should be frustrating and therefore result in decreased liking.

If one has not been previously aided by another and there is no opportunity to aid the other in the future, a request from that other is inappropriate in an exchange relationship. In an exchange relationship, a person who has not been aided by another should like the other more when he or she does not

ask for a benefit than when he or she does ask for a benefit.

However, requesting a benefit in the absence of prior aid is appropriate in a communal relationship. Such a request implies that the other desires a communal relationship and, assuming that beginning or maintaining such a relationship is desirable, it should result in increased liking. Jones and Wortman (1973) suggest that asking another for a benefit is a way of conveying that we think highly of them. They say, "This tactic is likely to convey that we feel good about our relationship with the target person, since it is not customary to ask people to do favors for us unless our relationship is a relatively good one" (Jones & Wortman, 1973, p. 13).

The implications of the distinction between communal and exchange relationships for reactions to requests for a benefit in the context of prior aid or lack of prior aid were investigated in Experiment 2. A situation was arranged in which aid could be given to the subject and, later, a different benefit requested from the subject. The anticipation of a communal relationship was created by leading the subject to believe that the other wanted to meet people and that she would be discussing common interests with the other. The anticipation of an exchange relationship was created by not mentioning anything about the other wanting to meet people, implying that the other was very busy and leading the subject to believe that she would be discussing differences in interests with the other.

The following hypotheses were tested in the second experiment:

1. A request for a benefit from another after the person is aided by the other leads to greater attraction when an exchange relationship is expected.
2. When a communal relationship is expected, a request for a benefit after the person is aided by the other decreases attraction.
3. A request for a benefit in the absence of aid from the other decreases attraction when an exchange relationship is expected.
4. When a communal relationship is expected, a request for a benefit in the absence of aid from the other increases attraction.

Method

Overview. Under the guise of a study of task performance, female college students worked on a task while a television monitor showed another female working on a similar task in another room. Some of the subjects were told that the other was married, had a child, and lived far from the university, and that she and the subject would be discussing differences in interests in a second study (exchange conditions). Other subjects were told that the other was new at the university and did not know many people, and that she and the subject would be discussing common interests in a second study (communal conditions). The other female finished the task, received 1 point, and gave the subject aid on her supposedly more difficult task or did not give the subject aid. The other female then requested a point from the subject or did not request a point. Finally, the subject's liking for the other and expectations concerning the future discussion with the other were assessed.

Subjects. The subjects were 80 female, introductory psychology students who received extra credit toward their course grade for their participation. They were randomly assigned to one of the eight experimental conditions: exchange-aid-request, exchange-aid-no request, exchange-no aid-request, exchange-no aid-no request, communal-aid-request, communal-aid-no request, communal-no aid-request, and communal-no aid-no request.

Procedure. Upon arriving for the study, the subject was greeted by the experimenter and told that the other subject scheduled to participate at the same time had already arrived and was waiting in another room for the experiment to begin. The experimenter explained that it would take a little time for the equipment to warm up before the experiment could begin.

Relationship manipulation. In the communal conditions, the experimenter casually stated that the other person was anxious to begin because:

She thinks it will be interesting. She's new at the university, doesn't know many people, and she's interested in getting to know people.

In the exchange conditions, the experimenter casually said:

She wants to finish soon. Her husband is coming by to pick her up, then they have to pick up her child and go home to Columbia (a city some distance from the university).

The experimenter said that the first study was actually one of two short, unrelated studies they would be asked to participate in that day. The rationale for the first study was the same as in Experiment 1. The experimenter went on to say that the second study would be quite different from the first. In the communal conditions she continued:

What we're going to do is bring you both into one room. We want you to talk over common interests. We're interested in finding out how people get to know one another. We try to create a relaxed atmosphere, and actually, in the past we've found that some of the people have gotten to know one another quite well.

In the exchange conditions she continued:

What we're going to do is bring you both into one room. We want you to talk over differences in interests. We're doing this because most people avoid talking about differences in interests and we're interested in getting people's reactions to doing so.

Vocabulary task. After the subject had signed an experimental consent form, the procedure for the vocabulary task was explained in the same manner as in Experiment 1, except that the subject was told that she would be performing the more difficult task while the other person would be performing the easier task. The experimenter pointed out that since the subject's task was the more difficult one, she would have a chance to earn 4 points toward the extra credit, whereas the other person, Tricia, only had a chance to earn 1 point, since she had the easier task. As in Experiment 1, the experimenter mentioned that the awarding of points to maintain motivation obviously would not be necessary in the second study.

After the same instructions concerning the stopwatches as in Experiment 1, the subject was left alone to work on the task for a short time. With the 45 letters the subject had it was impossible for her to finish the task in that time. Subjects typically finished between five and seven words. During the time the subject was working, the experimenter, who always wore a lab coat so that changes in clothing over days could not be detected, could be seen on the monitor starting Tricia on her task and then leaving the room. Tricia finished her task easily. After a short time the experimenter reentered the other room, and Tricia could be seen pushing some extra letters to the front of the table. At this point the experimenter stepped in front of the camera, blocking the subject's view of the other so that the subject could not see whether the other handed the letters to the experimenter. Finally, the experimenter could be seen leaving the room, and Tricia sat back in her chair.

Aid manipulation. Shortly thereafter, the experimenter reentered the subject's room and said that Tricia had finished her task and received 1 point. The experimenter turned off the monitor, commenting that it wouldn't be needed any more. In the aid conditions she said, "Tricia asked me to give you these letters," and handed the subject some letters. In the no-aid conditions there was no mention of the letters. The experimenter then left the room, telling the subject she would be back

Table 2
Means for the Measure of Liking in
Experiment 2

Relation- ship	Aid from & request for benefit from the other			
	Aid- request	Aid- no request	No aid- request	No aid- no request
Exchange	173	149	149	173
Communal	156	191	179	177

Note. The higher the score, the greater the liking. Scores could range from 0 to 240. $n = 10$ per cell.

shortly. In approximately 3 minutes, she returned, and regardless of whether the subject had finished (none in the no-aid conditions did, whereas most in the aid conditions did), she told the subject she had done well enough to receive the 4 points toward extra credit. She filled out a form indicating this and handed it to the subject. The experimenter said that was all there was to the first study, except for filling out a form if the subject wanted to request any points from Tricia. Before the subject had an opportunity to look at the form, the experimenter said she would check with Tricia and see if she wanted to fill out a form and left the room for approximately 2 minutes.

Request manipulation. When she appeared, the experimenter handed the subject a folded note, supposedly from Tricia, in which a box was checked indicating either that she wished to request 1 point from the subject (request conditions) or that she did not wish to request any points (no-request conditions). The experimenter was unaware of how the form was checked, having drawn it from a container of folded forms checked in both ways. If the subject wished to fill out a form to request points from the other, the experimenter took it.

Dependent measures. Next, the experimenter reminded the subject that the second study would involve having both subjects talk over common interests (communal conditions) or differences in interests (exchange conditions). Before starting the study it was necessary to get some idea of what their expectations were about the forthcoming interaction in order to control for those expectations, since they might vary from person to person. Therefore, she was asking the subject to fill out two forms indicating what her first impressions of the other person were and also what she expected the discussion to be like. The subject was told that these forms would be kept completely confidential.

The first-impressions form, which was given the subject on top of the form concerning expectations about this discussion, was the same as the first-impression form used in Experiment 1. The other form asked the subject to indicate how friendly, spontaneous, strained, enjoyable, and awkward she expected the discussion to be, on scales from 1 to 20.

Suspicion check. The experimenter left and watched through a one-way mirror until she could see that the subject had finished the forms. She then waited approximately 30 additional sec and reentered the room. As she picked up the forms, she casually said that there was something more to the study than she had mentioned before and asked the subject if she had any idea of what it might be. The responses of eight persons indicated suspicion of the instructions, and they were not included as subjects. Five persons suspected that the other person was not actually in the other room, one thought that the other's task had been intentionally made easy, one thought that the request did not actually come from the other person, and one thought that neither the aid nor the request came from the other person. All five people who suspected that the other person was not actually in the other room had been in another study by a different experimenter, in which they were told that another person participated but later found out that there was no such other person. Three of the eight persons were run under the exchange-aid-request condition, two under the exchange-aid-no-request condition, one under the exchange-no-aid-request condition, one under the communal-aid-request condition, and one under the communal-aid-no-request condition. In addition, four other people were not included as subjects. Two requested points from the other person, one did not read the request for a point before filling out the questionnaires, and one asked so many questions that the experimenter could not leave the room before appearing on the monitor.

Finally, the true purpose of the experiment was fully explained, and the subject promised not to discuss it with anyone.

Results

A measure of liking for the other was calculated in the same way as in Experiment 1. The means for the experimental conditions for the measure of liking are presented in Table 2. An analysis of variance of the measure of liking revealed that the main effect of type of relationship was significant, $F(1, 72) = 6.21$, $p < .05$. Neither of the other main effects nor any of the two-way interactions were significant. The three-way interaction between type of relationship, aid, and request was significant, $F(1, 72) = 12.73$, $p < .001$.

From the first hypothesis, it would be expected that scores on the measure of liking would be greater in the exchange-aid-request condition than in the exchange-aid-no-request condition. As can be seen in Table 2, the difference was in the predicted direction. A planned comparison indicated that this dif-

ference was significant, $F(1, 72) = 4.03$, $p < .05$.

From the second hypothesis, it would be expected that liking would be less in the communal-aid-request condition than in the communal-aid-no-request condition. As can be seen in Table 2, the difference was as predicted. A planned comparison indicated that this difference was significant, $F(1, 72) = 8.60$, $p < .01$.

From the third hypothesis, it would be expected that liking would be less in the exchange-no-aid-request condition than in the exchange-no-aid-no-request condition. As can be seen in Table 2, the difference was as predicted. A planned comparison indicated that this difference was significant, $F(1, 72) = 4.07$, $p < .05$.

From the fourth hypothesis, it would be expected that liking would be greater in the communal-no-aid-request condition than in the communal-no-aid-no-request condition. As can be seen in Table 2, the means for these two conditions were very similar. A planned comparison indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant.

Another way of looking at the results is to compare the aid and the no-aid conditions. It would be expected that liking would be greater in the exchange-aid-request condition than in the exchange-no-aid-request condition. As can be seen in Table 2, this expected difference was obtained. A planned comparison indicated that the difference was significant, $F(1, 72) = 3.99$, $p < .05$. It would be expected that liking would be less in the communal-aid-request condition than in the communal-no-aid-request condition. As can be seen in Table 2, this expected difference was obtained. A planned comparison indicated that the difference was marginally significant, $F(1, 72) = 3.93$, $p < .06$. It would be expected that liking would be less in the exchange-aid-no-request condition than in the exchange-no-aid-no-request condition. As can be seen in Table 2, this expected difference was obtained. A planned comparison indicated that it was significant, $F(1, 72) = 4.10$, $p < .05$. Finally, it would be expected that liking would be greater in the communal-aid-no-request condition than in the communal-

Table 3

Means for the Measure of Anticipated Pleasantness of the Discussion in Experiment 2

Relation- ship	Aid from & request for benefit from the other			
	Aid- request	Aid- no request	No aid- request	No aid- no request
Exchange	56	59	58	59
Communal	63	72	70	52

Note. The higher the score, the more positive the subjects' expectations for the discussion. Scores could range from 5 to 100. $n = 10$ per cell.

no-aid-no-request condition. Although the means were in the expected direction, the planned comparison indicated that this difference was not significant.

A measure of anticipated pleasantness of the discussion was calculated by summing the scores on the questions concerning how friendly, spontaneous, strained, enjoyable, and awkward the subjects expected the discussion to be. The scores for the favorable characteristics were the same as the subjects' ratings. The scores for the unfavorable characteristics were obtained by subtracting the subjects' ratings for those characteristics from 21. The means for the experimental conditions for the measure of anticipated pleasantness of the discussion are presented in Table 3.

An analysis of variance of the measure of anticipated pleasantness of the discussion revealed that the main effect of type of relationship was significant, $F(1, 72) = 5.01$, $p < .05$. The main effects of aid and of request and the interactions between type of relationship and aid and between type of relationship and request were not significant. The interaction between aid and request was significant, $F(1, 72) = 7.31$, $p < .01$, and the three-way interaction between type of relationship, aid, and request was also significant, $F(1, 72) = 5.61$, $p < .05$.

As can be seen in Table 3, anticipated pleasantness was approximately the same in all four of the exchange conditions, but there were differences within the communal conditions. Anticipated pleasantness was lower in the communal-aid-request condition than in

the communal-aid-no-request condition. A simple comparison indicated that this difference approached significance, $F(1, 72) = 2.99$, $p < .10$. Anticipated pleasantness was greater in the communal-no aid-request condition than in the communal-no-aid-no-request condition. A simple comparison of this difference was significant, $F(1, 72) = 11.19$, $p < .001$.

Discussion

In general, the results supported the hypotheses concerning reactions to a request for a benefit based on the distinction between communal and exchange relationships. As expected from the hypothesis that a request for a benefit after the person is aided by the other leads to greater attraction when an exchange relationship is expected, it was found that liking for the other was higher in the exchange-aid-request condition than in the exchange-aid-no-request condition. As predicted from the hypothesis that a request for a benefit after the person is aided decreases attraction when a communal relationship is expected, liking was lower in the communal-aid-request condition than in the communal-aid-no-request condition. In line with the hypothesis that a request for a benefit in the absence of aid from the other decreases attraction when an exchange relationship is expected, liking for the other was lower in the exchange-no-aid-request condition than in the exchange-no-aid-no-request condition.

The hypothesis that a request for a benefit in the absence of aid from the other increases attraction when a communal relationship is expected was not supported; there was no difference in liking between the communal-no-aid-request condition and the communal-no-aid-no-request condition. The subjects in the communal-no-aid-request condition may have been somewhat uncertain about the intentions of the other. Although the request may have indicated to the subject that the other wanted a communal relationship with her and consequently led the subject to expect such a relationship, it also may have reminded the subject that the other had not given her aid earlier. This reminder may have raised doubt about whether the other would

behave in an appropriate way for a communal relationship. This could explain why the request did not result in increased liking for the other in the communal-no-aid-request condition.

As would be expected from the distinction between communal and exchange relationships, liking was greater in the exchange-aid-request condition than in the exchange-no-aid-request condition, marginally less in the communal-aid-request condition than in the communal-no-aid-request condition, and less in the exchange-aid-no-request condition than in the exchange-no aid-no-request condition. The greater liking in the exchange-aid-request condition than in the exchange-no-aid-request condition could be due to a general tendency for aid to increase liking, as well as to the appropriateness of the request. However, the fact that liking was less in the exchange-aid-no-request condition than in the exchange-no-aid-no-request condition is opposite to what would be expected from a general tendency for aid to increase liking, but follows from the idea that differences in liking are due to the appropriateness of the other's behavior for the type of relationship. That liking was less in the communal-aid-request condition than in the communal-no-aid-request condition is also opposite to the tendency for aid to increase liking and consistent with the effect on liking of the appropriateness of the other's behavior for the type of relationship.

Since the focus was on the interactive effects of type of relationship, a main effect of type of relationship was not specifically predicted. However, the significant main effect that was obtained for liking is understandable in view of the operations used to manipulate type of relationship. Among other things, subjects in the communal conditions may have expected the other to be more similar than did subjects in the exchange conditions.

The results for the measure of anticipated pleasantness of the interaction were also consistent with the distinction between communal and exchange relationships. Anticipated pleasantness was similar in the four exchange conditions, marginally less in the communal-aid-request condition than in the communal-

aid-no-request condition, and greater in the communal-no-aid-request condition than in the communal-no-aid-no-request condition.

The results for the measure of pleasantness can be understood in terms of the assumption that one will anticipate interaction with the other to be more pleasant if one expects a communal relationship than if one expects an exchange relationship. In the exchange condition, subjects were led to expect an exchange relationship by the experimental instructions given in those conditions. Subjects in the communal-aid-request condition should have expected an exchange relationship, because the rules of a communal relationship were violated by the request following the prior aid. Subjects in the communal-no-aid-no-request condition should also have expected an exchange relationship, because the rules of a communal relationship were violated by the other's failure to respond to their needs or to request something from the subject for which the other presumably had a need.

The interpretation of the results for the measure of anticipated pleasantness might appear inconsistent with the fact that liking was not significantly higher in the communal-no-aid-request condition than in the communal-no-aid-no-request condition. However, it is possible that the request for a benefit in the absence of prior aid was sufficient to create an expectation of a communal relationship yet insufficient to increase liking. As mentioned earlier, the request for aid in the communal-no-aid-request condition may have been taken as an indication that the other felt positively toward the subject and thus led the subject to expect a communal relationship with that other, but it may also have reminded the subject that the other had not fulfilled her needs earlier, resulting in ambivalent feelings toward the other.

General Discussion

While it is assumed that the distinction between communal and exchange relationships is made implicitly by most people in their interactions with others, it is not assumed that they are explicitly aware of the distinction or are able to describe how it affects their reactions. Certainly they do not use the

terms *communal* and *exchange relationships*. It is also not assumed that everyone makes the distinction in the same way. Some people restrict their communal relationships to only a very few persons, whereas others have communal relationships with a wide circle of others. There are some people who do not make the distinction at all. Some people treat every relationship, even relationships with members of their own immediate family, in terms of exchange.

It is possible for a person to have both a communal relationship and an exchange relationship with the same other, for example, when a person sells something to a friend or hires a family member as an employee. In such instances, a distinction is typically made between what is appropriate for the business (exchange) relationship and what is appropriate for the family or friendship (communal) relationship. Exchange relationships sometimes can develop into communal relationships, such as when a merchant and a customer become close friends or when an employer and an employee marry.

The lack of attention paid to communal relationships in previous research on interpersonal attraction may be accounted for by the fact that almost all of the past research has involved attraction toward persons who are not only previously unknown to the subject but who are not expected by the subject ever to be known in the future. Communal relationships involve an expectation of a long-term relationship, whereas exchange relationships need not be long-term. However, the variables of communal versus exchange relationship and expected length of the relationship are conceptually independent. Exchange relationships may be expected to continue over a long period.

If it is true that treating a communal relationship in terms of exchange compromises the relationship, then exchange theories of interpersonal attraction (e.g., Secord & Backman, 1974, chapter 7) may create a misleading impression about the development and breakup of intimate relationships. The idea that exchange is the basis of intimate relationships may actually have the effect of impairing such relationships. For example, the rec-

ommendation, which seems to be growing in popularity, that prior to marriage a marriage contract be drawn up that specifies in detail what each partner expects from the other, should, if followed, tend to undermine the relationship.

If the theoretical viewpoint of this research is correct, a communal relationship will be strained by dickerings about what each of the partners will do for the other. Of course, if one of the partners in a communal relationship is convinced that he or she is being exploited by the other because that person is concerned about the other's welfare while the other is not concerned about his or her welfare, the communal relationship has disintegrated. If this happens in a marriage, there may be attempts to preserve the marriage by changing it into an exchange relationship through dickerings.

References

- Adams, J. S. Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1963, 67, 422-436.
- Castro, M. A. C. Reactions to receiving aid as a function of cost to donor and opportunity to aid. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1974, 4, 194-209.
- Darley, J. M., & Berscheid, E. Increased liking as a result of the anticipation of personal contact. *Human Relations*, 1967, 20, 29-40.
- Gergen, K. J., Ellsworth, P., Maslach, C., & Seipel, M. Obligation, donor resources, and reactions to aid in three cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1975, 31, 390-400.
- Goffman, E. *Asylums*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1961.
- Gross, A. E., & Latané, J. G. Receiving help, reciprocity, and interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1974, 4, 210-223.
- Jones, E. E., & Wortman, C. *Ingratiation: An attributional approach*. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1973.
- Keisler, S. B. The effect of perceived role requirements on reactions to favor doing. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 1966, 2, 198-210.
- Mauss, M. *The gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1954.
- Mirels, H., & Mills, J. Perception of the pleasantness and competence of a partner. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1964, 68, 456-459.
- Pruitt, D. G. Methods for resolving differences of interest: A theoretical analysis. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1972, 28, 133-154.
- Secord, P. F., & Backman, C. W. *Social psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. *The social psychology of groups*. N.Y.: Wiley, 1959.
- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Berscheid, E. *Equity: Theory and research*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1978.

Received November 7, 1977 ■