REACTIONS TO A REQUEST FOR A BENEFIT IN COMMUNAL AND EXCHANGE RELATIONSHIPS

by
Margaret Sydnor Clark

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
1977

Cop. 1

APPROVAL SHEET

Title of Thesis: Reactions to a Request for a Benefit in Communal and Exchange Relationships

Name of Candidate: Margaret Sydnor Clark

Thesis and Abstract Approved:

Judson R. Mills
Professor
Department of Psychology

Date Approved: 2 Aug 1972

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: Reactions to a Request for a Benefit in Communal and Exchange Relationships

Margaret Sydnor Clark, Doctor of Philosophy, 1977

Dissertation directed by: Dr. Judson R. Mills
Professor
Department of Psychology

Based on a distinction between communal relationships, in which benefits are given in response to the needs of the other, and exchange relationships, in which benefits are given with the expectation of receiving comparable benefits in return, the following hypotheses were proposed:

1) If a person has been aided by another, that other will be liked more when he requests a benefit than when he does not request a benefit, if the person expects an exchange relationship with the other.

2) If a person has been aided by another, that other will be liked more when he does not request a benefit than when he does request a benefit, if the person expects a communal relationship with the other.

3) If a person has not been aided by another, that other will be liked more when he does not request a benefit than when he does request a benefit, if the person expects an exchange relationship with the other.

4) If a person has not been aided by another, that other will be liked more when he requests a benefit than when he does not request a benefit, if the person expects a communal relationship with the other.

Under the guise of a study of performance, female college students worked on a vocabulary task while a television monitor showed another female working on a similar task in another room. In order to manipulate the expectation of an exchange or a communal relationship, some

of the subjects were told that the other was married, had a child, lived far from the university and that she and the subject would be discussing differences in interests in the second study (Exchange condition). Other subjects were told that the other was new at the university, did not know many people and that she and the subject would be discussing common interests in a second study (Communal condition). The other female finished the task, received one point and gave the subject aid on her task or did not give 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 her expectations concerning the future discussion with the other were assessed.

In general the results for the measure of liking provide evidence for the distinction between communal and exchange relationships. In support of the first hypothesis it was found that the other female was liked more in the Exchange-aid-request condition than in the Exchange-aid-no request condition. In support of the second hypothesis it was found that the other female was liked more in the Communal-aid-no request condition than in the Communal-aid-request condition. In support of the third hypothesis it was found that the other female was liked more in the Exchange-no aid-no request condition than in the Exchange-no aid-request condition. The fourth hypothesis was not supported; there was no difference in liking for the other female in the Communal-no aid-request condition and in the Communal-no aid-no 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 results for the measure of pleasantness of the future discussion with the other were also consistent with the distinction between communal and exchange relationships. The results on the liking measure demonstrate that equity principles, which have been useful in understanding a number of different social relationships, do not apply to all relationships.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special appreciation is expressed to Dr. Judson Mills who served as my advisor and as the chairman of my dissertation committee. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Harold Sigall, Dr. Ellin Scholnick, Dr. Gregory White and Dr. Alice Isen for serving as members of my dissertation committee. I would also like to thank Saskia Wesley who served as the confederate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	7
RESULTS	15
DISCUSSION	23
APPENDIX A	30
APPENDIX B	31
APPENDIX C	32
APPENDIX D	33
APPENDIX E	35
REFERENCES	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Means for the Measure of Liking.....	16
2.	Analysis of Variance of the Measure of Liking.....	17
3.	Means for the Measure of Anticipated Pleasantness of the Discussion.....	21
4.	Analysis of Variance of the Measure of Anticipated Pleasantness of the Discussion.....	22

INTRODUCTION

Equity theory is currently one of the most influential theories in social psychology (Adams, 1963; Walster, Berschied and Walster, 1973). According to equity theory, a relationship between one person and another is equitable when the ratio of the person's inputs into the relationship to the person's outcomes from the relationship equals the ratio of the other's inputs to the other's outcomes. An inequitable relationship produces distress which leads the members of that relationship to attempt to restore equity. Equity theory has been applied to business, exploitative and helping relationships and even to intimate relationships (Walster, Berschied and Walster, 1973, p. 31).

The viewpoint of the present research is that, while they are very useful in understanding many types of relationships, equity principles do not apply in all types of relationships. In particular it is assumed that they do not apply in relationships which have been called communal (Clark, 1975, unpublished master's thesis). The impetus for the distinction between communal relationships and other relationships, which have been called exchange relationships, was a discussion by Goffman (1961) of economic and social exchange. He notes that, "A person defaulting in an economic exchange may be made to repay what he owes," and that, "Something given in exchange must be immediately paid for, or the extension itself paid for." Social exchange is, in Goffman's view, quite different from economic exchange. In social exchange, agreement in advance as to what is to be exchanged may be compromising and a person involved in such an exchange can not be made to repay what he owes. Instead, he, "...can only be accused of bad spirit and withdrawn from in disgruntlement."

Something given in a social exchange, "...need only be returned if the relationship calls for it, that is when the putative recipient comes to be in need of a favor or when he is ritually stationed for a cermonial expression of regard." (Goffman, 1961, pp. 275-276).

Based on Goffman's distinction, a differentiation between communal and exchange relationships was made in a previous study (Clark, 1975). In an exchange relationship, any benefit which is given by one member to the other creates a debt or obligation to return a comparable benefit. The giving of a benefit is assumed by both members of an exchange relationship to be motivated by the expectation of receiving a comparable benefit in return. The benefits involved may be monetary, goods or services for which a monetary value can be calculated, or other things for which no monetary value can be calculated. The distinguishing aspect of such a relationship is not what is exchanged, but rather that the receipt of a benefit creates an obligation to return a comparable benefit.

In communal relationships, in contrast, each member is assumed to be concerned with the other's well being. Benefits are given when one member perceives that the other is in need of a benefit. Receipt of a benefit does not incur a specific debt, but there is a general obligation to respond to the other's needs should such needs arise. In a communal relationship, the giving of a benefit in return for a previous benefit is inappropriate. It may be taken as a sign that the recipient of the benefit either interprets the relationship as an exchange relationship and wishes to "even up" his debts or that the recipient correctly perceives the donor's "communal" intentions but wishes to indicate that he is not interested in such a relationship.

Evidence for a distinction between communal and exchange relationships

has been found in the study by Clark (1975). In that study two hypotheses were tested. 1) After a person helped an attractive other the other would be liked more if they materially compensated the person than if they did not, when the other was not available for a communal relationship, and 2) After a person helped an attractive other the other would be liked less if they materially compensated the person than if they did not, when the other was available for a communal relationship.

To test these hypotheses, male subjects worked on a task while watching a television monitor showing an attractive female working on a similar task, under the guise of an experiment on task performance. After the subject finished the task, he was given one point toward extra credit and he then sent aid to the female. When she finished her more difficult task she received four points. Each subject received a note from the female which either thanked him and gave him a point or just thanked him. Half the subjects were then told that the female was married (and thus was unavailable for a communal relationship) and half that she was new at the university and did not know many people (and thus was available for a communal relationship). Finally, the subject's liking for the female and his expectations about how pleasant a future discussion with her would be were assessed. In support of the hypotheses it was found that the married woman was liked more when she gave the subject a point than when she did not and that the unmarried woman was liked less when she gave the subject a point than when she did not.

In the present study the distinction between communal and exchange relationships was applied to 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, in an exchange relationship a person who has been aided by another should be liked more when he asks that other for a benefit than when he does not ask that other for a benefit.

The idea that the recipient of a benefit will like his benefactor more if he can return the benefit is consistent with equity theory and has been expressed before (Mauss, 1971). 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 specifically requesting that the other repay the benefit (Gergen, Ellsworth, Maslach and Seipel, 1975) or whether the opportunity to repay is provided but repayment is not specifically asked for (Castro, 1974; Gergen and Latané, 1974). This has also been found to hold true in at least three cultures (Gergen, Ellsworth, Maslach and Seipel, 1975).

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. Such a request creates an inequity and the resultant state of indebtedness should be adversive (Greenberg and Shapiro, 1970). Thus in an exchange relationship a person who has not been aided by another should like the other more when he does not ask for a benefit than when he does ask for a benefit. This prediction is consistent with equity theory.

Following the receipt of aid in a communal relationship, a different situation exists. In a communal relationship benefits are given in

response to needs. 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 may result in decreased liking. This prediction does not follow from equity theory.

If aid has not previously been given, however, requesting a benefit 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. Indeed, Jones and Wortman (1973) suggest asking another for a benefit as 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 and Wortman, p. 13). Again, equity theory would not make this prediction.

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 the present study. A situation was arranged in which aid could be given to the subject and, later, a different benefit requested from the subject. The situation also allowed the experimenter to create an anticipation of a communal relationship by leading the subject to believe that the other wanted to meet people and that she would be discussing common interests with that

other or of an exchange relationship by not mentioning anything about the other wanting to meet people and leading the subject to believe that she would be discussing differences in interests with that other.

Specifically, the following hypotheses were tested in the present study:

1) If a person has been aided by another, that other will be liked more when she requests a benefit than when she does not request a benefit, if the person expects an exchange relationship with the other.

2) If a person has been aided by another, that other will be liked more when she does not request a benefit than when she does request a benefit, if the person expects a communal relationship with the other.

3) If a person has not been aided by another, that other will be liked more when she does not request a benefit than when she does request a benefit, if the person expects an exchange relationship with the other.

4) If a person has not been aided by another, that other will be liked more when she requests a benefit than when she does not request a benefit, if the person expects a communal relationship with the other.

METHOD

Overview

Under the guise of a study of 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, 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, 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 one point and gave the subject aid on her task or did not give 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 her expectations concerning the future discussion with the other were assessed.

Subjects

Eighty female, introductory psychology students served as subjects. For their participation they received extra credit toward their course grade. They were randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions: Exchange-aid-request, Exchange-aid-no request, Communal-aid-request, Communal-aid-no request, Exchange-no aid-request, Exchange-no aid-no request, Communal-no aid-request, Communal-no aid-no request.

Procedure

Upon arriving for the study, each 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 for the experiment to begin

in another room. The experimenter explained that it would take a little time for the equipment to warm up before the experiment could begin. Then, in the Communal conditions, she casually added 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.

or, in the Exchange conditions,

> 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.

The subject was left in the hall while the experimenter turned on the equipment. After a short time the experimenter returned, led the subject to a small room and seated her at a table. To the side of the room was a video monitor on which the subject could see another young woman, actually a confederate, seated at a table. The experimenter mentioned that the monitor was a part of a closed circuit television and that the person appearing on that monitor was Tricia, the other subject, who was in an adjacent room. The experimenter then began explaining the study to the subject saying,

> The first study you will be participating in today is actually one of two you'll be in. Each one of these studies takes less than half an hour, so although they're unrelated to one another, we're asking people to participate in both during one session. The first study involves having both of you work on a vocabulary task. In the condition to which you and Tricia have been randomly assigned, you will be able to see one another over closed circuit television but you will not be able to talk directly to one another.

To further explain why the experiment was begin done, the experimenter said that it had been found in past studies that when people worked separately on these tasks in the same room their performance was often affected by the mere presence of another person. This might happen

because people could talk to one another or because they could see one another and that this particular experiment was being done to separate those variables. The experimenter then went on to explain the second experiment saying, in the Communal conditions,

> It will be quite different from the first. 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. Anyway, I'll be explaining that study to you in more detail once we get to it.

and in the Exchange conditions,

> It will be quite different from the first. 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. Anyway, I'll be explaining that study to you in more detail once we get to it.

At this point the experimenter asked the subject to sign an experimental consent form and then pointed to the batch of forty-five letters (see Appendix A) printed on small cards in front of the subject. She explained to the subject that her job was to form ten different four letter words as quickly as she could using just the letters given to her. The experimenter explained that there were two versions of the task and that one was more difficult than the other. She said a coin had been flipped to determine which person was assigned which task. The subject would be performing the more difficult task while the other person would be performing the easier task. The subject was told that her task was more difficult because she had only forty-five letters ranging from A to L while the other subject, Tricia, had fifty-five letters ranging from A to Z.

Each subject was asked to time herself on her task with a stopwatch

and the experimenter showed her how to do so. She said that although the subject and Tricia would not be permitted to talk with one another directly, that one type of communication was allowed. They would be allowed to send letters to one another if they finished all ten words and had letters left over. They would also be allowed to request points from one another after each person had finished the task. This could be done by filling out a form which the experimenter pointed to (Appendix B). These points would be explained in just a minute, the experimenter stated, and she said she would be coming in and out of the room from time to time during the experiment and she would deliver any letters or points the subject wanted to send to the other person.

The experimenter then explained that time was a factor in the study and that the subject's motivation to do well on her task would obviously affect the time taken to complete her task. Therefore, 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 but just to finish as quickly as possible. At this point the experimenter also pointed out that since the subject's task was the more difficult one, she would have a chance to earn four points toward the extra credit while the other person, Tricia, only had a chance to earn one point since she had the easier task. Finally, the experimenter mentioned that the awarding of points to maintain motivation obviously would not be necessary in the second study.

The subject was told to start her stopwatch, begin working, and to stop the watch if she had a chance to finish all ten words. The experimenter picked up another stopwatch and left saying she had given

Tricia the instructions already but would give her a stopwatch and get her started on the task. The subject was left alone working on the task for a short time, and with the forty-five letters the subject had it was impossible for her to finish the task in that time. In fact, 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. The confederate started working on her task and finished easily. Then a short time passed, the experimenter re-entered the room and the confederate 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 would not see whether the other handed the letters to the experimenter or not. Finally, the experimenter could be seen leaving the room and the confederate sat back in her chair.

Shortly thereafter the experimenter re-entered the subject's room and said that Tricia had finished her task so she got one point. She walked over to the monitor and turned it off commenting that it wouldn't be needed anymore. 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 and told the subject she would be back shortly. In approximately three minutes she returned saying, "Did you get a chance to finish?", and she stopped the subject regardless of whether or not she had finished. None of the subjects who had not received aid finished and most, but not all, of those who had received aid finished.

In any case the experimenter told the subject she had done well enough to receive the four points toward the extra credit. She then filled out a form and handed it to the subject indicating that this was the case. (Appendix C).

Then she said, "O.K. that's all there is to the first study. The only thing left to do is fill out one of these forms (Appendix B) if you want to request any points from Tricia, and then before we can start the second experiment I have some forms for you to fill out regarding what you expect the experiment to be like." Before the subject had a chance to look at or fill out the form, the experimenter added, "I'll go check with Tricia and see if she wants to fill one of them out and I'll get those others forms I just told you about.", and left the room for approximately two minutes.

When she reappeared she had two forms and explained to the subject that these were the forms she had talked about. She also had a folded note which she had drawn out of a box on which the other had supposedly checked either that she wished to request one point from the subject (Request conditions) or that she did not wish to request any points from the other (No request conditions). The experimenter then unfolded the note and handed it to the subject. Since the note was folded, until this time the experimenter was unaware of which request condition the subject was in. At this point, if the subject wished to fill out a form to send to the other, the experimenter took it.

Next the experimenter reminded the subject that the second study would involve having both subjects talk over common interests or differences in interests. Before starting the study, she said, 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 (Appendix D) and also what she expected the discussion to be like (Appendix E). The subject was told that these forms would be kept completely confidential.

The first impression form was placed on top of the form concerning expectations about the discussion in the hope that the subject would be induced to fill out the impression form first. Observations through a one-way mirror indicated that this hope was not realized in all cases.

The first form asked the subject to rate how well eleven traits applied to the other person 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. It also asked the subject 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, strained, enjoyable and awkward she expected the discussion to be on scales from one to twenty.

The subject was left alone while filling out the forms. The experimenter watched through a one-way mirror until she could see that the subject had finished. She then waited approximately thirty additional seconds and re-entered the room. She picked up the forms and looked them over saying she was checking to see that the subject had not missed any questions. As she did so she casually mentioned 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 "set up" to be 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 in which they were told that another person was participating, but later found out that there was no other person. One of the eight persons excluded was in the Communal-aid-request condition, one was in the Communal-aid-no request condition, three were in the Exchange-aid-request condition, two were in the Exchange-aid-no request condition and one was in the Exchange-no aid-request condition. In addition, two subjects 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 in the other room. These people were also excluded from the analysis of the results. Finally the true purpose of the experiment was explained and the subject promised not to discuss it with anyone else.

RESULTS

Liking for the Other

A measure of liking for the confederate was calculated by summing the scores for each of the eleven traits and the direct measure of liking on the first questionnaire. The scores for the favorable traits and for the direct measure of liking were the same as the subjects' ratings. The scores for the unfavorable traits were obtained by subtracting the subjects' ratings from twenty. For this measure, the greater the score, the greater the liking. The means for this measure are presented in Table 1.

A three-way analysis of variance of the measure of liking is presented in Table 2. The main effect of type of relationship was significant [$F(1,72)=6.21$, $p<.025$]. Neither the main effect of aid nor the main effect of request approached significance. None of the two-way interactions was significant, but the three-way interaction between type of relationship, aid and request was significant [$F(1,72)=12.73$, $p<.001$].

From the first hypothesis that if a person has been aided by another, that other will be liked more when he requests a benefit than when he does not request a benefit, if the person expects an exchange relationship, 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 1, the mean liking was higher in the Exchange-aid-request condition than in the Exchange-aid-no request condition. A planned comparison indicated that this difference was significant [$F(1,72)=4.03$, $p<.05$].

From the second hypothesis that if a person has been aided by

Table 1

Means for the Measure of Liking

	Aid		No Aid	
	Exchange	Communal	Exchange	Communal
Request	172.9 (10)	156.0 (10)	149.3 (10)	179.4 (10)
No Request	149.2 (10)	190.6 (10)	173.1 (10)	177.3 (10)

Note: The higher the score, the greater the liking. N's are given in parentheses.

Table 2

Analysis of Variance of the Measure of Liking

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Total	66357.95	79	-	-
Relationship	4321.80	1	4321.8	6.21*
Aid	135.20	1	135.20	.19
Request	1328.45	1	1328.45	1.91
Relationship x Aid	120.05	1	120.05	.17
Relationship x Request	1312.2	1	1312.2	1.88
Aid x Request	145.8	1	145.8	.21
Relationship x Aid x Request	8862.05	1	8862.05	12.73**
Error	50132.40	72	696.28	-

*p<.025
**p<.001

another that other will be liked more when he does not request a benefit than when he does request a benefit, if the person expects a communal relationship it would be expected that liking would be greater in the Communal-aid-no request condition than in the Communal-aid-request condition. As can be seen in Table 1 the mean liking was higher in the Communal-aid-no request condition than in the Communal-aid-request condition. A planned comparison indicated that this difference was significant $[F(1,72)=8.60,\ p<.01]$.

From the third hypothesis that if a person has not been aided by another that other will be liked more when he does not request a benefit than when he does request a benefit, if the person expects an exchange relationship it would be expected that liking would be greater in the Exchange-no aid-no request condition than in the Exchange-no aid-request condition. A planned comparison indicated that this difference was significant $[F(1,72)=4.07,\ p<.05]$.

From the fourth hypothesis that if a person has not been aided by another that other will be liked more when he requests a benefit than when he does not request a benefit, if the person expects a communal relationship with the other, 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 mean liking in these two conditions was very similar. A planned comparison indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant $[F(1,72)=.03]$.

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 1 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 greater in the Communal-no aid-request condition than in the Communal-aid-request condition. As can be seen in Table 1, 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 greater in the Exchange-no aid-no request condition than in the Exchange-aid-no request condition. As can be seen in Table 1, 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-no aid-no request condition. While it may be seen in Table 1 that the means were in the expected direction, the planned comparison indicated that this difference was not significant [$F(1,72)=1.27$].

Expectations about the Discussion

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 from twenty-one. For this measure, the greater the score was, the greater the anticipated pleasantness of the discussion was. The means for this measure are presented in Table 3.

An analysis of variance of the measure of anticipated pleasantness of the discussion is presented in Table 4. The main effect of type of relationship was significant [$F(1,72)=5.01$, $p<.05$]. The main effects of

aid and request were not significant. The interaction between aid and relationship and between request and relationship were not significant. The interaction between aid and request was significant [$F(1,72)=7.31$, $p<.01$], and the three-way interaction between aid, request and relationship was also significant [$F(1,72)=5.61$, $p<.025$].

As can be seen in Table 3, anticipated pleasantness was approximately the same in all four of the Exchange conditions. However, there were differences within the Communal conditions. Anticipated pleasantess 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 [$F(1,72)=11.19$, $p<.001$].

Table 3

Means for the Measure of Anticipated Pleasantness of the Discussion

	Aid		No Aid	
	Exchange	Communal	Exchange	Communal
Request	56.0 (10)	62.8 (10)	57.9 (10)	69.9 (10)
No Request	59.3 (10)	72.1 (10)	59.4 (10)	51.9 (10)

Note: The higher the score, the more positive the subjects' expectations for the discussion. N's are given in parentheses.

Table 4

Analysis of Variance of the Measure of Anticipated Pleasantness of the Discussion

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Total	13808.89	79	-	-
Relationship	726.01	1	726.01	5.01*
Aid	154.01	1	154.01	1.06
Request	19.01	1	19.01	.13
Relationship x Aid	285.01	1	285.01	1.97
Relationship x Request	227.81	1	227.81	1.57
Aid x Request	1058.51	1	1058.51	7.31**
Relationship x Aid x Request	812.81	1	812.81	5.61***
Error	10425.70	72	144.80	-

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.025

DISCUSSION

In general the results support the hypotheses based on a distinction between communal relationships, in which benefits are given in responses to the needs of the other, and exchange relationships, in which benefits are given with the expectation of receiving comparable benefits in return. It was hypothesized that if a person has been aided by another, that other will be liked more when she requests a benefit than when she does not request a benefit, if the person expects an exchange relationship with the other. It was assumed that in an exchange relationship any aid given by one member to the other results in a debt and a request from the donor of that aid for a benefit following the aid is appropriate. It creates an opportunity to repay the debt and to eliminate any tension caused by the presence of the debt. Therefore the request should increase the person's liking for the other. In the present study the expectation of an exchange relationship was manipulated by leading the subject to believe that the other had expressed no interest in meeting people and that she and that other person would be discussing their differences in interests. The results supported the first hypothesis. Liking for the other was higher in the Exchange-aid-request condition than in the Exchange-aid-no request condition.

From the distinction between communal and exchange relationships it was hypothesized that if a person has been aided by another, that other will be liked more when she does not request a benefit than when she does request a benefit, if the person expects a communal relationship with the other. It was assumed that in a communal relationship benefits are given in response to needs. Requesting a benefit following prior

aid is inappropriate in a communal relationship. It may imply that the original aid was not given with the intent of fulfilling a need but rather with the expectation of receiving something in return and as an indication that the other does not desire involvement in a communal relationship. It should, therefore, decrease liking. In the present study the expectation of a communal relationship was manipulated by leading the subject to believe that the other had expressed an interest in meeting people and that she and that other person would be discussing their common interests. The second hypothesis was supported. Liking was higher in the Communal-aid-no request condition than in the Communal-aid-request condition.

It was hypothesized that if a person has not been aided by another, that other will be liked more when she does not request a benefit than when she does request a benefit, if the person expects an exchange relationship with the other. It was assumed that in an exchange relationship, a request for a benefit in the absence of prior aid and in the absence of an opportunity to repay that aid is inappropriate. To fulfill such a request would create a debt and distress and consequently reduce liking. The results of the study support the third hypothesis. Liking for the other was higher in the Exchange-no aid-no request condition than in the Exchange-no aid-request condition.

It was hypothesized that if a person has not been aided by another, that other will be liked more when she does request a benefit than when she does not request a benefit when the person expects a communal relationship with the other. It was assumed that 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. This prediction was not supported. There was no difference between liking in the Communal-no aid-request condition and in 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. While 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 of the fact 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 attributed 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 of the appropriateness of the other's behavior for the type of relationship.

It should be noted that the results for the measure of liking for the Communal conditions are contrary to what would be expected from equity theory. On the basis of equity theory it would be expected that, following the receipt of aid liking for the donor would be greater if one had an opportunity to repay the aid than if one did not. However, following prior aid in the present study, liking was greater if no request for a benefit was made than if a request for a benefit was made in the Communal conditions.

The results for the measure of anticipated pleasantness of the interaction were also consistent with the distinction between communal and exchange relationships. A three-way interaction between type of relationship, aid and request was found. Anticipated pleasantess was similar in the four Exchange conditions, marginally less in the Communal-aid-request condition than in the Communal-no 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 pleasantess can be understood in terms of the assumption that if one anticipates a communal relationship one will expect an interaction with the other to be more pleasant than if one expects an exchange relationship. In the Exchange conditions, subjects were led to expect an exchange relationship by the experimental instructions given in those conditions. Subjects in the Communal-aid-

request condition were assumed to 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 since the rules for 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 is not inconsistent with the fact that liking was not higher in the Communal-no aid-request condition than in the Communal-no aid-no request condition. 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 indicated that the other felt positively toward the subject and 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.

Several alternative explanations for the Clark (1975) study should be discussed in light of the present results. In that study it was possible 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. This, it has been argued, would explain the finding that males who had benefited unmarried women liked those who did not benefit them in return better than those who did benefit them in return. Such an explanation would assume that

the males did not apply the same rule to their relationships with a married woman. In the present study only females served as subjects and a female served as the confederate as well. Thus, any explanation based on the role relationship of males and females could not account for the results of the present study.

A second alternative explanation for the results of the Clark (1975) study is that the finding that subjects in the unmarried conditions liked those who did not benefit them following their aid better than those who did benefit them might be explained by assuming that subjects in the unmarried conditions wanted the other to be in their debt so that the relationship might be prolonged. This explanation, which differs from the communal and exchange explanation but which is still contrary to equity theory, cannot be ruled out on the basis of the results in the present study.

Finally it should be noted that a similar, though more specific version of the second alternative explanation for the Clark (1975) study, is clearly ruled out on the basis of the present study. It has been proposed that the reason that males liked the unmarried woman who gave them a benefit less was that they wanted her to be in their debt so that later they could extract a more valuable benefit and she frustrated this desire. However, since this explanation depends on the sex of the subject and the stimulus person being different, it is ruled out in the present study in which the subjects were females and the stimulus person was also a female.

The present study together with the previous study (Clark, 1975) demonstrates that equity principles, which have been useful in understanding a number of different social relationships, do not apply to all relationships. In what are here referred to as communal relationships, behavior

which decreases inequity, as defined by equity theory, is sometimes inappropriate because it violates the assumptions of a communal relationship and leads to less liking than behavior which would increase equity. From the present viewpoint it would be expected that if equity principles are explicitly applied to communal relationships, for example if there is an explicit calculation of each person's inputs and outcomes from the relationship, misunderstandings are likely to result which may strain the relationships and perhaps lead them to dissolve. The distinction between communal and exchange relationships has important practical as well as theoretical implications for social relationships.

APPENDIX A

Letters Given to the Subject for the Vocabulary Task

A (3), B (3), C (4), D (6), E (4), F (4), G (6), H (6), I (3), J (2), K (1), L (3)

Letters Given to the Subjects in the Aid Conditions

A (1), E (1), O (2), P (1), R (1), S (2), U (1), Y (1)

APPENDIX B

FORM FOR REQUESTING POINTS

I would like to request: 1 point ___

2 points ___

3 points ___

4 points ___

I do not wish to request any points ___

APPENDIX C

FORM FOR AWARDING POINTS

You have earned _____ points toward an extra credit.

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE I

For each characteristic, circle the number which best indicates how well it applies to the person you are rating. Circle 20 if you think it is extremely appropriate; circle 0 if you think it is extremely inappropriate. If you think it is somewhere in between, circle the number between 1 and 20 which best indicates how well you think it applied. Your ratings will be kept completely confidential.

CONSIDERATE

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Extremely Inappropriate — Extremely Appropriate

FRIENDLY

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Extremely Inappropriate — Extremely Appropriate

INSINCERE

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Extremely Inappropriate — Extremely Appropriate

INTELLIGENT

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Extremely Inappropriate — Extremely Appropriate

IRRITATING

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Extremely Inappropriate — Extremely Appropriate

KIND

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Extremely Inappropriate — Extremely Appropriate

OPEN-MINDED

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Extremely Inappropriate — Extremely Appropriate

SYMPATHETIC

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Extremely Inappropriate — Extremely Appropriate

UNDERSTANDING

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Extremely Inappropriate — Extremely Appropriate

UNPLEASANT

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Extremely Inappropriate — Extremely Appropriate

WARM

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Extremely Inappropriate — Extremely Appropriate

What is your person reaction to this person, how much do you like her?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Dislike Very Much — Like Very Much

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE II

Please read each question carefully, then circle the number which best indicates your response to the question.

1. How friendly do you expect the discussion to be?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
   Not friendly at all — Very friendly

2. How spontaneous do you expect your discussion with the other person will be?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
   Not spontaneous at all — Very spontaneous

3. How strained would you estimate the atmosphere in which the conversation between yourself and the other person takes place will be?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
   Not strained at all — Very strained

4. How enjoyable do you expect the interaction to be?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
   Not enjoyable at all — Very enjoyable

5. How awkward do you think the discussion will be as compared with an average discussion?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
   Not awkward at all — Very awkward

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.

Clark, M. Effects of receiving a benefit in communal and exchange relationships. (unpublished master's thesis, 1975).

Gergen, K. J., Ellsworth, P., Maslach, C. and Seipel, M. Obligation, donor resources and reactions to aid in a three nation study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 390-400.

Goffman, E. Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1961.

Greenberg, M. S. and Shapiro, S. P. Indebtedness: an adversive aspect of asking for and receiving help. Sociometry, 1971, 34, 290-301.

Gross, A. E. and Latané, J. G. Receiving help, reciprocation and interpersonal attraction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1974, 4, 210-223.

Jones, E. E. and Wortman, C. Ingratiation: An Attributional Approach. General Learning Press, 1973.

Mauss, M. The gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1954.

Walster, E., Berscheid, E. and Walster, G. W. New directions in equity research. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, vol. 9. New York: Academic Press, 1976.