

## The Communal/Exchange Distinction and Some Implications for Understanding Justice in Families

Gail M. Williamson<sup>1</sup> and Margaret S. Clark<sup>2</sup>

---

*This article briefly reviews 10 years of research on a distinction between communal and exchange norms. Communal norms dictate benefits should be given in response to the other's needs. Exchange norms dictate benefits should be given in response to specific benefits received in the past or with the expectation of receiving specific benefits in the future. Choice of norms is shown to be influenced by the type of relationship desired or existing between two people. Evidence of chronic individual differences in tendencies to follow communal and to follow exchange norms in relationships is also presented. We argue that most people believe that communal norms should be followed in family relationships and we outline implications of the research reviewed for understanding justice in the family. Implications of (i) behavior in accord with exchange norms (e.g., quick repayment of benefits received, keeping track of individual inputs into joint tasks), (ii) behavior in accord with communal norms (e.g., helping, expressing emotion) and (iii) individual differences in relationship orientations are discussed.*

---

**KEY WORDS:** communal norms; exchange norms; interpersonal relationships; family relationships.

“Communal” relationships are distinguished from “exchange” relationships by rules governing the giving and receiving of benefits in each. In this paper, we review research showing that the existence of such norms results in different sets of behaviors being appropriate depending upon the type of relationship one has or desires with another. We also review research suggesting there are

<sup>1</sup>University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602.

<sup>2</sup>Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.

chronic individual differences in tendencies to follow communal and exchange norms. Although the work reviewed has not been conducted in family contexts, we make a case that it nevertheless has important implications for understanding justice in families.

We begin by describing the communal/exchange distinction. Then, we systematically review three categories of empirical support for the distinction: (i) work on the applicability of exchange behaviors to relationships desired to be communal or exchange, (ii) work on the applicability of communal behaviors to relationships desired to be communal or exchange, and (iii) work on individual differences in relationship orientation. After each section, we speculate on some implications of the reviewed work for understanding justice in the family. We hope to convince readers that our speculations warrant investigation.

## COMMUNAL AND EXCHANGE RELATIONSHIPS

Clark and Mills (1979; Mills and Clark, 1982) have distinguished between two types of relationships based on rules governing the giving and receiving of benefits in each. One type is characterized by mutual feelings of responsibility for the other's well-being. Benefits are given in response to the other's needs or simply to please the other with no expectations of specific repayment.<sup>3</sup> These *communal relationships* are often typified by family relationships, romantic involvements, and friendships. In the second type, people do not feel a special responsibility for each other's needs. Rather, benefits are given to repay debts created by benefits previously received or in anticipation of receiving specific repayment in the future. These *exchange relationships* are often typified by interactions between strangers, casual acquaintances, and business associates.

### Variations in Certainty and Strength

Both communal and exchange relationships can vary in certainty. That is, people can be more or less certain about which norms they want to follow (and also about which norms others want to follow) in particular relationships. For instance, a woman might be unsure about whether she really desires a friendship with a particular other and thus unsure about whether she wants to

<sup>3</sup>A benefit, for our purposes, is defined as something of value intentionally given by one person to another (Mills and Clark, 1982). This definition excludes rewards that are not given intentionally. For example, parents may receive many rewards from their children (e.g., watching them acquire new skills) that are not intentionally given.

follow communal norms with that person. Similarly, she might not feel confident that the other wants a friendship with her and thus whether that other will follow communal norms with her.

Communal, but not exchange, relationships also may vary in strength. This variation can be thought of in at least two ways. One is that the stronger a communal relationship, the greater costs each member incurs to meet the other's needs and the more costly benefits each member is likely to expect when such benefits are needed. For example, a communal relationship between a parent and child is generally stronger than one between two friends. This is reflected in the fact that a parent generally incurs greater costs to meet a child's needs (e.g., spending thousands of dollars for college education) than to meet a friend's needs and that children often expect these benefits whereas friends do not. (Of course the costliness of benefits given and expected is tempered by members' respective abilities to incur such costs.) A second way to think about strength is to conceptualize a hierarchy of communal relationships with stronger relationships (e.g., those with a child or a spouse) at the top and weaker ones (e.g., those with friends) at lower levels. When conflicts in needs arise, the needs of people toward the top legitimately take precedence over those of people lower on the hierarchy. For example, a friend should understand if you cannot drive him or her to the airport because you must stay at home to care for a sick child.

### Determinants of Relationship Type

What determines the type of relationship one has with another? In some cases, culture. For example, our culture seems to dictate that communal norms should be followed by family members and exchange norms should be followed by business associates. In other cases, norms are not specified by the culture. For example, people are generally free to decide about pursuing friendships or romantic relationships with particular others. Their decisions may be based on a number of factors: (i) Similarity, e.g., presumably similar individuals best understand each other's needs and thus may make better communal partners; (ii) physical attractiveness, e.g., perhaps because the physical attractiveness of one person reflects on his or her intimate partner's own attractiveness (cf. Sigall and Landy, 1973), attractive people will seem more desirable as communal partners (Clark, 1986); (iii) availability of the other for a communal relationship, e.g., people should be less likely to pursue a romantic relationship with someone already involved in such a relationship or a friendship with someone who clearly has many other friends. An exchange relationship may be preferred instead; and (iv) one's own availability or need for an additional communal re-

relationship, e.g., if one's needs are already being met in other communal relationships, any new acquaintance may be treated in an exchange manner.

## STUDYING COMMUNAL AND EXCHANGE RELATIONSHIPS

Approximately 10 years ago, Clark and Mills (1979; Mills and Clark, 1982) began a program of research designed to demonstrate the validity of the distinction between communal and exchange relationships. Most research in this program has been experimental in nature. That is, subjects have been randomly assigned to a communal or an exchange condition, and desire for a communal or an exchange relationship with a stranger was manipulated. Based on the theoretical distinction, many differences in behavior were hypothesized, and the hypotheses were tested. This approach was chosen rather than deciding to compare behavior in naturally occurring communal and exchange relationships because naturally occurring communal and exchange relationships often differ in *many* ways in addition to norms governing the giving and receiving of benefits. For instance, members of ongoing friendships or family relationships typically possess more numerous and diverse types of knowledge about one another than do acquaintances or members of business relationships. Thus, if naturally occurring communal relationships were compared with naturally occurring exchange relationships, differences in behavior observed between the two types of relationships could be attributed to that difference rather than to differences in norms governing the giving and receiving of benefits.

Nonetheless, generalizing laboratory findings to ongoing relationships requires that additional studies be conducted in which behaviors of members of naturally occurring communal relationships (e.g., relationships between friends or family members) are contrasted with behaviors of members of naturally occurring exchange relationships (e.g., business relationships or relationships between strangers who expect to remain strangers). Recent work both by Clark (e.g., Clark *et al.*, in press) and others (e.g., Schoenrade and Schudy, 1989) includes these sorts of studies as well as further experimental studies.

### Manipulating Desire for Communal and Exchange Relationships

Because so much of the original research depends on manipulating desire for a communal or an exchange relationship, these manipulations are described before reviewing the communal/exchange work. In devising their manipulations, Clark and Mills assumed that college student subjects, particularly the freshmen

and sophomores who typically participate in studies, are generally available and even eager for new communal relationships. Thus, when a similar, attractive target person indicates he or she is also available and motivated to form new communal relationships, subjects should desire a communal relationship with that person. On the other hand, when the attractive target indicates that he or she is not similar and is not available for a communal relationship, an exchange relationship should be desired (or at least expected) instead.

The actual manipulations involve recruiting subjects to participate in a study with a physically attractive confederate. Then, information subjects receive about the other is varied. In the communal conditions, the confederate is single (as are almost all subjects), new at the university, and wants to meet new people. In the exchange conditions, the confederate is married, has been at the university for some time, and is not interested in meeting new people.

Do the manipulations work? One study was conducted specifically to verify their effectiveness (Clark, 1986). In this study, subjects were exposed to either the communal or the exchange manipulation. Then they rated the extent to which they would want to behave in certain exchange ways (e.g., immediately repay benefits received with comparable benefits) and/or in certain communal ways (e.g., do things just to please the other) in a relationship with the other. An index of preference for behaving in communal relative to exchange ways was calculated. Higher scores indicated greater preference for behaving in communal rather than exchange ways. Those exposed to the communal manipulation scored higher than did those exposed to the exchange manipulation. In addition, communal subjects were more likely than exchange subjects to state that they desired a friendship rather than an acquaintanceship or business-like relationship with the other. The reverse was true for those exposed to the exchange manipulation. (As will become evident shortly, there is also substantial evidence for the effectiveness of these manipulations from studies in which they have produced theoretically expected behaviors.)

### **APPROPRIATE AND INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIORS IN COMMUNAL AND EXCHANGE RELATIONSHIPS**

Studies using the communal/exchange manipulations as well as studies of naturally occurring communal and exchange relationships provide evidence that certain behaviors are indeed viewed as differentially appropriate when different types of relationships exist or are desired. Behaviors in accord with exchange norms not only seem to be more common in exchange than in communal relationships, they also seem to promote good feelings and perceptions of just

treatment in exchange, but not necessarily in communal, relationships. Also, behaviors in accord with communal norms not only seem to be more common in communal than in exchange relationships, they also seem to promote good feelings and perceptions of just treatment in communal, but not necessarily in exchange, relationships. First, we review the evidence on exchange behaviors.

### **Behaviors in Accord with Exchange Norms**

In exchange relationships, perceptions of fairness and justice should be associated with behaviors allowing for absolute balance of specific benefits given and received by both parties. Examples include (i) prompt repayment for specific benefits received, (ii) requesting repayment for benefits given, (iii) giving and receiving comparable rather than noncomparable benefits, and (iv) keeping track of individual inputs into joint tasks to facilitate overall balancing of benefits. These behaviors should not be required to maintain a sense of justice in communal relationships. Indeed, since exchange behaviors may be interpreted as indicating desire for an exchange rather than a communal relationship, they may even produce negative reactions or be avoided in communal relationships.

#### *Prompt Repayment for Specific Benefits Received*

Prompt repayment should promote perceptions of justice in exchange relationships but may cause distress in communal relationships. Two studies support these predictions.

In one (Clark and Mills, 1979, Study 1), undergraduate men were led to desire either a communal or an exchange relationship with an attractive, friendly female confederate. Both subject and confederate worked simultaneously on individual tasks. All subjects were induced to help the confederate. Later, the confederate either repaid the subject or did not. As predicted on the basis of the communal/exchange distinction, subjects led to desire an exchange relationship reported liking the confederate more if she repaid them than if she did not. Those led to desire a communal relationship liked the confederate better if she did *not* repay them than if she did.

In a second study (Clark and Waddell, 1985), female subjects were paired with an attractive female confederate with whom they were led to desire an exchange or a communal relationship. The confederate asked subjects to fill out a lengthy questionnaire for a class project and then either paid them or did not. In the exchange conditions, payment increased liking for the other and prevented feelings of exploitation. In contrast, payment had no impact on feelings of exploitation (which were low) or liking when a communal relationship

was desired.<sup>4</sup> These two studies support the idea that specific repayments are important for maintaining perceptions of justice in exchange, but not in communal, relationships.

### *Giving and Receiving Comparable Benefits*

Because repayment for specific benefits is appropriate in exchange but not in communal relationships, Clark (1981) reasoned that any variable that causes benefits to *appear* to be repayment for a benefit previously received should produce more positive reactions in exchange than in communal relationships. For example, giving benefits precisely comparable to ones previously received may be particularly likely to be seen as repayment. Because specific debts are supposed to be repaid in exchange but not in communal relationships, giving comparable benefits should be reacted to more positively in exchange than in communal relationships. In contrast, noncomparable benefits may be preferred in communal relationships because they should be less likely to be perceived as repayment and more likely to be viewed as given to meet a need.

A series of three studies (Clark, 1981) supports these ideas. In each one, subjects read scenarios in which one person gave something to another and the other person then gave something to the first. Perceived degree of friendship was significantly lower when comparable (e.g., two lunches) rather than non-comparable (e.g., a lunch and a ride home) benefits were given (Clark, 1981, Studies 1 and 2). Moreover, comparable benefits were more likely than non-comparable benefits to be seen as repayment, whereas noncomparable benefits were more likely than comparable benefits to be perceived as given for such communal reasons as "to start a friendship" or "out of appreciation" (Clark, 1981, Study 3). Thus, exchanging comparable benefits may be important to achieving a sense of justice in exchange, but not in communal, relationships.

### *Requesting Repayment for Benefits Given*

Requesting repayment is another behavior that should be seen as appropriate in exchange but not communal relationships. A study by Clark and Mills (1979, Study 2) supports this idea. Females led to desire a communal or an exchange relationship with a female confederate received some help from her.

<sup>4</sup>Note that in this study, unlike in the Clark and Mills study (1979, Study 1), repayment had no negative effects on liking when a communal relationship was desired. Perhaps this was because, unlike what occurred in the Clark and Mills (1979, Study 1) study, repayment came from a third source (class funds) and not from the confederate herself. Therefore, it may not have been taken as an indicator of the confederate's attitudes toward the subject. This suggests that repayment need not always reduce attraction in the context of communal relationships.

Subsequently, the confederate either requested repayment or explicitly indicated she wanted no repayment. As predicted, exchange subjects liked the other more when she requested repayment than when she did not. In contrast, communal subjects liked the other more when she did not request repayment than when she did.

### *Keeping Track of Individual Inputs Into Joint Tasks*

The final exchange behavior to be discussed is keeping track of individual inputs into joint tasks for which there will be a reward. According to exchange norms, people should receive benefits in proportion to their inputs into a task. Keeping track of inputs is necessary to allocate benefits in this way. In contrast, communal norms specify that the needier person should receive more benefits, or if needs are equal, benefits should be divided equally. It is not necessary to keep track of individual inputs to follow this rule.

Four studies provide evidence that members of exchange relationships are more likely than members of communal relationships to keep track of inputs into joint tasks. In the first (Clark, 1984, Study 1), male subjects led to desire a communal or an exchange relationship with an attractive female kept track of individual contributions toward joint task completion. By contrast, subjects led to desire communal relationships avoided keeping track of inputs. These findings were replicated in three additional studies in which subjects worked on tasks with an established friend or with a stranger (Clark, 1984, Studies 2 and 3; Clark *et al.*, 1989). In each replication, strangers clearly kept track of inputs but no evidence was obtained that friends kept track of individual inputs.

Interestingly, in the first study (in which communal or exchange relationships were desired but not established), subjects actually seemed to bend over backward to avoid keeping track of inputs. In contrast, in the three subsequent studies (in which subjects were either friends or strangers), while they did not make efforts to keep track, neither did they seem to bend over backwards *not* to do so. This suggests that effortfully avoiding any appearance of exchange behavior may be important when communal relationships are not yet established but may no longer be important once such relationships exist and members are certain of the nature of their relationship.

### *Summary*

It seems evident that exchange behaviors—including promptly repaying benefits, requesting repayment of benefits, exchanging comparable benefits, and keeping track of individual inputs into joint tasks—are appropriate, desirable,



and expected when an exchange relationship is desired but not when a communal relationship is desired or exists. We argue that these behaviors are important for maintaining a sense of justice within the context of exchange relationships but are not necessary for maintaining a sense of justice and may even produce discomfort within the context of communal relationships.

### *Implications for Family Justice*

What implications does research on exchange behaviors have for understanding justice in families? We assume the cultural ideal for family relationships is that communal rather than exchange norms should be followed. As Aldous (1977) noted, "Family members may benefit one another, but they do not usually expect immediate reciprocation, nor do they require reciprocation necessarily from that person." Instead, "Families are generally groups whose members trust that their *needs* [italics added] will be met eventually by someone" (p. 109). [See also Ekeh (1974) from whom Aldous derived these ideas.]

Assuming that the implicit ideal for families is that communal norms will be followed, communal/exchange research suggests that exchange behaviors generally will not be important for establishing a sense of justice in family relationships. Rather they may often cause dissatisfaction and a sense that one is not being treated correctly. For example, a parent who gives an adult child no-strings-attached money to buy a car may feel hurt (rather than being pleased at having been "justly" treated) when the money is carefully paid back in a businesslike manner. Similarly, the husband or wife whose spouse keeps careful track of each partner's earnings in order to determine how much money each one can spend may feel terribly distressed (again rather than feeling justly treated). Interestingly, in such cases, the distressed party may feel hard pressed to justify his or her negative feelings. People generally do not explicitly draw the communal/exchange distinction in their own minds (Mills and Clark, 1982), and repayment and record keeping are "fair" behaviors (at least in exchange relationships). Thus, if the other party asks, "What's unfair or wrong with what I did?", it may be difficult to say. People may only implicitly know that something is wrong. Of course, what is wrong is that exchange behaviors suggest that the other prefers an exchange rather than a communal relationship while the distressed person prefers a communal relationship.

Turning to some more implications for families, consider how such exchange behaviors as formulating marriage contracts and offering children specific rewards for performing certain chores may affect families. Marriage contracts that specify in advance exactly who will do what for whom (and thus, do not allow flexibility for meeting changing needs) might well put marriages on an exchange basis and undermine use of communal norms. Also,

whereas offering children specific rewards for performing specific chores or behaving in specific ways may be effective in the short run, children offered such rewards may not learn they have obligations to respond to other family members' needs just as their parents are generally obligated to watch out for their welfare. This too may undermine the use of communal norms in the long run.

Next, consider some implications of communal/exchange research for clinical treatment of families in distress. We suspect that marriages with high levels of satisfaction may typically be those in which both members adhere to communal norms (i.e., both respond to the other's needs as those needs arise). These relationships may deteriorate if members begin to violate communal norms by neglecting each other's needs. When this happens, couples presumably feel distress and may switch to exchange rules for giving and receiving benefits in an effort to save the marriage. However, exchange rules are not in line with what most people see as ideal in marriages and cannot provide the same sense of security (i.e., the sense of security that arises from knowing the other feels responsible for one's needs) as communal norms. Consequently, members may still feel dissatisfied.

These ideas have clear implications for a commonly advocated marital therapy. Specifically, training members of couples to give specific rewards to their partner when their partner meets one of their specific needs (as several therapists have advocated—see, for instance, Liberman, 1970, and Stuart, 1969, or the “behavior exchange” component of the “behavioral marital therapy” advocated by Jacobson and Margolin, 1979) may have short-term benefits but fail to produce long-term improvements. Why? Couples may initially perceive improvements in their relationship because they now are at least interacting more than they did previously and because their interactions are now based on exchange of comparable benefits rather than individual self-interest. However, such techniques may contribute little to long-term improvement because little has been done to move the couple toward use of communal norms (and, indeed, something has been done which may even interfere with that goal).

Interestingly, Jacobson (1984) reported some results that fit well with this reasoning (even though the results did not confirm his own initial hypotheses). His study involved randomly assigning couples seeking therapy to either a control (no treatment), behavior exchange, communication/problem-solving, or behavior exchange plus communication/problem-solving treatment condition (only the first two conditions are relevant to our present point). Couples participated in 12–16 therapy sessions and completed measures of global marital satisfaction—before therapy, immediately after therapy, and 6 months later. Both the behavior exchange and the communication/problem-solving components (relative to no treatment) improved relationship satisfaction from before therapy to immediately following therapy. However, the results were quite different 6

months later. As we would expect (but not as predicted by Jacobson), after 6 months, behavior exchange couples were *less* satisfied than control couples while communication/problem-solving couples continued to show improvement and were more satisfied than control couples. (We return to the effectiveness of the latter technique after discussing research on communal behaviors.)

### Behaviors in Accord With Communal Norms

Thus far we have focused on exchange behaviors. The communal/exchange distinction also implies the existence of communal behaviors that should have differential effects in exchange and communal relationships. Communal behaviors are those reflecting feelings of special obligation for the other's needs and expectations that the other will feel a special obligation for one's own needs. They include (i) giving help, (ii) feeling good about helping and bad about not helping, (iii) keeping track of the other's needs/taking the other's perspective, (iv) responding positively to the other's expressions of emotion, and (v) considering needs when distributing jointly earned rewards. They also include (vi) a willingness to let the other know about *your* needs, and (vii) *accepting* help from the other without attempting repayment. A number of studies provide evidence for the differential importance of these behaviors in communal and exchange relationships.

#### *Giving Help*

Because it demonstrates concern for the other's well-being, help-giving should be more expected and should occur more often in communal than in exchange relationships. Furthermore, giving help in communal relationships should not depend upon the other's ability to repay in kind whereas it may in exchange relationships. Research supports each of these ideas.

First, consider evidence that helping is more *expected* in the context of communal than exchange relationships. In a study by Bar-Tal *et al.* (1977), subjects who imagined they needed help said they would feel most grateful for help given by a stranger, acquaintance, or close friend, less if helped by a sibling, and least if helped by a parent. On the other hand, if help was refused, subjects said they would feel more resentment toward parents, siblings, and close friends than toward acquaintances and strangers. Both results indicate people expect to receive help more in communal than in exchange relationships.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup>The fact that subjects reported they would feel the least gratitude toward a parent, somewhat more toward a sibling, and still more toward a close friend may be taken as an indication of the differential strength of communal relationships. People presumably feel the least gratitude in the strongest communal relationships, where helping is most expected. Also, it should be noted that

Second, there is also evidence that helping occurs more often in communal than in exchange relationships. Specifically, in a study reported by Clark *et al.* (1987, Study 2), subjects led to desire a communal or an exchange relationship with an attractive, opposite-sex other spent more time voluntarily helping that other than did those led to desire an exchange relationship.

Finally, there is evidence that the other's ability to reciprocate in kind is not an important consideration when giving help in a communal relationship but is important when giving help in an exchange relationship. Schoenrade and Schudy (1989) had students participate in an experiment along with a friend or with a stranger. To begin, all subjects received an easy task while the other received a difficult task. The subject was allowed to help the other by giving that other some of his or her task materials if he or she wished. Half expected the other to help them in the same way shortly thereafter (when roles would be reversed and the subject would have a hard task and the other would have an easy task). Half did not. Fitting with the Clark *et al.* (1987) results, members of communal relationships (in this case, friends) tended to help the other more than did strangers (although the effect did not reach significance). Most interestingly though, and as would be expected based on the communal/exchange distinction, knowing that the other would be able to repay in kind later increased the rate of helping among exchange pairs (strangers) but had no impact on helping among those in communal relationships (friends). Based on these three studies we surmise that offering help when it is needed, regardless of the other's opportunity to repay, should be far more important to maintaining a sense of justice in communal than in exchange relationships.

### *Feeling Good About Helping and Bad About Refusing to Help*

The work just reviewed suggests that people desiring (or having) communal relationships have a greater motivation to meet the other's needs than do those desiring (or having) exchange relationships. The work on adherence to exchange norms reviewed earlier further suggests that after having helped, those desiring a communal relationship should be less likely than those desiring an exchange relationship to feel the other owes them something in return. For both reasons, people who desire (or have) a communal relationship should react

---

the fact there was no evidence that helping was actually detrimental in exchange relationships is not surprising, since although people are not expected to help in the context of exchange relationships, helping is not necessarily inappropriate in exchange relationships. Aid that can be repaid may be acceptable, and the possibility of repayment was not ruled out in the Bar-Tal *et al.* (1977) study. Low-cost aid and aid in an emergency may also be acceptable in exchange relationships.

more positively to having helped the other than should people who desire (or have) an exchange relationship. Similarly, people who desire (or have) a communal relationship should feel worse about refusing to help the other than those who desire (or have) an exchange relationship. Recent research supports this reasoning.

In one study (Williamson and Clark, 1989a, Study 3), among male subjects led to desire an exchange relationship with a female confederate, neither helping nor being prevented from helping had much impact on moods. However, among those led to desire a communal relationship, helping caused moods to improve relative to being prevented from helping. Indeed, in the communal conditions, the pattern of results suggested that helping improved moods and *not* being allowed to help caused moods to worsen. In another study (Williamson and Clark, 1989b, Study 1), communal subjects' moods were improved by helping (either by choice or requirement) relative to receiving no request for help. In contrast, among exchange subjects, helping did not cause moods to improve and indeed, freely choosing to help actually appeared to cause moods to deteriorate. Finally, in still another study, (Williamson and Clark, 1989b, Study 2) among subjects led to desire a communal relationship, refusing to help caused positive moods to deteriorate relative to not being asked to help.<sup>6</sup> In contrast, among subjects led to desire an exchange relationship, refusing to help did not cause positive moods to decline. Rather, turning down a request for aid actually tended to elevate positive moods relative to not being asked to help.

These studies demonstrate that providing help is associated with more positive changes in moods and failing to provide help with greater deterioration in moods when communal rather than exchange relationships are desired. It is our guess that expressing good feelings (and refraining from grumbling) about helping the other and expressing regret when unable to help are also far more important for maintaining congenial communal relationships than for maintaining congenial exchange relationships.

### *Keeping Track of the Other's Needs/Taking the Other's Perspective*

Communal norms specify that benefits are given in response to the other's needs. Living up to these norms requires taking the other's perspective and attending to indications of the other's needs. Research supports both ideas. First,

<sup>6</sup>In the earlier Williamson and Clark (1989a) study, a single mood scale incorporating measures of both positive and negative moods was used. In this study, changes in both positive and negative moods were measured using the Watson *et al.* (1988) PANAS. Refusing to help had significant effects only on positive moods.

there is indirect evidence that members of communal relationships are more likely to take the other's perspective than are members of exchange relationships. Zuckerman (1979) argued that if people take another's perspective, they should be more likely to attribute that person's success to personal factors and that person's failures to situational factors than would otherwise be the case (mimicking tendencies that show up when making judgments about the self). And, Finney and Helm (1982) reported results showing that people in communal relationships do display these tendencies. In their study, subjects watched either a friend or a stranger play a Prisoner's Dilemma game. When players succeeded, observers who were friends were more likely than observers who were strangers to attribute the player's success to personal factors. When players failed, friends attributed less personal responsibility. In addition, players felt better after watching a friend rather than a stranger succeed.

Second, several studies indicate that people desiring (or having) communal relationships are more attentive to one another's needs than are those desiring (or having) exchange relationships. For instance, in a study by Clark *et al.* (1986, Study 1), subjects worked on a problem-solving task with a confederate with whom they were led to desire a communal or an exchange relationship. Regardless of whether it was clear that the other would be able to reciprocate in kind soon thereafter or not, subjects led to desire communal relationships monitored the other's requests for help. In contrast, subjects led to desire an exchange relationship with the other *selectively* attended to the other's needs. They paid attention to needs when they could reasonably expect repayment from the other in the future, and were significantly less attentive when they knew the other could not reciprocate.

These findings were strengthened by the results of two additional studies. In a second study reported by Clark *et al.* (1986, Study 2), subjects were again led to desire a communal or an exchange relationship with another, but were *not* able to respond to her needs. Even when nothing could be done to help, keeping track of the other's needs was greater when a communal rather than an exchange relationship was desired. Moreover, these findings have been found to generalize to existing communal and exchange relationships. That is, subjects paired with a friend will monitor the other's needs more than with those paired with a stranger (Clark *et al.*, 1989).

### *Considering Needs When Distributing Jointly Earned Rewards*

Another way to be responsive to another's needs is to allocate rewards from jointly performed tasks on the basis of needs rather than according to other principles (e.g., equity). Thus, when there are differential needs, people

in communal relationships should be more likely than those in exchange relationships to distribute jointly earned rewards according to needs. In the absence of evidence for differential needs, rewards should be divided evenly rather than according to individual inputs.

Research supports these points. First, Lamm and Schwinger (1980, 1983) examined how the type of relationship between two people with differing needs influenced outside allocators' decisions about how rewards should be divided. If recipients were perceived to be friends, allocators gave a larger proportion of the benefits to the person with greater needs. In contrast, if recipients were perceived to be casual acquaintances, needs were less likely to be considered. Second, at least four other studies provide evidence that in the absence of information about differential needs, friends are more likely than other pairs to divide rewards equally rather than equitably or selfishly. In a study by Austin (1980), pairs of female friends and pairs of female strangers worked together on a task. Subjects working with a friend, whether they performed better or worse than their partner, tended to divide rewards equally. In contrast, subjects paired with a stranger behaved more selfishly. They divided rewards equally if they had performed poorly but according to inputs if they had excelled. Studies with children also indicate that friends are more likely than strangers to divide rewards equally (Benton, 1971; Lerner, 1974). Finally, Greenberg (1983) found that if two people divide a restaurant check equally, observers are more likely to perceive them as friends than if they divide it according to what each person ordered.

### *Responding Positively to the Other's Expressions of Emotion*

Still other studies provide indirect evidence that sensitivity to the other's needs is greater in communal than in exchange relationships. Two studies have shown that people respond more positively to the other's expressions of emotion (which convey information about needs) when communal rather than exchange relationships are desired. First, Clark *et al.* (1987) found that another's expression of sadness increased the amount of help subjects gave the other *if* a communal relationship was desired. In contrast, the other's sadness actually tended to slightly decrease the amount of help given if an exchange relationship was desired. Second, Clark and Taraban (1989) found that while simply manipulating desire for a communal or exchange relationship did not alter liking of the other, if the other subsequently expressed any emotion (happiness, sadness, or irritability), liking was greater in the communal than in the exchange conditions.

*Expressing One's Needs to Others/Accepting Help Without  
Attempting Repayment*

Communal norms dictate that not only should one be responsive to the other's needs but also that the other should be responsive to one's own needs. To facilitate this, members should be willing to communicate information regarding their own needs to the other and to accept help from the other without attempting repayment.

Supporting the former idea, Clark and Taraban (1989) found that friends were more willing to talk to one another about their emotions (which, as already noted, convey information about needs) than were pairs of strangers. In addition, supporting the latter idea, Clark and Mills (1979) found evidence that people are also more likely to graciously accept help in communal than in exchange relationships. The second study they report included conditions in which subjects received help from another with whom they were led to desire a communal or an exchange relationship. When communal relationships were desired, receiving help that could not be repaid increased liking. In contrast, receiving help actually decreased liking when exchange relationships were desired. (Also see Gergen *et al.*, 1975, who found evidence that among strangers who expected to remain strangers, receiving help that could not be repaid decreased liking.)

Since letting the other know about one's needs and graciously accepting help seem to be more common when a communal rather than an exchange relationship is desired, it may well be that these behaviors also lead to feeling that the relationship is fair and somehow on the right track when they occur in communal relationships. On the other hand, they may seem unfair and even manipulative when they occur in the context of exchange relationships.

*Summary*

There is substantial evidence that behaviors such as helping, keeping track of the other's needs, responding positively to the other's expressions of emotion, and allowing the other to respond to one's own needs are more appropriate, desirable, and indeed, expected in communal than in exchange relationships. In the context of communal relationships, their absence may have serious negative effects and cause members to feel unjustly treated. In contrast, communal behaviors do not seem to be required in order to maintain a sense of fairness in exchange relationships. Indeed, they may even be resented if they cannot be reciprocated in kind and/or if they imply an unwelcome desire for a communal relationship.



*Implications for Family Justice*

At the broadest level, and again based on the assumption that our cultural ideal is for family relationships to be communal ones, work on communal behaviors suggests that to feel justly treated in family relations (be they spouse-spouse, parent-child, or sibling-sibling), one must be treated communally. That is, one should feel the other attends to one's needs and meets them when necessary. The others should seem willing to convey their own needs and to accept help. Less obviously, it seems that emotional expressiveness may also be important to perceptions of fair treatment in such relationships. This may be evidenced in several ways. People should feel good (rather than grumbling) about helping and should feel bad when they cannot help. Moreover, they should welcome our expressions of emotion and should be willing to express their own emotions. All this follows from the simple norm dictating that each member should feel a special responsibility for the other's needs and should give benefits on the basis of needs. Feelings of injustice, or just that something seems wrong, should be common when one person willingly neglects the other's needs, does not allow the other to respond to his or her needs, or seems to lack emotional feelings. Interestingly, failure to do these things should not lead to feelings of injustice in exchange relationships.

Communal norms also imply that certain types of communication between family members are likely to be perceived as exploitative (Mills and Clark, 1986). Most straightforwardly, family members who exaggerate their own needs or minimize the extent to which the other has already met their needs should be seen as behaving unfairly. Both behaviors imply one person should benefit another more than is necessary. Also, family members who are able to help but who minimize the other's needs, who exaggerate the extent to which they have already met the other's needs, and/or who minimize their own ability to meet the other's needs may be perceived as behaving unfairly. These actions unjustly reduce one's apparent obligation to the other. Finally, exaggerating the strength of the communal relationship to obtain greater benefits than are justified and/or pretending that benefits given in the past now obligate the other to make repayment may also be perceived as exploitative in a communal relationship. [Note that communications perceived as unfair in nonfamily exchange relationships would be distinct from these. They include such things as minimizing the value of benefits received from the other (to reduce one's debt) and exaggerating the value of benefits given to the other (to increase the other's apparent debt) (Mills and Clark, 1986).]

Even when both members of a family relationship really are striving to meet one another's needs, might feelings of being unjustly treated still result? We think so. First, family members may disagree about legitimacy of needs. If one person claims to have a need and the other does not perceive it as le-

gitimate, the former may feel unjustly treated. This might occur, for instance, when a child feels he or she needs certain clothes for school but a parent (not believing the need is legitimate) refuses to purchase the clothing. The child may then feel unfairly treated. Similar feelings may occur when one family member is willing but unable to meet another's need and the latter fails to understand that inability. For instance, a wife who asks her husband to keep the children quiet so that she may finish some work may feel unfairly treated if her husband fails to meet this need, not recognizing that he tried but was unable to do so.

A second time feelings of injustice may arise in communal relationships—even when members are trying to live up to communal norms—relates to communal relationships varying in strength (as noted at the beginning of this article). Recall that one way to think about differences in strength of communal relationships is that each person forms a hierarchy with the needs of those higher up taking precedence over those lower. People lower in the hierarchy ordinarily, we stated, understand when their needs were neglected because needs of someone higher in the hierarchy take precedence. We gave as an example a person understanding (and not feeling unjustly treated) if a friend could not drive her to the airport because that friend had to care for a sick child. But, such understanding depends on members of relationships agreeing on what each one's hierarchy should be. Within families, it seems to us, feelings of being unjustly treated may result from (often unarticulated) differences between one individual's hierarchy and the other's belief about what that hierarchy either is or should be. For example, a woman might (implicitly or explicitly), place her child's interests first, her husband's second, and her parent's third. Her husband might feel, however, that his needs should come first and may feel unjustly treated when his wife gives the child's needs priority.

Finally, consider implications of communal norms for clinical treatment of families in distress. Earlier we mentioned some implications of exchange behaviors in communal relationships for family therapy. It was suggested that *quid pro quo* techniques of behavioral exchange therapy may not improve marital happiness over the long run. Does research on communal behaviors suggest more effective techniques? We think so. Any therapy that increases family members' attentiveness to one another's needs, knowledge about one another's needs, and responsiveness to those needs should be effective. For example, recall the study by Jacobson (1984) on the effectiveness of "exchange" therapy techniques of contingency contracting. Although these exchange techniques improved satisfaction immediately following therapy, six months later these couples were *less* satisfied than control couples. In contrast, consider the effectiveness of a different, more communal technique (communication/problem solving) also evaluated by Jacobson (1984). With this technique, couples learn

to communicate their needs more clearly to one another. In contrast to "behavior exchange," "communication/problem solving" not only increased satisfaction in the short run but also resulted in continued improvements six months later.

## INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN RELATIONSHIP ORIENTATION

Finally, we turn to another, related issue. To this point, we have implied that, although they may not live up to communal norms, all people believe these are the appropriate norms to follow in family relationships. In so doing, we have overstated our case. Although the majority of people probably do seem to feel that communal norms are the ideal for giving and receiving benefits in romantic and family relationships, recent research has revealed chronic individual differences in general tendencies to follow communal norms as well as chronic individual differences in general tendencies to follow exchange norms. What are these individual differences?

### Communal Orientation

Being high in communal orientation means that people characteristically endorse and perform behavior in accord with communal norms. To demonstrate that individuals differ in this orientation and to measure these differences, Clark *et al.* (1987, Study 1) developed the Communal Orientation Scale. It includes items that measure desire to respond to others' needs (e.g., "When making a decision, I take other people's needs and feelings into account") as well as items that measure desire to have others respond to one's own needs (e.g., "It bothers me when other people neglect my needs"). (See Clark *et al.*, 1987, for the complete Communal Orientation Scale.) Those rating these behaviors and feelings as most characteristic of them are classified as high in communal orientation; those rating these behaviors and feelings as least characteristic of them are classified as low in communal orientation. The Communal Orientation Scale has adequate psychometric properties. Based on a sample of 561 students, Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.78. Test-retest reliability for a sample of 128 students at an 11-week interval was  $r = .68$ . In a principle components factor analysis, all 14 items loaded positively (between .29 and .64) on the first factor. Finally, scores on the scale were not correlated with scores on the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (1964) but were correlated with measures of conceptually overlapping constructs such as social responsibility (Berkowitz and Lutterman, 1968) and empathy (Mehrabian and Epstein, 1972).

Do scores on the scale predict communal behavior? To date, two studies indicate that they do. In one (Clark *et al.*, 1987, Study 1), subjects had an opportunity to help another person. As expected, those high in communal orientation helped more than did those low in communal orientation. In addition, subjects high in communal orientation tended to help more when the other was sad than when she was not, suggesting responsivity to the other's expression of emotion. In contrast, subjects low in communal orientation actually tended to help less if the other was sad than if she was not.

In the second study, more directly related to justice in family contexts, distress among people acting as primary caregivers of family members with Alzheimer's disease was assessed (Williamson and Schulz, in press). Caregivers high in communal orientation were less distressed by the burdens of caring for an Alzheimer's patient than were those low in communal orientation. Specifically, high communal orientation scores at Time 1 were associated with less depression at both Time 1 and six months later (Time 2).

### Exchange Orientation

Being high in exchange orientation means that people characteristically endorse and perform behaviors in accord with exchange norms. To demonstrate that individuals differ in this orientation and to measure these differences, Clark *et al.* (1989) developed the Exchange Orientation Scale. It includes items measuring expectations of repayment for benefits given (e.g., "When I give something to another person, I generally expect something in return"), desire to repay others for specific benefits received (e.g., "When someone buys me a gift, I try to buy that person as comparable a gift as possible"), and desire to keep track of benefits given and received [e.g., "I don't bother to keep track of benefits I have given others" (reverse scored)]. Although the exchange scale is not yet published, there is considerable evidence supporting its validity. (A copy of the scale may be obtained by writing to Margaret Clark, Department of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213.) Based on a sample of 366 students, Cronbach's alpha was 0.73. Test-retest reliability for 110 students at a 7-week interval was .71. In a principle components factor analysis using the same sample, all nine items loaded positively (from .32 to .66) on the first factor. Finally, the scale has been found to be uncorrelated with social anxiety (Fenigstein *et al.*, 1975) or with social desirability (Crowne and Marlowe, 1964) but to be correlated with a second, independent exchange scale (Murstein and Azar, 1986).

Scores on the scale also have successfully predicted several exchange behaviors. In a recent study (Clark *et al.*, 1989), subjects scoring above the median showed greater efforts to keep track of individual inputs during a task for which

there would be a joint reward than did those scoring below the median. In a second, related study (Clark *et al.*, 1989), subjects with high exchange scores also showed a greater preference for dividing rewards according to inputs (rather than equally or according to needs) than did those with low exchange scores. Finally, in still another study, Clark *et al.* (1989) examined the effects of individual differences in exchange orientation on reactions to receiving help that cannot be repaid. As expected, among subjects high in exchange orientation, receiving help tended to cause moods to decline and resulted in decreased attraction toward the helper. Opposite effects were found among those low in exchange orientation.

### The Relationship Between Communal and Exchange Orientation

The communal and exchange orientation scales were designed to be conceptually independent. The two scales are largely empirically independent as well. That is, high communal scores do not necessarily imply low exchange scores. In several studies employing large samples, the Communal Orientation Scale and the Exchange Orientation Scale have either been uncorrelated or, at most, have evidenced small negative correlations.

This came as a surprise. After all, most of the communal/exchange work has involved manipulating desire for a communal versus an exchange relationship and, in those studies, desire for following communal norms was often clearly associated with lack of desire for following exchange norms, and desire to follow exchange norms clearly was often associated with lack of desire to follow communal norms. Thus, it was natural to expect the same pattern in individual differences. However, one can simultaneously be both high in communal and exchange orientation (perhaps, these people help others but expect repayment quickly; alternatively, they may be very communal in communal relationships and also very exchange in exchange relationships). One can also simultaneously be low in both communal and exchange orientation (perhaps, these people simply do not care about justice of any sort and are primarily self-interested). In any case, the fact that these orientations are independent is not logically in conflict with earlier findings showing that desire for a communal (exchange) relationship with a *particular* other is negatively related to desire for an exchange (communal) relationship with the same other.

### Implications for Family Justice

Just as with the distinction between types of relationships, we think there are some important implications of individual differences in relationship orientation for understanding family justice. Most obvious are implications parallel

to those outlined following our earlier sections. First, to the extent that effects of individual relationship orientations are not swamped by expectations that a certain set of norms should be followed in a specific relationship, the more exchange oriented family members are, the more they should want to follow exchange norms in their family relationships. They may be distressed and/or feel unjustly treated as a result of not receiving repayment for specific favors, not having individual inputs into the relationship recorded and individual outcomes balanced with those inputs, and so forth. (Of course, the reverse should also be true the lower in exchange orientation a person is.) Second, the more communally oriented family members are, the more they should want to follow communal norms in their family relationships. As a result, they should feel particularly distressed and/or unjustly treated when their needs are not met, when others do not welcome their help, and so forth. (And, again, the reverse should hold for people low in communal orientation.)

Of most interest, perhaps, are implications of the particular *match* in orientations occurring between two family members. Just as combinations of tendencies toward closeness/distance, control/dependency, and sex-role orientations have been shown to have important implications for satisfaction during courtship and marriage (see, for instance, Antil, 1983; Robinson and Jacobson, 1987; Zammichieli *et al.*, 1988), so too may each possible match or mismatch in communal and exchange orientation be important. For example, if spouses match in communal and in exchange orientation, one might expect them to get along well. Best off may be couples in which both members are high in communal and simultaneously low in exchange orientation. They are in agreement with one another and with cultural dictates regarding appropriate norms. To give another example, to the extent to which they are able to ignore cultural dictates, spouses who are both high in exchange orientation (and low in communal orientation) may also function well. And, in their case, qualification of some of our earlier comments may be necessary. That is, in this type of pairing it may be that following exchange (and not communal) norms leads to the greatest perception of justice even in family relationships.

What of mismatches? To the extent that individual differences in orientation override the cultural dictate that communal norms should be followed in family relationships, mismatches in either communal or exchange orientation (or both) among any given pair of family members may lead to mutual perceptions of mistreatment, disagreement, and dissatisfaction.

Thus, for instance, in couples in which a person high in communal orientation is paired with a person low in communal orientation, both may be unhappy. The person high in communal orientation may feel his or her own needs are not met with sufficient regularity and/or enthusiasm and that his or her own attentiveness to the other's needs is not sufficiently appreciated. In contrast, the person low in communal orientation may feel a bit "smothered"

by the other. Such relationships may be destined for trouble. Also, when one person is high in exchange orientation and the other is low in exchange orientation, both members of a couple may be dissatisfied. The person high in exchange orientation may feel exploited when the other does not specifically pay back benefits given, does not contribute enough financially to the relationship, and so forth. Meanwhile, the person low in exchange orientation may not feel trusted by the other and may also feel the other is overly concerned about record keeping in the relationship. The worst combination may well be when one partner is high in communal orientation and simultaneously low in exchange orientation while the other is high in exchange orientation and simultaneously low in communal orientation. Such couples might suffer from both sets of problems just described.

Interestingly, according to some recent analyses of how people negotiate courtship and early marriage (e.g., Holmes and Boon, 1990; Eidelson, 1983), couples may ignore mismatches in interpersonal orientations early in their relationship when other, positive aspects of the relationship are salient and couples are establishing a commitment to one another. Only later may negative feelings associated with mismatches become salient and troublesome.<sup>7</sup>

We have tempered many of our comments above with the qualification that such effects should occur only to the extent that cultural dictates about appropriate norms in family settings do not overpower individual differences. It is certainly possible that cultural norms are more powerful than these individual differences. As Snyder and Ickes (1985) state, personality may only have its effects and/or may have its greatest effects in situations in which norms for appropriate behavior are ambiguous. However, we personally suspect that cultural norms for family relationships do not entirely overwhelm the individual differences and that, at least to some extent, the implications suggested above may prove true.

There may be some interesting *interactive* effects of cultural norms and individual differences in relationship orientation. For instance, because cultural norms dictate that communal rules should be followed in family relationships, family members may help each other regardless of their personal relationship orientation. However, individual differences in communal orientation may mediate how they feel about having to help the other. The results of the work by Williamson and Schulz (in press) support this idea. They found people both high and low in communal orientation who were willing to serve as caregivers

<sup>7</sup>In discussing problems mismatches may create within families, we have chosen to emphasize mismatches in spouse-spouse orientations rather than in parent-child or sibling relationships. Theoretically, such mismatches may cause problems in the latter relationships as well. However, such mismatches seem less likely to occur since, through parental socialization, children may typically adopt orientations similar to those of their primary caretakers. Thus, among siblings, orientations are likely to be similar.

of family members with Alzheimer's disease. Thus both sorts of people did appear willing to follow the *cultural* dictate to help their family member even when helping was very costly. However, individual differences in communal orientation appeared to mediate emotional reactions to having to follow cultural norms. As mentioned earlier in this paper, those high in communal orientation were less depressed about giving help than were those low in communal orientation. In other words, it may be that people help family members because culture dictates it is the proper thing to do, but those low in communal orientation may not feel good about it.

A final, perhaps less obvious implication of the individual difference work has to do with tendencies to form family relationships in the first place. As Snyder and Ickes (1985) have pointed out, personality may influence the situations in which people place themselves. Given that our culture seems to dictate that family relationships should be communal in nature, relative to people high in communal orientation, those low in communal orientation may be more reluctant to marry and/or have children. Moreover, they may spend relatively less time interacting with their family of origin and/or with their own spouse and children (if they do form the latter types of relationships). (Note that this last implication of the existence of individual differences in communal and exchange orientation does not depend on the question of whether or not culture norms override individual differences in relative orientation.)

## CONCLUDING COMMENTS

By now we hope we have convinced the reader that the distinction between communal and exchange relationships and the existence of individual differences in communal and exchange orientations have important implications for understanding perceptions of justice and fair treatment in families. Specifically, any exchange behavior (such as prompt repayment of benefits received) should not only be unnecessary for promoting a sense of justice in families but may actually be distressing to family members when they occur. On the other hand, communal behaviors (such as attending to the other's needs) should prove essential to maintaining a sense of justice in families. In addition, we have pointed out some pitfalls family members can fall into even when they attempt to follow communal norms (e.g., feelings of unfair treatment resulting from mismatches in partners' communal relationship hierarchies) as well as how family members can unfairly exploit the existence of communal norms (e.g., exaggerating one's own needs). Finally, we have discussed some possible implications of individual differences in relationship orientation for feelings of justice in families and for the likelihood of forming such relationships in the first place. Of course, the value of most of our speculations awaits further em-



pirical validation. We are beginning to move in that direction ourselves. As noted previously, one of us is currently examining the effects of individual differences in communal orientation on responses to the burden of caring for a family member with Alzheimer's disease. The other is beginning to explore how matches in communal and exchange orientation influence progress in courtship. We hope others will join us.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Preparation of this paper was supported by National Institute of Mental Health postdoctoral fellowship grant MH17184-06 to the first author and by NSF grant BNS 8807894 to the second author.

### REFERENCES

- Antill, J. K. (1983). Sex role complementarity versus similarity in married couples. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 45: 145-155.
- Aldous, J. (1977). Family interaction patterns. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 3: 105-135.
- Austin, W. (1980). Friendship and fairness: Effects of type of relationship and task performance on choice of distribution rules. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 6: 402-408.
- Bar-Tal, D., Bar-Zohar, Y., Greenberg, M. S., and Herman, M. (1977). Reciprocity behavior in the relationship between donor and recipient and between harm-doer and victim. *Sociometry* 40: 293-298.
- Benton, A. A. (1971). Productivity, distributive justice, and bargaining among children. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 18: 68-78.
- Berkowitz, L., and Lutterman, K. (1968). The traditionally socially responsible personality. *Public Opinion Quart.* 32: 169-185.
- Berscheid, E., Dion, K., Walster, E., and Walster, G. W. (1971). Physical attractiveness and dating choice: A test of the matching hypothesis. *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 7: 173-189.
- Clark, M. S. (1981). Noncomparability of benefits given and received: A cue to the existence of friendship. *Soc. Psychol. Quart.* 44: 375-381.
- Clark, M. S. (1984). Record keeping in two types of relationships. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 47: 549-557.
- Clark, M. S. (1986). Evidence for the effectiveness of manipulations of communal and exchange relationships. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 12: 414-425.
- Clark, M. S., and Mills, J. (1979). Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 37: 12-24.
- Clark, M. S., Mills, J., and Corcoran, D. (1989). Keeping track of needs and inputs of friends and strangers. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 15: 533-542.
- Clark, M. S., Mills, J., and Powell, M. C. (1986). Keeping track of needs in communal and exchange relationships. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 51: 333-338.
- Clark, M. S., Ouellette, R., Powell, M. C., and Milberg, S. (1987). Recipient's mood, relationship type, and helping. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 53: 94-103.
- Clark, M. S., and Taraban, C. B. (1989). Reactions to and willingness to express emotion in communal and exchange relationships. Unpublished manuscript.
- Clark, M. S., Taraban, C. B., Ho, J., and Wesner, K. (1989). A measure of exchange orientation and its relation to keeping track of inputs, reactions to receiving help, and styles of dividing rewards. Unpublished manuscript, Carnegie Mellon University.

- Clark, M. S., and Waddell, B. (1985). Perception of exploitation in communal and exchange relationships. *J. Soc. Pers. Rel.* 2: 403-413.
- Crowne, D., and Marlowe, D. (1964). *The Approval Motive*, Wiley, New York.
- Ekeh, P. P. (1974). *Social Exchange Theory: The Two Traditions*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Eidelson, R. J. (1983). Affiliation and independence issues in marriage. *J. Marr. Fam.* 45: 683-688.
- Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., and Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 43: 522-527.
- Finney, P. D., and Helm, B. (1982). The actor-observer relationship: The effect on actors' and observers' responsibility and emotion attributions. *J. Soc. Psychol.* 117: 219-225.
- Gergen, K. J., Ellsworth, P., Maslach, C., and Seipel, M. (1975). Obligation, donor resources, and reactions to aid in three cultures. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 31: 390-400.
- Greenberg, J. (1983). Equity and equality as clues to the relationship between exchange participants. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 13: 195-196.
- Holmes, J. G., and Boon, S. D. (1990). Developments in the field of close relationships: Creating foundations for intervention strategies. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 16: 23-41.
- Jacobson, N. S. (1984). A component analysis of behavioral marital therapy: The relative effectiveness of behavior exchange and communication/problem-solving training. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 52: 295-305.
- Jacobson, N. S. & Margolin, G. (1979). *Marital Therapy: Strategies Based on Social Learning and Behavior Exchange Principles*, Brunner/Mazel, New York.
- Lamm, H., and Schwinger, T. (1980). Norms concerning distributive justice: Are needs taken into consideration in allocation decisions? *Soc. Psychol. Quart.* 43: 425-429.
- Lamm, H., and Schwinger, T. (1983). Need consideration in allocation decisions: Is it just? *J. Soc. Psychol.* 119: 205-209.
- Liberman, R. (1970). Behavioral approaches to family and couple therapy. *Am. J. Orthopsychiat.* 40: 106-118.
- Lerner, M. J. (1974) The justice motive: "Equity" and "parity" among children. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 29: 539-550.
- Mehrabian, A., and Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *J. Pers.* 40: 525-543.
- Mills, J., and Clark, M. S. (1982). Communal and exchange relationships. In Wheeler, L. (ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Mills, J., and Clark, M. S. (1986). Communications that should lead to perceived exploitation in communal and exchange relationships. *J. Soc. Clin. Psychol.* 4: 225-234.
- Murstein, B. I., and Azar, J. A. (1986). The relationship of exchange-orientation to friendship intensity, roommate compatibility, anxiety, and friendship. *Small Group Behav.* 17: 3-12.
- Robinson, E. A., and Jacobson, N. S. (1987). Social learning theory and family psychopathology: A Kantian model in behaviorism? In Jacob, T. (ed.), *Family Interaction and Psychopathology*, Plenum Press, New York, pp. 117-162.
- Schoenrade, P., and Schudy, K. (1989). Reciprocity or responsiveness? Helping in exchange and communal relationships. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA, August.
- Sigall, H., and Landy, D. (1973). Radiating beauty: Effects of having a physically attractive partner on person perception. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 28: 218-224.
- Snyder, M., and Ickes, W. (1985). Personality and social behavior. In Lindzey, G., and Aronson, E. (eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, Random House, New York, pp. 883-947.
- Stuart, R. B. (1969). Operant-interpersonal treatment for marital discord. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 33: 675-682.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., and Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 54: 1063-1070.
- Williamson, G. M., and Clark, M. S. (1989a). Providing help and desired relationship type as determinants of changes in moods and self-evaluations. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 56: 722-734.
- Williamson, G. M., and Clark, M. S. (1989b). Affective reactions to choosing, being required, and refusing to help: Moderating effects of desired relationship type. Unpublished manuscript.
- Williamson, G. M., and Schulz, R. (in press). Relationship orientation, quality of prior relationship, and distress among caregivers of Alzheimer's patients. *Psychology and Aging*.

- Zammichieli, M. E., Gilroy, F. D., and Sherman, M. F. (1988). Relation between sex-role orientation and marital satisfaction. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 14: 747-754.
- Zuckerman, M. (1979). Attribution of success and failure revisited, or: The motivational bias is alive and well in attribution theory. *J. Pers.* 47: 245-287.