

PERCEPTIONS OF EXPLOITATION IN COMMUNAL AND EXCHANGE RELATIONSHIPS

Margaret S. Clark & Barbara Waddell

Carnegie-Mellon University

Using the distinction between communal and exchange relationships, it was hypothesized that failure to offer repayment for a favour would create perceptions of exploitativeness and decreases in attraction in exchange relationships but not in communal relationships. To test these hypotheses, subjects were led to expect a communal or an exchange relationship with a confederate. Shortly afterwards, the confederate asked the subject for a favour and subsequently either promised repayment or not. Finally, subjects indicated how exploitative and attractive they perceived the other to be. As predicted, failure to offer repayment increased perceived exploitativeness and decreased attraction when an exchange relationship was expected but not when a communal relationship was expected.

To say a person has exploited another implies the person has made unjust or improper use of another for his or her own advantage. Some authors have identified specific behaviours as exploitative, and have studied the conditions under which such behaviours occur (e.g. Faucheux & Moscovici, 1968; Swingle, 1970). By contrast, we believe that distinct norms govern social behaviour in different types of relationships and, as a result, behaviours considered unjust in one relationship may be considered perfectly acceptable in another. Thus it becomes important to take

This work was supported by NIMH Grant R03MH35844-01. We thank Jeanne Jessup for serving as the confederate and Judson Mills for helpful comments on an earlier version of this article. Appreciation is also expressed to the Learning, Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh, where the first author was a Visiting Scholar at the time this article was written. Correspondence should be addressed to Margaret S. Clark, Department of Psychology, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA.

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships (SAGE, London, Beverly Hills and New Delhi), Vol. 2 (1985), 403–418.

relationship type into account when identifying the behaviours that will lead to perceptions of exploitation.

According to Clark & Mills (1979; Mills & Clark, 1982), the rules governing the giving and receiving of benefits are different in 'communal' and 'exchange' relationships. Communal relationships are ones in which members feel a special obligation and usually a special desire to be concerned about the other's welfare. Thus benefits are typically given to meet the other's needs or simply to please the other, and receipt of a benefit does not create a specific debt or obligation to return a comparable benefit.

Communal relationships are often exemplified by relationships between family members, romantic partners and friends. The applicability of communal norms to relationships is sometimes culturally dictated (e.g. for relationships with kin) and sometimes voluntarily chosen (e.g. for relationships with people with whom one wishes to be friends or romantic partners). Such choices presumably are based in part on potential members' perceived ability to meet one another's needs. In addition, since one is capable of being responsible only for a limited number of others' needs and since the benefits one derives from new communal relationships such as friendships should diminish as the number of one's own (and the other's) existing communal relationships increases, one's own and the other's availability for new communal relationships should be an important factor in such decisions (Clark, *in press*).

People who are led to expect communal relationships with others are especially concerned about others' needs as evidenced by increased helping and sensitivity to cues indicating a need for help (Clark et al., 1984) and increased efforts to take others' preferences into account when making a decision (Sholar & Clark, 1982). For purposes of the present research, communal norms imply that if one desires a communal relationship with another, one should view a request for a favour with no offer of repayment as perfectly appropriate. It breaks no norm, should not result in feelings of exploitation, and should not decrease liking.

In contrast to communal relationships, members of exchange relationships presumably feel no special obligation for the other's welfare beyond what they would feel for any person. In such relationships, benefits are given as repayments for specific benefits received in the past or with the expectation of receiving specific repayment in the future. Exchange relationships are often

exemplified by relationships between people who do business with one another, strangers meeting for the first time, and acquaintances. The applicability of exchange norms to relationships is sometimes culturally dictated (e.g. for business relationships) and sometimes voluntarily chosen (e.g. for use with acquaintances or co-workers with whom one does not expect nor wish to form communal relationships). People presumably choose to apply exchange norms to relationships with others when those others can provide benefits which one cannot easily obtain or which one does not wish to obtain from other sources, including one's communal relationships. Possible reasons for not turning to someone with whom one has a communal relationship for such benefits include one's communal relations not having the ability to provide the benefit, their not being readily available or one not wishing to ask them for a benefit because doing so would infringe on their needs in an undesirable way. The idea that these norms are applied in exchange relationships but not in communal ones has been well supported in a series of studies. For example, we have found that both receipt of repayments for help and requests for repayment of help increase attraction when an exchange relationship is expected but actually decrease attraction if a communal relationship is expected (Clark & Mills, 1979). We have also found that two people who give and receive comparable benefits are more likely to be seen as repaying one another and are less likely to be perceived as friends than are two people who exchange non-comparable benefits (Clark, 1981).

Exchange norms imply that if one desires an exchange relationship with another, one should view a request for a favour with no offer of repayment as inappropriate. It breaks a norm and should result in the perception that the other is exploitative. Furthermore, liking for the other ought to decrease.

The present study, then, explicitly tested the following hypotheses:

1. If one expects a communal relationship with another, the other's failure to offer a repayment for a favour that has been granted will not influence perceptions of exploitation.
2. If one expects an exchange relationship with another, the other's failure to offer a repayment for a favour which has been granted will increase perceptions of exploitation.

It was also expected that feelings of attraction would reflect the pattern of exploitation results. That is, as feelings of exploitation increased, attraction was predicted to decrease.

What did we believe a test of these hypotheses would add to our knowledge of communal and exchange relationships? First, unlike prior studies (Clark & Mills, 1979), it includes measures of exploitation as well as attraction. If failure to repay increases perceptions of exploitativeness as well as decreases attraction in exchange relationships, that will provide evidence that the exchange norm that benefits received must be specifically repaid is 'prescriptive'. That is, if people violate these rules, their behaviour is subject to being labelled as wrong or unjust. The Clark & Mills (1979) study clearly indicated that in exchange but not in communal relationships, people preferred to be repaid. However, the decrease in general attraction as a function of failure to repay did not necessarily indicate that exchange subjects felt failure to repay was unjust.

Second, by using same-sex pairs the present study attempts to rule out an alternative explanation for the results of the first study reported by Clark & Mills (1979). Some have suggested that exchange norms govern the giving and receiving of benefits in both communal and exchange relationships. The results in the communal conditions of the Clark & Mills (1979) study where repayment of credit did not lead to greater liking than no repayment (and indeed led to less) can be explained, critics have argued, by assuming that the men in this condition preferred a type of repayment other than points towards a credit. Specifically they may have preferred sexual favours, and many have been disappointed when they received something else. The use of same-sex pairs rules out this possibility in the present study.

Third, the present study tested the generalizability of the Clark & Mills (1979, study 1) findings regarding the effects of offering or failing to offer repayment for a specific benefit on attraction to a new situation. The situation in the present study differs from the original study not only in terms of the sex of the participants but also in several other respects. In the present study there was a change from the donor *initiating* the giving of the first benefit to the recipient of the initial benefit *requesting* the benefit. There was also a change from the repayment coming from the recipient's own resources to the repayment coming from a third party's resources. Despite these changes, our theoretical framework suggests we

should still find evidence that repayment (or a promise of repayment) for benefits is necessary to prevent decreases in attraction (and in the present study increases in perception of exploitation) in exchange but not in communal relationships.

Finally, the present study included conditions to check on the effectiveness of our communal and of our exchange manipulations. This addition is important. We have already used manipulations similar or identical to the one here (e.g. Clark & Mills, 1979, studies 1 and 2; Clark, 1984; Clark et al., 1984, study 1). While the results on our dependent measures have provided converging evidence for the effectiveness of our relationship manipulations, the manipulation check reported in this article represents our first direct attempt to examine the effectiveness of our manipulations.

Method

Under the guise of a study on how people gain insight into others, female subjects individually reported for an experiment along with an attractive female confederate. The subject was told the other was anxious to begin. Half were told this was because her husband was picking her up after the session, and they were also led to expect a discussion of differences in interests with her (exchange conditions). Half were told this was because she was looking forward to meeting people, and they were also led to expect a discussion of common interests with her later (communal conditions). During a break in the experimental procedures, the confederate requested a favour from the subject. After the subject agreed, the confederate offered repayment (repayment conditions) or did not (no repayment conditions). Later the subject had a chance to rate how exploitative and how attractive she perceived the confederate to be. Two additional conditions were included to check on the effectiveness of the relationship manipulations. Subjects in these conditions were exposed to the same confederate and to one of the two relationship manipulations. Measures were taken to assess their anticipations of the degree of communal or exchange orientation in their relationship with the other.

The subjects were sixty-five female college students who received class credit for participation. The first forty-four to sign up were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions: communal/repayment, communal/no repayment, exchange/repayment and exchange/no repayment. The remaining twenty-one were randomly assigned to a communal or to an exchange condition for the manipulation check portion of the study.

Upon arrival, each of the first forty-four subjects was greeted and told that the other subject had arrived but had gone to the bookstore (in the same building) for a brief time to pick up something mistakenly left there. The experimenter said she had begun explaining the study to the other and that, while waiting for her return, would do the same for the subject. The study involved how getting to know another person through a discussion improved one's insight into the other. To examine this, the subject and the other would meet briefly, complete measures of initial insight into one another, have a brief discussion, then complete some additional measures of insight into one another.

The first pre-test of insight, the experimenter explained, involved having the subject and the other give their first associations to a list of words, then try to guess the other's first associations to the same words. Presumably the more insight they had into one another the better they would be at guessing each others associations. In the exchange conditions, the experimenter continued saying that after filling out the pre-tests, 'the two of you will have a brief discussion of differences in interests', while in the communal conditions she said that after filling out the pre-tests, 'the two of you will have a brief discussion of common interests'.

Noticing that the other still had not returned, the experimenter said she was surprised since the other had been anxious to begin. In the exchange conditions the experimenter explained that the other's husband would be picking her up right after the experiment was over. In the communal conditions the experimenter explained that the other was looking forward to meeting new people, thus implying the other was interested in meeting the subject.

The idea behind the communal manipulation was to create the impression that the other was available for, and desired, a communal relationship, specifically a friendship. This, in combination with the confederate's attractiveness, an opportunity to talk about common interests and the fact that the subjects were primarily first semester freshers and sophomores who ought to be available for new friendships, was expected to result in subjects also desiring and anticipating such a relationship. The idea behind the exchange manipulation was to create the impression that the other was *not* available for a friendship (she was married and lived off campus) and that she was not especially interested in forming new friendships, although she should not have been perceived as unfriendly. This in combination with being asked to talk about differences in interests was expected to create a preference for an exchange relationship.

Shortly after the relationship manipulation, about which the confederate was unaware, the confederate returned. Then both the subject and the confederate began to work independently on their word-association pre-tests. As the experimenter left the room, supposedly to get supplies, she told them not to talk while working on their pre-tests, but that it was all right to talk once they had finished.

Upon finishing, with the experimenter still out of the room, the confederate mentioned a survey she had to do for a class. She had some of the obviously long copies of this survey with her and asked the subject if she would mind filling out one. After the subject agreed, which all did, the confederate either said, 'I'll be able to pay you \$2.00 from class funds for doing this. Just send the questionnaire back through campus mail and I'll send you the money' (repayment conditions), or 'We used to have class funds to pay people for doing this, but we ran out. So I won't be able to pay you. I hope that's okay' (no repayment conditions).

At this point the experimenter, who was unaware of the repayment condition, returned and said there was a second pre-test to be filled out prior to their discussion. She said she would like them to fill this one out in separate rooms, and led the subject to another room. She told the confederate she would return shortly. Once in the other room, the experimenter handed the subject an 'impression form' and told her to confidentially rate her first impressions of the other person. This would be done before and after the discussion, supposedly to allow the experimenter to see how impressions changed. The subject was then left alone to rate the other in terms of each of the following traits on scales ranging from 0 to 20:

friendly, insincere, intelligent, irritating, kind, open-minded, unpleasant, warm, trustworthy, and in terms of how much they liked the other. The sum of these ratings made up our measure of general liking. In addition, subjects rated how 'exploitative' and 'willing to take advantage' of others they perceived the other to be. The sum of these ratings made up our measure of perceived exploitativeness.

When the experimenter returned, she picked up the form and casually said there was more to the study than she had explained. She asked if the subject had any idea of what it might be. Three subjects suspected the other was a confederate. Two were in the exchange/no repayment condition, and one was in the exchange/repayment condition. Their data were excluded from the analyses. Data from another subject were also excluded because she asked the confederate to fill out a questionnaire for *her*. This subject was in the communal/no repayment condition.

Instead of incorporating a check on the relationship manipulation during the experimental procedures, one was conducted separately. This was done to avoid suspicion and interference with the manipulations and/or dependent measures. Upon arrival, each of the twenty-one manipulation check subjects was told that the other subject scheduled to participate had already arrived and was in a separate room. Then the subject was seated at a table facing a TV monitor and a camera which was focused on her. The monitor was on and the same attractive female who had served as the confederate in the actual study could be seen sitting in another room.

The experimenter said the subject and the other, who could be seen on the 'closed circuit' monitor, would be participating in the study together. In a while they would be interacting by means of the TV system — something the experimenter said would be explained in detail later. Then she turned the monitor off saying it was not necessary now. (In actuality, the person on the monitor had been videotaped.)

The experimenter said she had briefly explained the study to the other and would now quickly explain it to the subject since the other was anxious to begin. Just as in the actual study, in the exchange conditions she said, '_____ is anxious to begin the study because her husband will be picking her up afterwards', whereas in the communal conditions she said, '_____ is anxious to begin the study because she is looking forward to meeting people'.

Again the study was described as having been designed to determine how people gain insight into one another. As in the experimental conditions, the subject was told that she and the other would discuss either differences in interests (in the exchange conditions) or common interests (in the communal conditions). Afterwards they would each be asked some questions about the other. First, however, it was necessary to record their first impressions of one another. The experimenter handed the subject an 'impressions' form (actually the dependent measure for these conditions), asked her to fill it out and left her alone while she did.

The impressions form used in these conditions asked the subject thirteen questions. Seven were designed to measure how 'communal' subjects expected their interactions with the other to be. These asked (1) if the subject and other would be likely to be friends in the future, (2) and (3) if the subject and the other would be likely to fulfil each other's needs, (4) and (5) if the subject and the other would be likely to provide each other with things that would be pleasing to them, (6) if the subject were in a particular mood whether the other would be as well, and (7) if the other were in a particular mood whether the subject would be as well. The

remaining six questions were designed to measure how exchange-oriented subjects expected their interactions with the other to be. These asked (1) and (2) if the subject and the other would feel obligated to specifically repay aid they received from the other, (3) and (4) if the subject and the other would, after receiving aid, return aid which was as comparable as possible, and (5) and (6) if the subject and the other would, after receiving aid, return aid as quickly as possible. All questions were filled out on seven-point scales from 1 (indicating a negative answer) to 7 (indicating a positive answer).

When picking up the questionnaire the experimenter conducted a suspicion check in the same manner as before. No subject expressed suspicion. However, during debriefing one subject said that when the TV monitor was on she had not understood that the person on the monitor was the other subject. Her data were not included in the analyses.

Results

Manipulation check

We believed that our manipulation of expectation for a communal relationship would influence desire to follow the communal norm of mutual responsiveness to one another's needs which would in turn be reflected in each of our 'communal' questions. Similarly we believed that our manipulation of expectation for an exchange relationship would influence desire to follow the exchange norm of repaying others for specific benefits received which would in turn be reflected in each of our 'exchange' questions. This suggests that in a factor analysis all the communal questions should load together and positively on a single factor and that all the exchange questions should load together and positively on a single factor as well.

To test this, subjects' answers to the questions designed to check on the relationship manipulations were submitted to a principal components factor analysis using varimax rotation (Dixon & Brown, 1979). Two factors accounted for 56 percent of the variance. The first could be described as a 'communal' factor. The first five 'communal' questions all had their highest loadings (all positive) on this factor. The second could be described as an 'exchange' factor. All six 'exchange' questions had their highest loadings (all positive) on this factor. The last two questions designed to measure expectations for a communal relationship (those dealing with mood) had their highest loading on a third factor. These were dropped from the manipulation check. To provide an index of how communal (relative to exchange-oriented) our subjects anticipated their relationship with the other

to be, the sum of their answers to the six exchange questions was subtracted from the sum of their answers to the first five communal questions. The mean score on this measure was -2.2 for subjects exposed to the communal manipulation and -9.2 for subjects exposed to our exchange manipulation. A t test revealed these scores to be significantly different $t(18) = 2.17, p < 0.05$.

Exploitation and attraction

A measure of perceived exploitation was calculated for each subject by summing that subject's ratings of the other on exploitativeness and willingness to take advantage of others. The means in each condition are presented in Table 1. As can be seen, the pattern of means was as predicted. An analysis of variance revealed that the main effect of the repayment manipulation was significant $F(1,36) = 5.70, p < 0.05$. No other effects were significant.

TABLE 1
Mean perceptions of exploitation and attraction as
a function of relationship type and repayment

		Type of relationship	
		Communal	Exchange
Repayment	Offered		
	Exploitation	11.5	10.7
	Attraction	152.0	168.3
Not offered	Exploitation	14.1	19.3
	Attraction	152.0	138.2

Note:

Mean attraction scores could vary from 10 to 220. Mean exploitation scores could vary from 0 to 40. The higher the score, the greater the feelings of exploitation or attraction. $N = 10$ per condition.

Despite the lack of a significant interaction between relationship type and repayment, and since it had been predicted that perceptions of exploitation would be greater in the exchange/no repayment condition than in the exchange/repayment condition, a planned comparison between these two conditions was justified and was performed. As predicted, the difference was significant

$t(36) = 6.68, p < 0.01$. A second planned comparison, justified on the same grounds, revealed that as expected there was no significant difference in feelings of exploitation between the communal/no repayment condition and the communal/repayment condition.

A measure of liking for the other was calculated by summing the scores for each of the ten traits designed to tap liking and the direct measure of liking on the impressions form. (The scores for the unfavourable traits were obtained by subtracting the subject's rating for those characteristics from 20.) The means for this measure of liking are presented in Table 1. These scores fell in the same pattern as did the exploitation scores. An analysis of variance of the measure of liking revealed a significant effect of repayment $F(1,36) = 4.98, p < 0.05$, and a significant interaction between type of relationship and repayment $F(1,36) = 4.98, p < 0.05$. The main effect of type of relationship was not significant. Planned comparisons revealed that, as expected, attraction was greater in the exchange/repayment condition than in the exchange/no repayment condition $t(36) = 6.67, p < 0.025$ and there was no difference in attraction between the communal/no repayment condition and the communal/repayment condition.

Finally, it is worth noting the correlations between our measures of exploitation and of attraction in each experimental condition. The correlation between these two measures across the entire sample was $-0.46 (p < 0.05)$. The correlations in the individual conditions were $r = -0.29$ (communal/repayment), $r = -0.14$ (communal/no repayment), $r = -0.46$ (exchange/repayment), and $r = -0.59$ (exchange/no repayment). None of the correlations in the individual conditions reached significance by themselves.

Discussion

The present results supported our predictions and fit well with a growing body of research supporting the idea that distinct norms govern the giving and receiving of benefits in communal and exchange relationships (Clark & Mills, 1979; Clark, 1981; Clark, 1984). They also add to our prior knowledge in several ways which are reviewed below.

Results on the exploitation measure. First, consider the exploitation results. These results indicate that not only do members of

exchange relationships prefer that others repay them for benefits given but also that the norm to repay is 'prescriptive', that is, failure to repay is subject to being labelled as 'wrong'. On the other hand, as predicted and as would be expected on the basis of the prior finding (Clark & Mills, 1979, study 1), we found no evidence of there being a 'prescriptive' norm requiring repayments of specific benefits when a communal relationship is expected.

The reader might think that our perception-of-exploitation measure merely reflected subjects' liking for the other as a result of a halo effect rather than a separate variable. However, the moderate to low correlations between perceptions of exploitation and attraction indicate that this was not the case. Instead, perception of exploitation and attraction appear to be largely separate variables that were related in the present study in the manner one would expect on the basis of our theory. That is, the fact that the negative correlations between attraction and perception of exploitation were somewhat larger in the exchange than in the communal conditions is quite consistent with our theorizing. This theorizing suggests that repayment for specific benefits (or lack thereof) should be more salient in exchange than in communal norms. In the exchange conditions of this study, whether the other repaid or not may have determined perceptions of exploitation which, in turn, partially determined attraction. In contrast, given the lack of any clear violation of communal norms, a similar causal sequence was presumably absent in the communal conditions.

Results on the attraction measure. Turning to the implications of our findings on the attraction measure, consider first the ways in which these findings parallel those reported earlier by Clark & Mills (1979, study 1). As in that study, we found that when subjects were granted a benefit, repayment was necessary to avoid decreases in attraction in exchange but not in communal relationships. This finding is important since it rules out the alternative explanation for the prior study that basically the same rule, an exchange rule, applied to both the communal and the exchange conditions but sexual favours rather than money may have been preferred in the communal conditions. By using female subjects and a female confederate in the present study we have ruled out this possibility. Of course, it is possible to argue that in the communal conditions of the present study the subjects also wanted

something different from what they desired in the exchange conditions, but it is difficult to imagine what that might be. Perhaps the subjects in that condition did want 'friendship' in return. In other words, they may have desired that the other be responsive to their needs in the future. However, once that is proposed, the explanation no longer appears to be an *alternative* explanation to the framework proposed here. We do not believe communal relationships are completely unselfish. When people initiate a communal relationship they usually expect the other to follow communal norms as well and they benefit as a result.

Beyond this, the attraction results in the exchange conditions indicate that our prior finding that failure to repay another for aid received decreases attraction in exchange relationships generalizes from males' reactions to females to females' reaction to other females. It also generalizes from a situation in which the aid giving was initiated by the subject to one in which the other initiated the interaction by requesting a benefit. On the other hand, the fact that the repayment did not actually decrease attraction in the communal conditions of the present study whereas repayment did decrease attraction in the communal conditions of a previous study (i.e. Clark & Mills, 1979, study 1) reveals there are at least some conditions under which repayment will not *decrease* attraction in communal relations. A comparison of the procedures used in the two studies suggests what these conditions might be.

First, such a comparison suggests that in relationships one desires to be communal, whether or not a person initiates the giving of a benefit may make a difference in how he or she reacts to being repaid for that benefit. In the Clark & Mills (1979) study, the experimenter asked the subject if he wished to give aid to the other and the subject indicated that he did. Thus the subject (albeit with a nudge from the experimenter) was initiating a gesture of goodwill towards the other. When the other subsequently gave the subject a repayment, it may well have been interpreted as a rebuff of the subject's gesture of friendliness. Therefore, in the communal/repayment conditions of the Clark & Mills study subjects may have felt some rejection and embarrassment. This could account for the lowered attraction ratings. In the present study, however, the confederate initiated the subject's help by directly asking the subject for that aid. While it is not believed that subjects wanted repayment, since it was the other who had initiated the interaction in the first place, the subject may

not have felt rebuffed or embarrassed by the repayment.

A second variable that may account for the discrepancy in the results is whether the other was choosing to repay the subject at some cost to herself or whether repayment was not costly to her. In the Clark & Mills study, in order to repay the subject the confederate chose to give up some of her own extra credit points. In the repayment condition of the present study, however, the money came from class funds. Perhaps a repayment from a third party is perfectly acceptable, although not required, in communal relations. This type of repayment does not infringe on the giver's needs — something the recipient is supposed to care about. On the other hand, the latter type of repayment does infringe upon those needs and thus should be seen as inappropriate in communal relationships.

Still another explanation for the difference between these two sets of results has to do with whether or not the subjects perceived that the confederate chose them, in particular, to repay whereas others might not be repaid. In the Clark & Mills (1979) study, the confederate seemed to have chosen the subject, in particular, to repay. Thus subjects here might have felt personally rejected. However, in the repayment conditions of the present study the confederate clearly implied she repaid everyone. Thus subjects should not have interpreted repayment as a preference for an exchange rather than a communal relationship with them in particular. Neither should they have interpreted the *lack* of repayment as a preference for a communal rather than an exchange relationship with them, in particular, as may have been the case in the first Clark & Mills (1979) study.

Finally, since males served as subjects in the Clark & Mills study, whereas females served as subjects in the present studies, one might suspect this difference in gender could explain the difference in results. It might be argued, for example, that males feel that repayment is inappropriate when they help a female with whom they expect a communal relationship, whereas females feel comfortable accepting repayments from other females with whom they expect a communal relationship. This would make sense if our males held a 'traditional' attitude that females with whom they expect a close relationship ought to be dependent upon them and not repay, whereas females did not hold similar attitudes towards other females with whom they have close relationships. In other words, one has to assume that if females had been subjects in the

Clark & Mills study they would not have objected to the other personally repaying them. Although this explanation is possible, it seems unlikely for two reasons. First this explanation assumes that such a traditional male belief applies only in their communal relationships and not at all to relationships with other women. Indeed, one has to assume that males prefer to be repaid by a woman in an exchange relationship in order to explain the results in the exchange conditions of the Clark & Mills study. Second, we have evidence from a second study reported by Clark & Mills (1979) indicating that females do not feel comfortable being expected to give repayments (that would be costly to them personally) in female-female communal relationships. In a portion of that study, female subjects received aid and another female either specifically requested repayment or did not. If a communal relationship was expected, subjects liked the other significantly less when she requested repayment than when she did not. (The reverse was true if an exchange relationship was expected.) This indicates that females do not generally find personal repayment for favours to be appropriate and acceptable in communal relationships. Thus we suspect they, like the males, would have felt uncomfortable receiving repayments had they been in the Clark & Mills study (1979, study 1) and that one of our two other explanations account for the fact that repayment did not decrease liking in the communal conditions of this study.

No matter what the correct explanations are for repayment not decreasing attraction in this study as it did in the prior study, the results of this study indicate that repayment need not always decrease attraction in communal relationships. Finding out exactly when it is acceptable and when it is not, however, remains a task for future research.

Results on the manipulation check. Finally the results on our manipulation check indicate that the manipulations of communal and of exchange relationships used in this study and several prior studies are effective. These findings are important for they represent the most direct evidence to date for the effectiveness of these manipulations. The two questions asking whether, if the subject were in a particular mood, the other would be as well and whether, if the other were in a particular mood, the subject would be as well did not load on the same factor as the remaining communal items. This was unanticipated but not uninterpretable.

These questions were based on an assumption that due to people's mutual responsiveness to needs, they maintain an 'equality of affect' (Mills & Clark, 1982) (e.g. when one person is sad the other will become sad too *or* will try to cheer the sad person, thus maintaining equality of affect). Although this assumption may be true, our particular questions, however, may not have tapped this — perhaps because they failed to take into account such things as people's moods being different when they first meet after a separation. Alternatively they may not have tapped it because sensitivity to one another's moods may take time to develop and subjects may not have felt such sensitivity would typify the very beginning of communal relationships in the present study.

Concluding comments. In conclusion, it may be useful to place our findings in a broader context than we have done thus far. Not only do the present results fit well with our communal/exchange programme of research, but that programme itself fits well with a number of empirical findings recently reported by other researchers. Specifically, the idea that people are likely to follow a need-based norm for benefiting others in communal relationships, but are more likely to give benefits on the basis of benefits received in the past or expected in the future fits well with recently reported evidence from 'observer' studies. For example, Lamm & Schwinger (1980, 1983) report evidence that when subjects are put in charge of dividing rewards between two others who, they know, have done varying amounts of work and have varying needs, they are more likely to divide rewards according to needs as opposed to amount of work done if they are told the two people are friends than if they believe the two people are strangers. As we have noted above, friendships often exemplify communal relationships. In addition Greenberg (1983) has found that if two people divide a restaurant-cheque equally, observers are more likely to perceive that they are friends than if they divide it according to what each person had ordered. In this case, no information about subjects' needs was given and it is reasonable to assume that needs were considered to be equal. Certainly these results are quite consistent with our idea that in communal relationships people follow a need-based norm for giving and receiving benefits while in exchange relationships people decide when benefits should be given or accepted on the basis of benefits received in the past or expected in the future.

REFERENCES

- Clark, M.S. (1981). 'Noncomparability of benefits given and received: a cue to the existence of friendship'. *Social Psychology Quarterly* (44), 375-81.
- Clark, M.S. (1984). 'Record keeping in two types of relationships.' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (47), 549-57.
- Clark, M.S. (in press) 'Evidence for the effectiveness of manipulations of desire for communal versus exchange 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., Ouellette, R. & Milberg, S. (1984). 'Recipient mood, relationship type and helping'. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Personal Relationships, Madison, WI, July.
- Dixon, W.D. & Brown, M.B. (1979). *BMDP Biomedical Computer Programs, P Series*. University of California Press: Berkeley.
- Faucheux, C. & Moscovici, S. (1968). 'Self-esteem and exploitative behavior in a game against chance and nature'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (8), 83-8.
- Greenberg, J. (1983). 'Equity and equality as clues to the relationship between exchange participants'. *European Journal of Social Psychology* (13), 195-6.
- Lamm, H. & Schwinger, T. (1980). 'Need consideration in allocation decisions: is it just?' *The Journal of Social Psychology* (119), 205-9.
- Lamm, H. & Schwinger, T. (1983). 'Norms concerning distributive justice: are needs taken into consideration in allocation decisions?' *Social Psychology Quarterly* (43), 425-9.
- Mills, J. & Clark, M.S. (1982). 'Communal and exchange relationships'. In L. Wheeler (ed.). *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*. Sage: Beverly Hills, CA.
- Sholar, W. & Clark, M.S. (1982). 'Deciding in communal and exchange relationships: by consensus or should majority rule?' Paper presented to the Eastern Psychological Association, April.
- Swingle, P.G. (1970). 'Exploitative behavior in non-zero sum games'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (16), 121-3.