

Keeping Track of Needs in Communal and Exchange Relationships

Margaret S. Clark
Carnegie-Mellon University

Judson Mills
University of Maryland

Martha C. Powell
Indiana University

Keeping track of needs in communal and exchange relationships was investigated in two experiments. In both, subjects could check to see if another person needed help. The first experiment tested the hypotheses that (a) When there is no opportunity for the other to reciprocate in kind, keeping track of the other's needs will be greater if the person desires a communal relationship with the other than if the person desires an exchange relationship with the other. (b) If the person desires an exchange relationship with the other, keeping track of the other's needs will be greater when an opportunity for the other to reciprocate in kind exists than when it does not. (c) If a communal relationship is desired, the existence of an opportunity for the other to reciprocate in kind will not influence keeping track of the other's needs. The results of the first experiment supported all three hypotheses. The second experiment tested and found support for the hypothesis that even when nothing can be done to help the other, keeping track of the other's needs will be greater if a communal relationship is desired with the other than if an exchange relationship is desired.

The research reported in this article focuses on the degree to which a person will try to keep track of another person's needs in different types of relationships. This focus extends in a new direction, an ongoing program of research based on a distinction between communal and exchange relationships (Clark & Mills, 1979; Mills & Clark, 1982). Exchange relationships are often exemplified by relationships between acquaintances or between people who do business with one another. Communal relationships are often exemplified by friendships, romantic relationships, and family relationships.

What distinguishes communal and exchange relationships are the rules governing the giving and receiving of benefits. In communal relationships, members have a general obligation to be concerned about the other's welfare. They give benefits in response to needs or to please the other. In exchange relationships, members do not have an obligation to be concerned about the other's welfare. They give benefits with the expectation of receiving comparable benefits in return or in payment for benefits previously received. Several studies have been reported supporting this distinction between communal and exchange relationships (Clark, 1981, 1984, in press; Clark & Mills, 1979; Clark & Waddell, 1985).

Recent research (Clark, 1984) has demonstrated that in exchange, but not in communal relationships, people keep track of individual inputs into joint tasks for which there will be a reward. Keeping track of inputs is necessary in order to allocate

benefits in proportion to inputs—something that is called for in exchange relationships. However, in communal relationships such record keeping is unnecessary because benefits are distributed according to needs or to demonstrate concern for the other. Although keeping track of individual inputs into joint tasks is called for in exchange but not in communal relationships, a different type of monitoring would be expected in communal but not in exchange relationships. Specifically, communal norms call for members to keep track of one another's needs but exchange norms do not.

In the present study, we examined the degree to which a person will keep track of another's needs as a function of (a) type of relationship desired (communal or exchange) and (b) perceived opportunity for the other to later reciprocate in kind by keeping track of the subject's needs (opportunity or no opportunity). Because in communal relationships people give benefits in response to needs, in such relationships people should keep track of the other's needs regardless of whether there is an opportunity for the other to reciprocate in kind. In contrast, in exchange relationships, because people feel no special obligation to respond to the other's needs, whether they keep track of the other's needs should depend on whether the other can reciprocate in kind. In exchange relationships, when no opportunity for the other to reciprocate exists, there is no reason to keep track of the other's needs. However, when the other can reciprocate in kind, people in exchange relationships should keep track of the other's needs. Doing so would allow them to respond to those needs thereby obligating the other to repay them with something they expect to need.

On the basis of this reasoning, we tested the following three hypotheses in our first study: (a) When there is no opportunity for the other to reciprocate in kind, keeping track of the other's needs will be greater if the person desires a communal relationship with the other than if the person desires an exchange rela-

This research was supported by National Institute of Mental Health Grants ROS MH40250-01 and RO1 MH40390-01.

Martha Powell was at Carnegie-Mellon University at the time this research was conducted.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Margaret S. Clark, Department of Psychology, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.

tionship with the other. (b) If the person desires an exchange relationship with the other, keeping track of the other's needs will be greater when an opportunity for the other to reciprocate in kind exists than when it does not. (c) If a communal relationship is desired, the existence of an opportunity for the other to reciprocate in kind will not influence keeping track of the other's needs.

Experiment 1

Method

Overview. Subjects in an experiment ostensibly on problem solving were led to believe an attractive woman seen briefly on a TV monitor was another subject in an adjacent room. They read a questionnaire the other had supposedly filled out which revealed that she was single and interested in meeting people (communal conditions) or married (exchange conditions). The subjects were instructed that the other, who supposedly had a more difficult task, could ask the subject for help by putting a note through a slot into a box in the subject's room. The subjects were told they could check the box for notes but were not required to do so. Some subjects were led to expect that there would be an opportunity to switch roles later in the session (*opportunity* conditions) and others were not (*no-opportunity* conditions). The number of times each subject checked the box was observed by the experimenter through a one-way mirror.

Subjects. The subjects were 66 undergraduates (46 men and 20 women) at Carnegie-Mellon University participating in partial fulfillment of a psychology course requirement. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions: communal-opportunity, communal-no-opportunity, exchange-opportunity, and exchange-no-opportunity.

Procedure. The subjects signed up for an experiment on problem-solving behavior. The sign-up sheet contained spaces for 2 subjects to sign up for each session, one of which had been filled in by the experimenter with a name of a woman.

Upon arrival, the subject was greeted by the experimenter who was just leaving the room adjacent to the lab to which the sign-up sheet had directed the subject. This was done to corroborate what the subject soon would be told about the other person. The experimenter said that another subject had arrived first, that she had been seated in the room adjacent to the subject's room, and that the experimenter had already briefly explained the study to her. As the experimenter led the subject into the lab, the subject could see a T.V. monitor showing an attractive woman sitting in a room similar to the subject's room. The experimenter commented that the other subject had already arrived and was in the room next door. Then she added, "Oh, the monitor is on. The rooms have closed-circuit cameras, but we don't need them," and she turned off the system. The film of the woman the subject saw as he or she was entering the room was actually on videotape, and this film was the same for all subjects. To increase the plausibility that there indeed was a closed-circuit T.V. set up between the two rooms, there was also a camera in the subject's room. However, the subject was told that this camera was not turned on.

After being seated, the subject was given a form entitled "Pre-session Questionnaire," which was divided into two parts. The top half had already been filled out, supposedly by the other subject. The subject was instructed to fill in the bottom half of the questionnaire. The experimenter said she was going to give the other subject some instructions and, when finished, would return and give the subject instructions. The experimenter then left the lab, entered the adjacent room, and recited instructions to the "other subject," actually an empty room. This was done in case the actual subject could hear through the wall.

The top half of the Pre-session Questionnaire, supposedly filled out by

the other, could easily be seen by the subject as he or she filled out the bottom half. It was used to manipulate the type of relationship desired with the other. The questionnaire asked for some demographic information about each person as well as for the reason they had signed up for this particular research session. In all cases, the other indicated that she was a 19-year old female. In the communal conditions, the other also had indicated that she was a single, transfer student, new to the campus that semester, and that she had signed up for the experiment because it was scheduled at a convenient time and she thought it might be a good way to meet people. In the exchange conditions, the other also indicated that she was married, that she had been at the university for 2 years, and that she signed up for the experiment because it was scheduled at a convenient time and her husband could pick her up afterwards.

The assumption behind this manipulation was that most of our student subjects would be available for and interested in a communal relationship with the attractive other who clearly indicated her availability for such a relationship. However, when the other ruled out her availability by failing to indicate a desire to meet people as well as by indicating that she was married, it was assumed subjects would expect and desire an exchange relationship.

A recent study specifically examined the effectiveness of these manipulations in producing a desire for a communal versus an exchange relationship (Clark, in press). In that study, subjects were exposed to either the communal or the exchange manipulation and asked questions designed to tap desire for a communal relationship (e.g., Would they enjoy responding to the other's needs?), and questions designed to tap desire for an exchange relationship (e.g., If they gave something to the other would they expect a repayment soon afterwards?). An index indicating preference for a communal relationship as opposed to an exchange relationship was derived. As expected, scores on this index were significantly greater for subjects exposed to the communal manipulation than for subjects exposed to the exchange manipulation.

Returning to the procedure, the time the experimenter spent in the adjacent room giving bogus instructions to the other "subject" was sufficient for the actual subject to complete his or her portion of the questionnaire and to read what the other had said. After reciting the instructions in the adjacent room, the experimenter re-entered the subject's room, picked up the completed questionnaire from the subject, and then explained that the subject's task was to form 10 four-letter words using the letters on the desk. She further explained that there were two versions of the task, one more difficult than the other. A coin toss had determined that the subject would work on the easier task, whereas the other subject would have the more difficult task. The other's task was more difficult because she had only 45 letters ranging from A to L, whereas the subject's easier letter set contained 60 letters ranging from A to Z. The subject was told that a small monetary reward, the exact amount of which was left unspecified, would be given if the task was completed in the allotted time, which was also left unspecified.

All subjects were then told that there was another condition, in which halfway through the experiment, the 2 subjects must exchange unused letters. Subjects were told they were not in the "exchange required" condition, rather they were in the "no exchange required" condition. The experimenter continued by saying, "However, some people have asked if it is okay to request letters in this condition. We decided it wouldn't harm the experiment if the person who had the more difficult task—that is, the other subject—asked for letters, so she *is* allowed to ask you for letters if she wants. However, your task is easy already, and we don't want to make it any easier. So you are *not* allowed to ask for letters from the other subject."

The experimenter then pointed out a box attached to the wall between the subject's and the other's room. This box was located approximately 6 feet (182.9 cm) from the subject's chair, and the subject's view of it was shielded by the large video monitor. The box itself concealed a slot through the wall and had a lid that could be lifted. The experimenter

explained that if the other needed to ask for letters, she would put her request through the slot and it would fall into the box. The experimenter mentioned that the box was lined with felt which meant the subject would not be able to hear the note fall into the box if the other put one through. Therefore, if the subject wanted to check to see if the other needed any letters, he or she would have to get up and look. (The subject's desk was in the opposite corner of the room.) The experimenter continued, explaining that the subject could get any notes the other sent by lifting up the cover of the box, and she demonstrated this. The subject was told he or she could respond by putting letters through the slot but was not required to check the box nor to send any letters. The experimenter said, "It is okay with us if you do so, but if you want to concentrate on your own task, that's fine too."

After asking if the subject had any questions, the experimenter handed the subject a list of anagrams and explained that the subject could earn more money by solving anagrams. Ten cents would be paid for each anagram solved, but the anagrams were only to be solved after the subject had completed his or her 10 four-letter words. These instructions were included to motivate subjects to work on their own task and not to check the box unless they were truly interested in the other's needs.

At this point, the procedure diverged for subjects assigned to the opportunity conditions and those assigned to the no-opportunity conditions. Those assigned to the opportunity conditions were told that after the allotted time for the task, there would be a second round which would be the same as the first with the exception of the difficulty assignments. In round two, the subject would have the more difficult task, whereas the other would have the easier letter set. Because the subject would have the more difficult task in the second round, he or she could request letters from the other by sending notes and the other could check the box and respond if she wanted. These instructions were omitted for those in the no-opportunity conditions. Finally, in both the opportunity and no-opportunity conditions, the subject was instructed to begin the task and the experimenter left the room.

After leaving the subject's room, the experimenter entered a third room from which the subject could be observed through a one-way mirror. The experimenter counted the number of times the subject checked the box for a note. (The box was always empty.) The experimenter re-entered the subject's room 10 min after the subject completed forming the 10 four-letter words. At that time, the subject was checked for suspicion, thoroughly debriefed, given credit, and paid for any anagrams completed. Two persons, both originally assigned to the exchange-no-opportunity condition, indicated that they did not believe that the other person was actually present. In addition, one person in the exchange-opportunity condition opened the box and placed some letters in it. Finally, during debriefing 6 more persons reported not having read the other's information. One had been assigned to the communal-opportunity condition, 2 to the communal-no-opportunity condition, 3 to the exchange-opportunity condition, and 1 to the exchange-no-opportunity condition. None of these persons were counted as subjects, and their data were not included in any analyses.

Results

The dependent measure in this study was the number of times each subject checked the mailbox to determine whether the other had requested help. The means on this measure for each condition are shown in Table 1. As can be seen from Table 1, the means fell in the predicted pattern. Subjects in the communal-no-opportunity condition checked more often ($M = 2.17$) than did those in the exchange-no-opportunity condition ($M = 1.19$). Those in the exchange-opportunity condition checked more often ($M = 2.13$) than those in the exchange-no-opportunity condition ($M = 1.19$). The number of checks was as great

Table 1
Mean Number of Box Checks

| Relationship | Opportunity for reciprocation | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | No opportunity | Opportunity |
| Communal | | |
| <i>M</i> | 2.17 | 2.06 |
| <i>n</i> | 18 | 16 |
| Exchange | | |
| <i>M</i> | 1.19 | 2.13 |
| <i>n</i> | 16 | 16 |

in the communal-no-opportunity condition ($M = 2.17$) as in the communal-opportunity condition ($M = 2.06$).

Because the distribution of scores on the dependent measure was skewed (skew = +.55), the scores were submitted to a logarithmic transformation ($x = \text{Log}_{10} [x + 1]$). Following the transformation, a three-way between-subjects analysis of variance (Sex \times Relationship Type \times Opportunity to Reciprocate) was conducted. As expected, this analysis revealed a significant interaction between relationship type and opportunity to reciprocate, $F(1, 58) = 4.42, p < .05$. There were no significant main effects, and the interactions involving the sex of the subject were not significant.

Following the analysis of variance (ANOVA), planned comparisons were performed. They revealed that, as expected, the difference between the communal-no-opportunity condition and exchange-no-opportunity condition was significant, $F(1, 58) = 7.03, p < .05$, as was the difference between the exchange-opportunity condition and the exchange-no-opportunity condition, $F(1, 58) = 7.37, p < .05$. Also, as expected, the difference between the communal-opportunity and communal-no-opportunity conditions did not approach significance.

Discussion

The results supported the three hypotheses that (a) When there is no opportunity for the other to reciprocate in kind, keeping track of the other's needs will be greater if the person desires a communal relationship with the other than if the person desires an exchange relationship with the other. (b) If the person desires an exchange relationship with the other, keeping track of the other's needs will be greater when an opportunity for the other to reciprocate in kind exists than when it does not. (c) If a communal relationship is desired, the existence of an opportunity for the other to reciprocate in kind will not influence keeping track of the other's needs.

The hypotheses were based on the assumption that persons desiring a communal relationship with the other will follow communal norms, which involve concern for the other's needs. Therefore, they will be motivated to keep track of the other's needs, whether or not there is an opportunity for the other to reciprocate in kind. On the other hand, persons desiring an exchange relationship will not follow communal norms. They will tend not to keep track of the other's needs except when responding to the other's needs would be expected to obligate the other to repay them with something they might need.

Some alternative explanations for the results might be raised. First, it might be thought that the results could be explained by assuming that the other was perceived as more dependent on the subject in the communal conditions than in the exchange conditions. If correct, this assumption could account for a main effect of relationship type on keeping track of needs. However, it would not predict the interaction obtained between relationship type and opportunity to reciprocate. Although the assumption that the other was perceived as more dependent in the communal conditions *together* with the presence of a ceiling effect in the communal–opportunity condition could account for the interaction, because the mean number of box checks in the communal–opportunity condition was only about two per experimental session, there is no reason to think a ceiling effect occurred in that condition.

Moreover, the results of a recent study (Clark & Muchant, 1986) call into question the assumption that the other was perceived as more dependent in the communal conditions. In this study, type of relationship was manipulated in the same manner as in the present study, and perceived dependency was measured by asking how “self-reliant,” “dependent,” and “needy” the other seemed to be. The communal manipulation did not result in higher scores on these measures than did the exchange manipulation.

Second, it might be asked whether, because similarity has been shown to increase helping (e.g., Karabenick, Lerner, & Beecher, 1973; Sole, Marton, & Hornstein, 1975), the obtained pattern was due to the communal manipulation causing the other to seem more similar to the subject than did the exchange manipulation. This assumption could account for a main effect of relationship type. However, it also does not predict the obtained interaction between relationship type and opportunity to reciprocate without assuming the existence of a ceiling effect in the communal–opportunity condition or without assuming that increased perceived similarity increases desire for a communal relationship (which, from our perspective, is probably the reason why similarity does increase helping). As already noted, there is no reason to think a ceiling effect occurred in the communal–opportunity condition and, if it is assumed that perceived similarity increases desire for a communal relationship, the explanation is no longer distinct from our own explanation.

Finally, an alternative explanation might be proposed specifically for the difference between the communal–no-opportunity and exchange–no-opportunity conditions. It might be argued that the same (exchange) rule was followed in the communal and exchange conditions and that a difference in the expected duration of the relationship accounts for the different results in those two conditions. According to this interpretation, subjects in the communal–no-opportunity condition expected their relationship with the other to persist into the future and, even though there was no opportunity to switch roles in the experimental session, they might have believed the other would repay them for their help sometime in the future. Thus subjects in the communal–no-opportunity condition were willing to help the other. In contrast, it might be argued that subjects in the exchange–no-opportunity condition had no expectations that their relationship with the other would persist into the future. Thus, having no opportunity to switch roles in the experi-

ment, they assumed they would not be able extract a repayment from the other and were consequently unwilling to help the other.

Such an interpretation is not, in our view, an adequate alternative explanation for our results. Granting that the communal subjects probably anticipated a longer relationship, if an exchange rule was followed in the communal conditions, there should have been a difference between the communal–opportunity and communal–no-opportunity conditions. Following an exchange rule would mean that keeping track of the other's needs and helping the other would create a specific debt to the subject. The existence of such a debt presumably causes distress (Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978). The more quickly and clearly the debt could be eliminated, the more motivated the subjects should have been to become involved in the creation of such a debt. Thus, they should have been more interested in checking on the other's needs when the other had an opportunity to reciprocate in exactly the same manner soon afterwards than when the other could not.

If the interpretation is altered to include the assumption that the subjects in the communal conditions did not care about specific repayment of the help but rather wanted the other to respond to different needs of theirs later on, then it is not an alternative explanation invoking the exchange rule and can no longer be clearly distinguished from our theoretical perspective. We assume that in a communal relationship people not only feel a special responsibility for the needs of the other but they also expect the other to feel a special responsibility for their needs. Thus, they should expect the other to be responsive to their needs when such needs arise.

Experiment 2

We conducted a second experiment to conceptually replicate the finding that there is greater attention to needs when a communal than when an exchange relationship is desired. It was also designed to determine whether this finding would generalize to situations in which those led to expect a communal or an exchange relationship are not able to respond to the other's needs. If people attend to needs in communal relationships even when it is not possible to respond to those needs, this would provide further evidence that keeping track of needs in communal relationships is not motivated by a desire to be able to indebt the other to oneself. Rather the motivation would seem to come from a more fundamental general concern about and interest in the other's welfare.

Further, although the possibility that the results of the first study might have been due to subjects in the communal but not exchange conditions expecting future interaction seemed remote to us, a second reason for conducting a second experiment is that we felt the second experiment would clearly rule out that possibility. We reasoned that if subjects in our communal–no-opportunity conditions kept track of the other's needs in order to get a repayment in the future, then there should be no difference between the communal and exchange conditions if subjects were told it was not possible to help the other. If subjects could not help the other, the other would not be in debt to them or obligated to repay them later.

In the second study, relationship type was once again manip-

ulated and subjects were put in a situation in which they could keep track of the other's needs but were not allowed to respond to those needs. Whether subjects kept track of the other's needs was observed. Even when not allowed to respond to the other's needs, we predicted that subjects exposed to the communal manipulation would be more likely to keep track of the other's needs than would subjects exposed to the exchange manipulation.

Method

Overview. The subjects were led to believe that an attractive woman was working in an adjacent room, and relationship type was manipulated in the same manner as in the first experiment. The subjects were told that the other could not request help but that as an experimental control for a different version of the experiment, she would turn on a green light when she started her task and a red light whenever she needed help. The subjects were left alone to wait while the other was supposedly working on her task. The number of times each subject looked toward the lights was observed by the experimenter through a one-way mirror.

Subjects. The subjects were 33 undergraduates (18 men and 15 women) at Carnegie-Mellon University participating either for pay ($n = 19$) or in partial fulfillment of a psychology course requirement ($n = 14$). Subjects were randomly assigned to either the communal or exchange conditions. Nine communal and 10 exchange subjects received credit. Seven communal and 7 exchange subjects received pay.

Procedure. Subjects signed up for an experiment described as involving word games. As in the first experiment, the experimenter had already filled in the name of a female subject for the same time period. The procedure used in Experiment 1 to convince the subject that another subject had arrived and was in the adjacent room was also used in this experiment. When the subject arrived, the experimenter was leaving the adjacent lab room and seated the subject in a room in which a T.V. monitor was on, showing an attractive woman. The subject was told the woman was the other subject but that the monitor was not necessary. It was then turned off.

Relationship type was also manipulated in the same manner as in Experiment 1. After the subject was seated he or she was given a "Pre-session Questionnaire" to complete, the top half of which had supposedly been filled in by the other subject. The other described herself as either a 19-year old, single female transfer student, who was new on campus that semester, and who had signed up for the experiment because it was a convenient time and she thought it might be a good way to meet new people, or as a 19-year old female who was married, had been at the university for 2 years, and who signed up because it was a convenient time and her husband could pick her up afterwards. The top half of these forms were filled out prior to the experiment by a person other than the experimenter. This allowed the experimenter to remain unaware of the relationship condition to which the subject had been assigned.

As in Experiment 1, the experimenter recited the instructions in the adjacent room to lend plausibility to the idea that another subject was present. The experimenter then re-entered the subject's room and informed him or her that the task was to form sets of 10 four-letter words using the letters on the desk. She further explained that there were two versions of the task, one more difficult than the other. A coin toss had determined that the subject would work on the easier task, whereas the other subject would have the more difficult task. The other's task was more difficult because she had only 45 letters ranging from A to L, whereas the subject's easier letter set contained 60 letters ranging from A to Z. When told to begin, the subject's task was to turn over the letters and form 10 four-letter words. The subject was then to write the words on a tablet of paper, shuffle the letters, try to form another different set of 10 four-letter words, and so forth. The subject was to continue in this

manner until the experimenter returned and said that time was up. At that time, the subject supposedly would be asked about the strategies that had been used.

In a change from the instructions used in the first experiment, all subjects were then told that there was another condition or version of the experiment in which the two subjects worked together. In that version of the experiment, the person with the more difficult task could request letters from the person with the easier task. The experimenter then pointed out the box, which was *behind* the subject, who was sitting in a different place in the room than in Experiment 1. The box was the same box used in Experiment 1 except that two small lights (one green and one red) had been placed on the lid of the box. Subjects were told that when the person with the more difficult task began forming words, he or she flipped a switch which turned on the green light, to signal the person with the easier task that things were going well. When the other wanted to request letters, he or she wrote out a request on a slip of paper and dropped it in the box. As a signal to the subject with the easier task that there was a note in the box, the other switched off the green light and switched on the red light. The red light was a signal to check the box, take out the note, and send the letters.

Subjects were told they were not in the condition in which the person with the difficult task could request letters but, as an experimental control, the other would be going through the motions of being in that other version of the experiment. More specifically, subjects were told that to keep conditions as comparable as possible across all the versions of the experiment, the other would turn on the green light when she started. If she could not complete a particular set, she would write out a request for letters, drop it in the box, and turn on the red light. If subjects saw the red light, they were *not* to send letters but to continue with their task, as they were *not* in the condition in which they were allowed to help the other. An index card stating the meaning of the color of the lights was on the wall in front of the subject.

At this point the experimenter explained that there was one more questionnaire to complete that dealt with subject's expectations about the task. Looking flustered, the experimenter said, "Oh shoot, this is my last copy. I'll have to run down to the secretary and see if she can get a copy for me. If she can't copy it, I'm sure she has it on the computer. Darn, this could take a few minutes. There's no reason the other can't start since you two are working separately. I'm going to tell her to start." As the experimenter left the subject's room, she pointed to a stack of magazines and told the subject that because it would take a few minutes to get the copy of the questionnaire, the subject should feel free to look at any of the magazines. She then entered the "other subject's" room, instructed "the other" to begin (once again just in case the actual subject could hear through the wall), and switched on the green light. Through a one-way mirror the experimenter observed the number of times the subject turned around to check the lights during a 10-min period. (The green light remained on during the entire time.) The experimenter then re-entered the subject's room, checked for suspicion, thoroughly debriefed the subject, and then gave the subject credit or pay.

One person originally assigned to the exchange condition expressed suspicion that the experimenter wanted to see if he looked at the lights. In addition, one person originally assigned to the communal condition reported hearing a click when the green light originally went on and expected to be able to hear additional clicks every time the lights changed; one person originally assigned to the communal condition picked up the lid of the box and held it up for 3 min; and another person originally assigned to the exchange condition stared at the box and lights for 5 min. Because these persons' responses could not be considered comparable to those of the other subjects, they were not considered to be subjects and their data were not included in any of the analyses.

Results

The dependent measure used in the second study was the number of times each subject turned around to look at the

lights. The means fell in the predicted pattern. Subjects in the communal condition looked more often ($M = 2.31$) than did subjects in the exchange condition ($M = 1.29$).

As in Study 1, the distribution of scores on the dependent measure was skewed (skew = .70) and the data were subjected to a logarithmic transformation ($x = \text{Log}_{10} [x + 1]$). Following the transformation a 2×2 (Relationship Type \times Sex) ANOVA was performed. It revealed a main effect for relationship type, $F(1, 29) = 4.43, p < .05$. Neither the main effect for sex nor the Relationship Type \times Sex interaction was significant.

Discussion

The results of the second experiment supported the hypothesis that even when nothing can be done to help the other, keeping track of the other's needs will be greater if a communal relationship is desired with the other than if an exchange relationship is desired. Subjects led to desire a communal relationship with the other looked at a set of lights that would indicate whether the other was having trouble on a task significantly more often than did subjects led to desire an exchange relationship with the other. This occurred even though the subjects were not allowed to do anything to help the other. This result follows from our theoretical assumption that persons in a communal relationship are concerned about the other's needs, whereas those in an exchange relationship are not.

The results of Experiment 2 cannot be explained by assuming that the communal subjects expected a longer relationship with the other than did the exchange subjects, and they were more willing to help the other because they anticipated that the other would be more likely to repay them later. In the second study the subjects knew they would not be able to help the other, so keeping track of the other's needs could have nothing to do with creating an obligation for repayment from the other later on.

The results of the two studies taken together offer clear and consistent support for the view that keeping track of another person's needs differs depending on the type of relationship with the other person. In accord with our assumption that in communal relationships but not exchange relationships, people feel a special responsibility for the other's welfare, in Experiment 1 it was found that when the other could not reciprocate in kind, keeping track of the other's needs was greater if a communal relationship was desired than if an exchange relationship was desired. In Experiment 2 we found that even when the other could not be helped, keeping track of the other's needs was greater if a communal relationship was desired than if an exchange relationship was desired.

Looking at the results from a broader perspective, it can be argued that they add important new evidence for the validity of the distinction between communal and exchange relationships.

Until this point, the studies reported on this distinction have focused on whether behaviors called by exchange norms apply to both exchange and communal relationships. For instance, how people react to repayments for benefits given and whether or not they will keep track of inputs into joint tasks for which there will be a reward have been examined (Clark, 1984; Clark & Mills, 1979; Clark & Waddell, 1985). Giving prompt repayments and keeping track of who does what during joint tasks are clearly behaviors called for by exchange norms, and we now know that these behaviors are considered more appropriate and/or are more common in exchange than in communal relationships. However, until now we have not reported evidence that behavior called for by the communal norm to be responsive to the other's needs is more likely in a communal than in an exchange relationship. Our studies provide this new type of evidence for our distinction by demonstrating that people are more likely to attend to the needs of the other in communal than in exchange relationships when there is no clear opportunity for reciprocation.

References

- Clark, M. S. (1981). Noncomparability of benefits given and received: A cue to the existence of friendship. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *44*, 375-381.
- Clark, M. S. (1984). Record keeping in two types of relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*, 549-557.
- Clark, M. S. (in press). Evidence for the effectiveness of manipulations of two types of relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- 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., & Muchant, C. B. (1986). *Reactions to expressions of emotions in communal and exchange relationships*. Unpublished manuscript, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Clark, M. S., & Waddell, B. (1985). Perceptions of exploitation in communal and exchange relationships. *Journal of Personal and Social Relationships*, *2*, 403-418.
- Karabenick, S. A., Lerner, R. M., & Beecher, M. D. (1973). Relation of political affiliation to helping behavior on election day, November 7, 1972. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *91*, 223-227.
- Mills, J., & Clark, M. S. (1982). Communal and exchange relationships. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 121-144). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Sole, K., Marton, J., & Hornstein, H. A. (1975). Opinion similarity and helping: Three field experiments investigating the bases of promotive tension. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *11*, 1-13.
- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Berscheid, E. (1978). *Equity: Theory and research*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Received August 19, 1985

Revision received April 2, 1986 ■