

# Journal of Experimental Psychology: General

## Pettiness in Social Exchange

Tami Kim, Ting Zhang, and Michael I. Norton

Online First Publication, July 30, 2018. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/xge0000463>

### CITATION

Kim, T., Zhang, T., & Norton, M. I. (2018, July 30). Pettiness in Social Exchange. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/xge0000463>

## Pettiness in Social Exchange

Tami Kim  
University of Virginia

Ting Zhang  
Columbia Business School

Michael I. Norton  
Harvard Business School

We identify and document a novel construct—pettiness, or intentional attentiveness to trivial details—and examine its (negative) implications in interpersonal relationships and social exchange. Seven studies show that pettiness manifests across different types of resources (both money and time), across cultures with differing tolerance for ambiguity in relationships (the United States, Switzerland, Germany, and Austria), and is distinct from related constructs such as generosity, conscientiousness, fastidious, and counternormativity. Indeed, people dislike petty exchanges even when the (petty) amount given is more generous (e.g., a gift card for \$5.15 rather than \$5), suggesting that pettiness may in some instances serve as a stronger relationship signal than are actual benefits exchanged. Attentiveness to trivial details of resource exchanges harms communal-sharing relationships by making (even objectively generous) exchanges feel transactional. When exchanging resources, people should be wary of both how much they exchange and the manner in which they exchange it.

*Keywords:* relationships, resource exchange, pettiness, norms

*Supplemental materials:* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/xge0000463.supp>

How do actors know whether they are in an exchange relationship, where both parties track a careful balancing of giving and taking, or a communal relationship, where both parties' behavior is noncontingent and characterized by trust (Clark & Mills, 1993; Fiske, 1992)? One previously identified clue is the objective value of resources being exchanged: As a general rule, giving more improves the quality of communal-sharing relationships (Cotterell, Eisenberger, & Speicher, 1992; Flynn, 2003; Flynn & Adams, 2009). However, we argue that communal-sharing relationships are not solely dependent on how much is exchanged but also how it is exchanged. Specifically, we suggest that when receivers perceive exchanges to be petty—defined as intentional attentiveness to trivial details—even generous actions can hurt social relationships. Critically, therefore, we differentiate petty behaviors from mere lack of generosity. Although pettiness and stinginess are often used interchangeably by laypeople, we propose that pettiness exerts influence independent of (lack of) generosity. Indeed, our results demonstrate that pettiness and generosity exert unique (and opposite) effects on relationship satisfaction in romantic couples and that petty behavior can undermine relationships even when that petty behavior is objectively generous (e.g., giving \$5.15 can be worse for relationship quality than is giving \$5).

The role of pettiness in exchanging resources is poised to become even more central with the rise of new digital payment services such as Venmo and Square Cash, which allow people in communal-sharing relationships to both closely monitor payment history and pay back amounts owed—down to the last cent. These platforms thus may shift communal-sharing relationships (e.g. when a friend offers a ride, there is no set expectation that I will pay her back) into market-pricing relationships (e.g. when a friend offers a ride, she requests a precise payment for the amount of gas consumed). In recent years, precise payments in communal-sharing relationships have become more commonplace: When we surveyed 100 Venmo users (48% male;  $M_{\text{age}} = 28.92$ ,  $SD = 8.02$ ) for two of their most recent transactions, 52.6% of transactions among friends entailed transfers of precise amounts (see the online supplemental materials). Moreover, popular discourse is replete with such payments gone awry—from a woman charging a friend for a coffee that she offered to purchase to putting a specific price on sips of wine shared at home (Paul, 2016). These examples suggest the potential for the pettiness inherent in such payment services—in their implicit encouragement of attention to trivial details—to negatively impact relationships.

Why might petty social exchanges harm relationships? In general, any sign that givers feel insecure in leaving room for error in a relationship can signal a lack of desire for an ongoing relationship (DePaulo & Kashy, 1998; Gould & Gould, 1989). We suggest that deliberating over trivial matters when deciding how much to expend can signal a partner's intention to give precisely no more and no less than is necessary, making that relationship feel transactional in nature. In market-pricing relationships such as between retailers and customers, such ongoing cost–benefit analyses are typical: Payment amounts reflect the quality and quantity of work being performed (Fiske, 1992; Gneezy & Rustichini, 2000). In

---

Tami Kim, Darden School of Business, University of Virginia; Ting Zhang, Management Unit, Columbia Business School; Michael I. Norton, Marketing Unit, Harvard Business School.

The authors would like to thank members of the NERD Lab for their invaluable comments.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Tami Kim, Darden School of Business, University of Virginia, 100 Darden Boulevard, Charlottesville, VA 22903. E-mail: kimt@darden.virginia.edu

communal-sharing relationships such as between friends, in contrast, cost–benefit analyses are uncommon and even inappropriate (Belk, 1976; Caplow, 1982; Fiske, 1992; Heyman & Ariely, 2004; Vohs, Mead, & Goode, 2006). We suggest that petty behavior harms communal-sharing relationships by signaling the kind of transactionality associated with market-pricing relationships—even when that behavior is objectively generous.

We operationalize pettiness in two distinct ways. First, we vary whether amounts exchanged are round (e.g., \$10 or 60 min) or precise (e.g., \$10.01 or 56 min). Given that units like cents and minutes are less consequential than are dollars and hours, we suggest—and demonstrate—that observing someone deciding about minor units is likely to feel more trivial. Furthermore, because round amounts are often used in an approximation context, precise amounts are regarded as more intentional than are round amounts (Jansen & Pollmann, 2001; Mason, Lee, Wiley, & Ames, 2013); as a result, precise numbers capture the elements of both triviality and intentionality central to our definition of pettiness. Second, we manipulate pettiness via actions that communicate an intention to track details (e.g., setting a timer when giving advice), independent of whether the amounts exchanged are round or precise. By doing so, we demonstrate that pettiness is not only about precise amounts but instead is a broader construct that encompasses a range of behaviors that, through intentional attention to trivial details, signal the transactionality typifying exchange relationships. Across seven studies, we demonstrate that petty exchanges negatively impact communal-sharing relationships by making those relationships feel more transactional.

### Study 1: The Unique Role of Pettiness

Study 1 investigated the role of petty behaviors in existing romantic relationships. We recruited individuals who had been in a relationship for more than a month and asked a series of questions about themselves and their significant others. To conceptually differentiate pettiness from related constructs, we also assessed generosity (i.e., someone who behaves prosocially; Dunn, Aknin, & Norton, 2008), fastidiousness (i.e., someone who likes order and organization; Samuel, Riddell, Lynam, Miller, & Widiger, 2012), and conscientiousness (i.e., someone who is dependable and responsible; Barrick & Mount, 1991). We predicted that pettiness would exert a (negative) influence on relationship satisfaction, independent of the effect of related constructs such as generosity, fastidiousness, and conscientiousness.

### Method

**Participants.** This study was completed by 201 participants from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (43.8% male;  $M_{\text{age}} = 32.47$ ,  $SD = 8.96$ ) who had been in a relationship for more than a month.

**Design and procedure.** Only participants who indicated “Yes” to the following question were allowed to proceed with the rest of the survey: “Do you currently have a romantic partner whom you’ve been dating for at least a month?” We assessed how much participants engaged in specific petty behaviors themselves (“self-pettiness”) and how much their partners engaged in those specific behaviors (“partner-pettiness”), across four different scenarios. Participants also answered questions about how generous their partners were (“generosity”) and how much their partners

counted minutes and cents (“pettiness”), regarding both money and time. These measures were completed in random order.

**Self-pettiness and partner-pettiness.** For the self-pettiness measure, participants indicated how much they agreed with the following statements that began with the stem “I tend to”: (1) “track our bills down to the last cent (e.g., groceries, meals),” (2) “track who paid for what when we go out for dinner or entertainment,” (3) “notice when I’m late down to the last minute,” and (4) “track whose turn is it to do household (or other relationship-related) responsibilities (e.g., taking out the trash, planning dates),” rated on a scale from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*;  $\alpha = .79$ ). For the partner-pettiness measure, participants answered the same set of questions about their partner (i.e., “My partner tends to . . .”;  $\alpha = .83$ ).

**Generosity.** The generosity measure included the following four items about how generously their partner spent money and time on both other people and themselves: “When it comes to spending [money/time] on [others/you], how generous is your partner?” rated on a scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Very much*;  $\alpha = .79$ ).

**Pettiness.** The pettiness measure included the following four items about their partners’ behavior toward other people and themselves: “When spending resources like money on [others/you], how much does your partner tend to count dollars and cents?” and “When spending resources like time on [others/you], how much does your partner tend to minutes and seconds?” rated on a scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Very much*;  $\alpha = .83$ ).

**Relationship satisfaction.** Participants also rated their relationship satisfaction by indicating the extent to which they agreed with each of the following seven questions (adapted from Hendrick, 1988): (1) “My partner meets my needs very well”; (2) “In general, I am very satisfied with my relationship”; (3) “There are many problems in this relationship” (reverse-coded); (4) “I want our relationship to last for a very long time”; (5) “I am committed to maintaining my relationship with my partner”; (6) “I would not feel very upset if our relationship were to end in the near future” (reverse-coded); and (7) “It is likely that I will date someone other than my partner within the next year” (reverse-coded), rated on a scale from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*;  $\alpha = .88$ ).

We also assessed how much participants viewed their partners as conscientious and fastidious. For the conscientiousness measure (John & Srivastava, 1999), participants indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements beginning with the stem “My partner is someone who”: (1) “does a thorough job,” (2) “can be somewhat careless” (reverse-coded), (3) “is a reliable worker,” (4) “tends to be disorganized” (reverse-coded), (5) “tends to be lazy” (reverse-coded), (5) “perseveres until the task is finished,” (6) “does things efficiently,” (7) “makes plans and follows through with them,” and (8) “is easily distracted” (reverse-coded), rated on a scale from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*;  $\alpha = .91$ ). For the fastidiousness measure (Samuel et al., 2012), participants indicated how much they agreed with the following statements beginning with the stem “My partner”: (1) “checks things more often than necessary”; (2) “gets upset if objects are not arranged properly”; (3) “feels compelled to count while she/he is doing things”; (4) “repeatedly checks doors, windows, drawers, and so forth”; (5) “gets upset if others change the way he or she has arranged things”; (6) “repeatedly checks gas and water taps and light switches after turning them off”; and (7) “needs things to be arranged in a particular order,” rated on a scale from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*;  $\alpha = .92$ ).

Participants also indicated their gender and age, their partner's gender and age, relationship status (1 = *Just began going on dates*, 2 = *Casually dating*, 3 = *Seriously dating*, 4 = *Engaged*, 5 = *Married*), and relationship length (1 = *Less than a month*, 2 = *1–6 months*, 3 = *7–12 months*, 4 = *1–2 years*, 5 = *More than 2 years*). For this and all subsequent studies, informed consent was obtained from all participants and the Institutional Review Board of our university reviewed and approved all materials and procedures (stimuli and data are available at <https://osf.io/wqmu5>).

**Results**

Including the self-pettiness and partner-pettiness measures simultaneously in a regression predicting relationship satisfaction revealed that both partner-pettiness and self-pettiness predicted relationship satisfaction: Specifically, participants were significantly more dissatisfied with their relationship when their partners engaged in petty behaviors ( $b = -.23, SE = .06, p < .001$ ) and also when they themselves engaged in petty behaviors ( $b = -.13, SE = .06, p = .04$ ). There was not an interaction between self- and partner-pettiness ( $b = .05, SE = .04, p = .14$ ).

We next regressed relationship satisfaction on pettiness, generosity, fastidiousness, and conscientiousness. All four constructs independently predicted relationship quality: Pettiness and fastidiousness were associated with reduced relationship satisfaction (pettiness:  $b = -.11, SE = .05, p = .01$ ; fastidiousness:  $b = -.22, SE = .04, p < .001$ ), whereas generosity and conscientiousness were positively associated with relationship satisfaction (generosity:  $b = .25, SE = .05, p < .001$ ; conscientiousness:  $b = .39, SE = .05, p < .001$ ; see Table 1; also see the online supplemental materials for additional regression analyses).

**Studies 2A and 2B: Being Petty With Money**

The correlational results of Study 1 are of course open to a number of alternative explanations, such as that low relationship satisfaction increases petty behavior. As a result, we turned to experimental methodology. Studies 2A and 2B examined the impact of pettiness in exchanges regarding money. We recruited users of Venmo and Paypal, two online money exchange platforms, and operationalized pettiness by varying whether the amount exchanged was round or precise. Study 2A asked participants to evaluate either communal-sharing exchanges (e.g., using these services to pay money owed to a friend) or market-pricing

exchanges (e.g., using the services to pay money owed to a company; Fiske, 1992). Because market-pricing exchanges are transactional in nature—consumers expect exact change from retailers, not a rough approximation of what they are owed—we expected petty behaviors to have more harmful consequences in communal-sharing exchanges, where such attention to detail sends a negative signal. Building on Study 2A's findings, Study 2B directly tested our proposed mediator—perceived transactionality—and assessed counternormativity and fastidiousness as alternative explanations for the effect of pettiness on liking.

**Study 2A Method**

**Participants.** This study was completed by 102 participants (41% male;  $M_{age} = 23.68, SD = 4.08$ ) from a university in the Northeast who had Venmo or PayPal accounts. The sample size for this study was based on previous experiments on exchange of resources (e.g., Heyman & Ariely, 2004). For this and subsequent studies, we targeted recruitment of at least 50 participants per condition so that the studies would have 80% power to detect an effect with an estimated effect size ( $w$  or  $d$ ) of .3.

**Design and procedure.** Participants were randomized into one of two conditions: market-pricing or communal-sharing. In both conditions, participants were presented with transaction histories for an individual who paid precise amounts and another individual who paid round amounts. Specifically, participants in the market-pricing condition saw that one giver paid three different companies in round amounts (\$10, \$35, and \$20), whereas another giver paid these companies in precise amounts (\$9.99, \$34.95, and \$20.06). In contrast, those in the communal-sharing condition saw that the two givers paid round or precise amounts to three different people (see Figure 1). Note that in both conditions, the total amount exchanged was \$65. All participants then selected the individual with whom they would rather be friends.

**Study 2A Results**

Participants in the communal-sharing and market-pricing conditions had different preferences for the individual with whom they preferred to be friends,  $\chi^2(1, N = 102) = 10.71, p = .001$ , Cramér's  $V = .32$ . In the market-pricing condition, participants

Table 1  
*Regression Results Comparing Pettiness to Related Constructs in Study 1*


Relationship satisfaction	Model			
	1	2	3	4
Pettiness	-.33 (.05)***	-.26 (.05)***	-.11 (.05)**	-.09 (.04)*
Generosity		.40 (.06)***	.25 (.05)***	.23 (.05)***
Fastidiousness			-.22 (.04)***	-.22 (.04)***
Conscientiousness			.39 (.05)***	.37 (.05)***
Relationship length				-.02 (.06)
Relationship status				.19 (.06)**
Constant	6.94 (.18)***	4.62 (.40)***	3.51 (.38)***	2.97 (.45)***
R <sup>2</sup>	.18	.32	.54	.57

Note. Standard errors appear in parentheses.  
\*  $p \leq .05$ . \*\*  $p \leq .01$ . \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

were evenly split between preferring to be friends with the individual paying round amounts (50%) and the one paying precise amounts (50%),  $\chi^2(1, N = 50) < .001, p > .99, w < .001$ . In contrast, the vast majority of participants in the communal-sharing

condition preferred to be friends with the nonpetty actors: the actor paying round amounts (81%),  $\chi^2(1, N = 52) = 19.69, p < .001, w = .62$ . Moreover, whereas the choice between the two actors was at chance in the market-pricing condition, petty behavior

a)



b)




Figure 1. Study 2A stimuli for the market-pricing condition (Panel a) and communal-sharing condition (Panel b).

toward other people led participants to prefer the nonpetty actor in the communal-sharing condition.

### Study 2B Method

Study 2A established that petty behaviors have a negative impact in communal-sharing exchanges. Building on this finding, Study 2B accomplished two goals. First, we investigated why petty behaviors in communal-sharing exchanges reduce relationship quality. We predicted that precise payments in communal-sharing contexts may signal that the sender is treating the relationship as transactional (see Fiske, 1991, 1992), akin to exchanges occurring in market-pricing contexts. We therefore assessed perceived transactionality as a mediating mechanism underlying the negative impact of pettiness. Second, we addressed additional alternative explanations. Beyond transactionality, petty behaviors may be disliked in communal-sharing exchanges because they are more counternormative. To address this explanation, Study 2B compared both nonpetty and petty communal-sharing exchanges to a new condition describing a market-pricing transaction that is equally counternormative: someone who transfers precise amounts to his or her own bank account. We measured counternormativity and also perceived fastidiousness (as in Study 1) as potential additional mediators.

**Participants.** This study was completed by 148 participants (48.6% male;  $M_{\text{age}} = 30.34$ ,  $SD = 7.32$ ) from Amazon's Mechanical Turk who had Venmo or PayPal accounts. We required participants to be Venmo users. To verify that they held Venmo accounts, we required them to complete a filter question in the beginning (see Appendix A). Only those who answered the question correctly were able to proceed.

**Design and procedure.** Participants were divided into one of three conditions: nonpetty communal-sharing, petty communal-sharing, and market-pricing. All participants were informed:

Today, you will be viewing two study participants' receipts from Venmo, a site that allows you to pay and receive money to your family and friends electronically. Venmo also allows its users to transfer their remaining balance to personal bank accounts. Below are their receipts.

In the nonpetty communal-sharing condition, participants were presented with transaction histories for "Participant A" and "Participant B"; both participants' histories indicated that they paid round amounts to three other individuals. Participants in the petty communal-sharing condition also saw transaction histories for Participants A and B; whereas Participant A's history indicated that he or she paid round amounts to three other individuals, Participant B's history indicated that he or she paid precise amounts to three other individuals. Finally, participants in the market-pricing condition saw transaction histories for Participants A and B. Similar to the case in the other two conditions, Participant A's history indicated that he or she paid round amounts to three other individuals; Participant B's history indicated that he or she had transferred precise amounts to his or her own bank accounts (see Appendix B). We intended the latter two conditions to be equally counternormative and to vary only whether the exchange was communal-sharing or market-pricing.

Participants then answered a series of questions in which they compared Participants A and B. As a manipulation check, participants responded to the question "Which participant is pettier?"

( $-5 = \text{Participant A}$ ;  $0 = \text{Neither}$ ;  $5 = \text{Participant B}$ ). Participants also rated whom they liked more ( $-5 = \text{Participant A}$ ;  $0 = \text{I like them equally}$ ;  $5 = \text{Participant B}$ ).

We also measured transactionality, fastidiousness, and counternormativity as mediators. More specifically, we asked them four questions assessing transactionality (adapted from Shore, Tetrick, Lynch, & Barksdale, 2006): (1) "Which participant's action feels more transactional?"; (2) "Which participant's action feels more like a strictly economic decision?"; (3) Which participant's action feels more like a business transaction?"; and (4) "Which participant's action feels more impersonal?" ( $-5 = \text{Participant A}$ ;  $0 = \text{Neither of them}$ ;  $5 = \text{Participant B}$ ;  $\alpha = .76$ ). We also assessed the same seven measures from Study 1 for fastidiousness: Participants rated whom they thought was more likely to engage in each fastidious behavior (e.g., "checks things more often than necessary";  $\alpha = .95$ ). Finally, participants rated how counternormative they thought each participant was on a scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Extremely*).

### Study 2B Results

**Pettiness.** A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed a significant impact of condition on pettiness perceptions,  $F(2, 145) = 16.88$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .19$ . As intended, compared to those in the nonpetty communal-sharing condition ( $M = .09$ ,  $SD = 1.25$ ), participants in the petty communal-sharing ( $M = 2.43$ ,  $SD = 2.39$ ),  $t(99) = -6.03$ ,  $p < .001$ , and market-pricing ( $M = 1.19$ ,  $SD = 2.18$ ),  $t(92) = -3.02$ ,  $p < .01$ , conditions thought that Participant B was pettier than Participant A. Furthermore, compared to participants in the market-pricing condition, participants in the petty communal-sharing condition viewed Participant B as pettier than Participant A,  $t(99) = 2.69$ ,  $p = .01$ .

**Liking.** There was a similar pattern for liking,  $F(2, 145) = 6.73$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .09$ . Specifically, compared to the nonpetty communal-sharing condition ( $M = .04$ ,  $SD = 1.20$ ), liking for Participant B was significantly lower among participants in the petty communal-sharing condition ( $M = -1.31$ ,  $SD = 2.30$ ),  $t(99) = 3.64$ ,  $p < .001$ , and marginally lower for the market-pricing condition ( $M = -.51$ ,  $SD = 1.89$ ),  $t(92) = 1.70$ ,  $p = .09$ . Liking for Participant B was marginally lower in the petty communal-sharing condition than in the market-pricing condition,  $t(99) = -1.95$ ,  $p = .06$ . In other words, liking for Participant B was the lowest when his or her transaction history involved petty exchanges with individuals.

**Perceived transactionality.** A one-way ANOVA using perceived transactionality as the dependent measure revealed a significant impact of condition,  $F(2, 145) = 29.63$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .29$ . Compared to those in the nonpetty communal-sharing condition ( $M = .07$ ,  $SD = .84$ ), participants viewed Participant B as more transactional than Participant A in the petty communal-sharing condition ( $M = 2.35$ ,  $SD = 1.83$ ),  $t(99) = -7.84$ ,  $p < .001$ , and in the market-pricing condition ( $M = 1.73$ ,  $SD = 1.65$ ),  $t(92) = -6.17$ ,  $p < .001$ . Perceived transactionality was marginally higher in the petty communal-sharing condition than in the market-pricing condition,  $t(99) = 1.78$ ,  $p = .08$ .

**Counternormativity.** We conducted two one-way ANOVAs using ratings for Participant A and for Participant B as the dependent measures. First, participants did not differ in how counternormative they found Participant A's actions,  $F(2, 144) = .37$ ,  $p =$




Figure 2. The indirect effect of petty exchange on liking through perceived transactionality, comparing the nonpetty communal-sharing condition to the petty communal-sharing condition. Values represent unstandardized coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. The coefficient above the path from nonpetty communal-sharing versus petty communal-sharing to liking represents the total effect with no mediator in the regression model; the coefficient below the path represents the direct effect when the mediator was inserted in the regression model. Dotted lines indicate no significant relationship. \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

.69,  $\eta_p^2 = .01$ . This should be the case, given that participants in all three conditions saw the same transaction history for Participant A. However, there was a difference in how counternormative participants perceived Participant B's actions to be,  $F(2, 145) = 14.55$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .17$ . Specifically, compared to participants in the nonpetty communal-sharing condition ( $M = 2.30$ ,  $SD = 1.57$ ), those in the petty communal-sharing ( $M = 4.02$ ,  $SD = 1.62$ ),  $t(99) = -5.40$ ,  $p < .001$ , and the market-pricing ( $M = 3.49$ ,  $SD = 1.68$ ),  $t(92) = -3.55$ ,  $p < .01$ , conditions viewed Participant B's actions to be significantly more counternormative. The latter two conditions did not differ,  $t(99) = 1.61$ ,  $p = .11$ , suggesting that perceptions of deviance from norms did not vary, whether precise amounts were exchanged in a communal-sharing or a market-pricing context.

**Fastidiousness.** The same analysis revealed a significant impact of condition on perceived fastidiousness,  $F(2, 145) = 20.77$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .22$ . Compared to those in the nonpetty communal-sharing condition ( $M = .10$ ,  $SD = .58$ ), participants viewed Participant B as more fastidious than Participant A in the petty communal-sharing condition ( $M = 2.12$ ,  $SD = 1.96$ ),  $t(99) = -6.82$ ,  $p < .001$ , and in the market-pricing condition ( $M = 1.61$ ,  $SD = 1.87$ ),  $t(92) = -5.30$ ,  $p < .001$ . Perceived fastidiousness did not differ among the two petty conditions,  $t(99) = 1.34$ ,  $p = .19$ .

**Mediation.** We conducted a multicategorical mediation analysis to test whether our proposed psychological driver—perceived transactionality—uniquely drove the relationship between petty behaviors and liking. We used indicator coding with the nonpetty communal-sharing condition as the reference group and simultaneously entered transactionality, fastidiousness, and counternormativity as three competing mediators. A 5,000-sample bootstrap analysis showed that the 95% bias-corrected confidence interval

(CI) for the size of the indirect effect excluded zero for the difference between the nonpetty communal-sharing condition and the petty communal-sharing condition (95% CI  $[-1.65, -.13]$ ) and for the difference between the nonpetty communal-sharing condition and the market-pricing condition (95% CI  $[-1.25, -.13]$ ) for transactionality, suggesting a significant indirect effect (Preacher & Hayes, 2004), but not for fastidiousness (nonpetty communal-sharing vs. petty communal-sharing: 95% CI  $[-1.17, .12]$ ; nonpetty communal-sharing vs. market-pricing: 95% CI  $[-.87, .09]$ ) and counternormativity (nonpetty communal-sharing vs. petty communal-sharing: 95% CI  $[-.12, .58]$ ; nonpetty communal-sharing vs. market-pricing: 95% CI  $[-.07, .45]$ ). Transactionality also mediated the difference in liking between the two petty conditions (95% CI  $[.01, .72]$ ). This result suggests that petty behaviors are associated with greater transactionality and, in turn, reduced liking in communal-sharing contexts compared to market-pricing contexts. In sum, these findings suggest that transactionality—but not fastidiousness and counternormativity—explain the negative impact of pettiness on liking (see Figure 2).

### Study 3: Being Petty With Time

In addition to money, time is another resource that individuals frequently spend on one another (Mogilner, Chance, & Norton, 2012). Rather than operationalizing pettiness by the precision of the amount given (with precision being one facet of our definition of pettiness), Study 3 operationalized pettiness via a behavior that directly signals intentional attention to details (with intentionality being a second facet of our definition): imposing a timer to precisely monitor the amount of time spent. We expected that the very act of setting a timer would signal pettiness and lead individuals to behave less positively toward this petty actor. In addi-

tion, Study 3 again assessed perceived transactionality as a mediating mechanism underlying the negative impact of pettiness.

## Method

**Participants.** This study was completed by 312 participants (51% male;  $M_{\text{age}} = 35.7$ ,  $SD = 11.4$ ) who were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk.

**Design and procedure.** The study had a two-condition, between-subjects design: petty versus nonpetty. All participants were informed that they would interact with a partner throughout the experiment. After creating a username for this purpose, participants then waited for 25 s to receive their match. After they were ostensibly matched with a partner, they were informed:

In this next part of this study, we will assign one of you to be the "advice giver" and another to be the "advice receiver." The "advice giver" may be asked to give advice to the "advice receiver" about how to best use Mechanical Turk.

They then waited for 10 s to learn which role they would be taking.

All participants were informed that they received the role of the advice giver. They were further informed:

In the past, we have asked advice givers to spend one minute to complete the task. The average completion time, however, has been 58 seconds, meaning that some participants do not spend the full 60 seconds to do the task. Your partner has also been informed about this fact.

If they were assigned to the nonpetty condition, they were told, "To make sure you spend 60 seconds, we will be using a timer if you are chosen to complete this task"; if they were assigned to the petty condition, they were told: "To make sure you spend 60 seconds, your partner has specifically requested that we use a timer if you are chosen to complete this task." In other words, all participants were informed that they would be timed, but the party imposing this timer varied by condition: their partners (the petty condition) or the researchers (the nonpetty condition).

Participants then completed a task that involved splitting positive and negative tasks between themselves and their partners (Gray, Ward, & Norton, 2014). Specifically, they read:

We have four tasks that we would like you and your partner to complete. There are two "fun" tasks (reading humorous pieces and rating them) and two "boring" tasks (identifying all vowels in foreign texts). We are asking you to assign your partner which two tasks he/she should complete. Your decision will be confidential; that is, your partner will not know that you are the one that had decided which tasks he/she would be completing. Any remaining tasks will be completed by you. For example, if you assign your partner 2 fun tasks, you will be completing 2 boring tasks.

They then indicated their allocation decision. Participants also answered four questions about their partner: (1) how much they liked their partner on a scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 10 (*Extremely*), (2) how generous they thought their partner was on a scale from 1 (*Not at all generous*) to 10 (*Extremely generous*), (3) what their overall impression of their partner was on a scale from 1 (*Extremely negative*) to 10 (*Extremely positive*), and (4) how annoying they thought their partner was on a scale from 1 (*Not at all annoying*) to 10 (*Extremely annoying*). We averaged these items

into a composite liking score ( $\alpha = .82$ ) with reverse coding on the annoyance item.

We also included four measures assessing perceived transactionality (adapted from Shore et al., 2006): (1) to what extent the giver's action felt like a business transaction, (2) how transactional the giver was in choosing how to act, (3) how much the giver's action felt like strictly an economic one, and (4) how much the giver's action felt impersonal on a scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 10 (*Very much*;  $\alpha = .93$ ). As a manipulation check, participants rated how petty they thought their partner was on a scale from 1 (*Not at all petty*) to 10 (*Extremely petty*).

## Results

As intended, participants in the petty condition (i.e., a timer imposed by their partners) rated their partners as significantly pettier than did those in the nonpetty condition (a timer imposed by the experimenter ( $M_{\text{petty}} = 4.63$ ,  $SD = 2.96$ , vs.  $M_{\text{nonpetty}} = 2.82$ ,  $SD = 2.23$ ),  $t(310) = -6.07$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = .69$ ).

It is important to note that participants in the petty condition liked their partners less ( $M_{\text{petty}} = 5.38$ ,  $SD = 1.81$ , vs.  $M_{\text{nonpetty}} = 6.35$ ,  $SD = 1.15$ ),  $t(310) = 5.57$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = .99$ , and assigned their partners more boring tasks compared to those in the nonpetty condition ( $M_{\text{petty}} = 1.35$ ,  $SD = .58$ , vs.  $M_{\text{nonpetty}} = 1.18$ ,  $SD = .64$ ),  $t(310) = -2.48$ ,  $p = .01$ ,  $d = -.28$ . Furthermore, they found their partners to be more transactional ( $M_{\text{petty}} = 6.01$ ,  $SD = 2.52$ , vs.  $M_{\text{nonpetty}} = 4.72$ ,  $SD = 2.47$ ),  $t(310) = -4.56$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = .52$ .

Conducting a 5,000-sample bootstrap analysis revealed that perceived transactionality mediates the relationship between pettiness and liking. The 95% bias-corrected confidence interval for the size of the indirect effect excluded zero (95% CI [-.36, -.09]), suggesting a significant indirect effect (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Furthermore, perceived transactionality and liking serially mediated the relationship between pettiness and task assignment (95% CI [.06, .18]).

## Study 4: Can People Be Both Petty and Generous?

Study 4 investigated whether petty individuals are penalized even when they are objectively more generous. We recruited individuals who were single to assess a potential date based on how their romantic prospect offered to give their time. We predicted that being petty with time—in this case, offering more precise meeting times—would diminish interest in meeting with their romantic prospect. Most important, we tested whether objectively more generous but petty behavior—that is, giving more time but in a precise amount—could be perceived as worse than giving objectively less time but in a nonpetty manner.

## Method

**Participants.** For this study, 230 participants whose marital status was single (51% male;  $M_{\text{age}} = 30.1$ ,  $SD = 10.16$ ) were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk.

**Design and procedure.** The study had a three-condition, between-subjects design, in which participants learned about a romantic prospect who offered to help someone else from 1:00 p.m. until 2:56 p.m. (stingy-petty), 3:04 p.m. (generous-petty), or

3:00 p.m. (nonpetty). At the beginning of the survey, participants responded to a few demographic questions, one of which included a question about marital status; only those who indicated that they were single proceeded to complete the study.

Participants were informed:

We are marketing researchers from a dating website, MatchActually.com. MatchActually.com, currently in its beta-testing mode, uses a novel matching system. Specifically, all users will be asked to respond to a few, randomly selected scenarios to find its users a perfect match. Today, you will be viewing a profile of someone in your area. For us to find you a good match, please fill out the form below.

In addition to indicating their five-digit zip code, which gender they preferred to be matched with, and what their profile ID would be, participants also responded to various questions typically asked on a dating website. These questions included (1) “My self-summary (Write a little about yourself);” (2) “What I am doing with my life (Don’t over think; Tell us what you are doing, day to day);” (3) “If you could, which superpower would you have?”; and (4) “If you could meet anyone in this world, who would it be?” To increase realism, we also asked for their contact information, depending on how they wanted to be contacted (i.e., phone, e-mail, or Mechanical Turk messaging), in case there was a match.

After waiting for 12 s while a match was being ostensibly generated, participants viewed one of three profiles. These profiles were matched based on information participants provided about their own gender and gender preferences for their partner, such that if a male or female participant was looking for a male partner, the profile indicated that their match, Samuel\_0426, was looking for single men or women, respectively; similarly, if a male or female participant was looking for a female partner, the profile indicated

that their match, Samantha\_0426, was looking for single men or women, respectively.

The profile included personal details about the match we generated for participants, including responses to the following target scenario (see Figure 3): “Your friend is moving to a new home this Saturday and needs some help with moving large pieces of furniture. He/she texts you, asking if you are free to help. What would you text back?” For those in the stingy-petty condition, the match had indicated “I can help for 1 hour and 56 minutes—from 1 pm to 2:56 pm,” whereas those in the generous-petty condition saw that their match had indicated 2 hr and 4 min—from 1 p.m. to 3:04 p.m. Finally, those in the nonpetty condition saw that their match had indicated 2 hr—from 1 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Our primary variable of interest was participants’ willingness to go on a date with their match. They indicated “yes” or “no” and were told that we would contact them if their match also expressed interest.

## Results

We conducted a logistic regression to examine whether willingness to date the target varied as a function of pettiness. To do so, we used the nonpetty condition as the reference group by creating two dummy-coded variables (one variable with the stingy-petty condition coded as 1 and the other conditions coded as 0; the other variable with the generous-petty condition coded as 1 and the other conditions coded as 0) and included them as simultaneous predictors in the regression analysis. This analysis revealed that willingness to date in the two petty conditions differed significantly from those in the nonpetty condition. Participants in the stingy-petty condition were less willing to date the match (44.7%) compared to



Figure 3. One of the images used in Study 4. See the online article for the color version of this figure.

those in the nonpetty condition (61.5%;  $b = .68$ , Wald's  $\chi^2 = 4.32$ ,  $p = .04$ ,  $OR = 1.98$ ). Most important for our account, those in the generous-petty condition (44.2%) approved their match at a lower rate than did those in the nonpetty condition ( $b = .71$ , Wald's  $\chi^2 = 4.65$ ,  $p = .03$ ,  $OR = 2.02$ ), even though the (petty) 3:04 match indicated that the person would spend objectively more time helping the friend.

### Study 5: Pettiness Across Cultures

In addition to providing additional evidence that petty behaviors can undermine objectively generous behaviors, Study 5 aimed to demonstrate the robustness of the petty construct across different cultures. We chose to compare Americans to people from Germanic regions based on previous research showing that the latter group tend to be less tolerant of ambiguity, increasing the likelihood that they value precise settling of debts (Hofstede, 1984). If people from Germanic regions continued to rate petty behavior poorly, these results would offer support for the robustness of the negative impact of pettiness across cultures.

### Method

**Participants.** Using an online survey panel from Qualtrics, we surveyed participants from the United States ( $N = 430$ ) and from the Germanic region (Austria, Germany, and Switzerland;  $N = 426$ ). We first targeted participants from the Germanic region and then from the United States, matching the U.S. sample to the Germanic based on gender, age, and household income.

**Design and procedure.** Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: nonpetty or petty. Participants in each condition read about four nonpetty or petty actors, respectively. To increase generalizability, the scenarios varied in terms of actor identity and the resource being exchanged. Actors in all four petty scenarios offered an objectively more generous amount than did the actors in the corresponding nonpetty scenarios. Our primary dependent measure was the extent to which participants wanted to be friends with the focal actor.

Participants who were in the nonpetty [petty] condition saw the following four scenarios:

1. Last week, you helped your neighbor with moving large pieces of furniture. As a thank you, the neighbor e-mails you a gift card to a local café, which contains the following value: \$5.00 [\$5.15].
2. Last weekend, you drove a friend to a wedding 30 minutes away. During the middle of the trip, you pull into the gas station that lists the following prices: Regular: \$3.09; Premium: \$3.29. As you pull into the gas station, your friend says: "Thanks for driving me over—I'll get this. Does regular work?" [Does premium work? This way, it will come out to be about the same amount as if I had taken a round trip bus ride]."
3. Your former college roommate works as an interior designer. You are hoping to redesign your living room so you e-mail to ask her if she has some time to chat this weekend. She emails you back the following: "I will be happy to help! I can chat this Saturday from 3:00pm to 3:30pm [3:12pm to 3:53pm]."
4. At your work, you are part of a program in which you and your designated mentor meet once a week. This week, you and your mentor meet for half an hour, but you have more questions.

In response to your question on whether he would be willing to stay for a little longer, he says the following: "Sure, I can stay for 10 [13] more minutes."

Note that Germanic participants saw the above dollar amounts in their currency (e.g., \$5.00 to €5.00 or CHF5.00).

For each scenario, participants were asked to indicate how much they wanted to be close friends with the focal actor on a scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 10 (*Very much*). As a manipulation check, participants also rated how petty they thought the focal actor was in each scenario on a scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 10 (*Extremely*; see the online supplemental materials for additional measures and analyses).

### Results

As predicted, a repeated-measures ANOVA with pettiness as a between-subjects factor and scenarios as a within-subject factor revealed that across four scenarios, participants in the petty condition ( $M = 5.02$ ,  $SD = 2.28$ ) rated the givers as significantly pettier than did those in the nonpetty condition ( $M = 3.90$ ,  $SD = 2.31$ ),  $F(1,854) = 1,074.39$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .06$ . The same analysis revealed that those in the petty condition ( $M = 5.49$ ,  $SD = 1.91$ ) expressed a significantly lower desire to be friends with the giver than did those in the nonpetty condition ( $M = 5.87$ ,  $SD = 1.92$ ),  $F(1,854) = 124.54$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .01$ .

Moreover, these patterns persisted across cultures. There were no significant interactions between condition and culture (American vs. Germanic),  $F(1,852) = .33$ ,  $p = .57$ ,  $\eta_p^2 < .001$ , and the negative impact of pettiness on liking persisted across both cultures,  $F(1,852) = 8.16$ ,  $p = .004$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .01$ . In other words, despite previously documented cultural differences in relationship norms and outcomes, we found evidence that petty behavior in communal-sharing exchange is viewed uniformly negatively.

These findings further support our account that generosity and pettiness are distinct across cultural contexts: Individuals can be objectively more generous but still be perceived as petty—and therefore unlikable.

### Study 6: The Moderating Role of Intentionality

To further demonstrate the critical role of intentionality in attributions of pettiness, Study 6 tested whether providing an alternative reason behind petty behaviors could mitigate the negative impact of pettiness. As in Studies 2B and 3, we hypothesized that when people infer that actors are being intentionally petty (giving a gift card where they took time to indicate they wished to give precisely \$13.50), they would perceive the relationship as more transactional, negatively affecting the relationship. However, we expected that providing an alternative reason for a seemingly petty decision—a decision aid that offers giving that same petty amount (\$13.50) as an option—would make choosing a petty option seem less intentional, mitigating the negative impact of pettiness on interpersonal evaluations.

### Method

**Participants.** This study included 301 participants (50.7% male;  $M_{\text{age}} = 38.2$ ,  $SD = 13.06$ ) recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk.

**Design and procedure.** Participants were randomized into one of three conditions: (1) nonpetty nonintentional, (2) petty nonintentional, and (3) petty intentional. Participants in the nonpetty [petty] condition read that they received a gift card of \$10 [\$13.50] from their neighbor Jamie in return for a favor: helping to move large pieces of furniture. Participants then read the following: “You go onto the café’s website, and find the following information for purchasing gift cards online. Jamie could choose one of the options or select an amount of his choice.” Those in the two nonintentional conditions saw \$10, \$13.50, and \$15 as options, such that Jamie’s choice of \$10 or \$13.50 could be attributed at least in part to the website’s payment options rather than Jamie’s intention (see Figure 4). However, those in the petty intentional condition saw only \$10 and \$15 as options, such that Jamie would have had to intentionally enter the value of \$13.50.

Participants then answered the same four questions from Study 1 about Jamie—concerning liking, generous, overall impression, and annoying (reverse-coded)—in random order, which we averaged into a composite liking score ( $\alpha = .88$ ). We also included in random order the same measure of perceived transactionality as in Study 3, adapted to a gift card scenario (e.g., “To what extent does this gift card feel like a business transaction?”;  $\alpha = .88$ ). As a manipulation check, participants rated Jamie on pettiness. All measures were on 10-point Likert scales.

## Results

**Pettiness.** A one-way ANOVA revealed a significant impact of condition on perceived pettiness of the giver’s behavior,  $F(2, 298) = 8.73, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .06$ . As expected, participants in the petty intentional condition perceived the giver as significantly pettier ( $M = 4.37, SD = 2.72$ ) than did those in the nonpetty nonintentional condition ( $M = 2.83, SD = 2.49$ ),  $t(198) = -4.19, p < .001, d = .60$ , as well as those in the petty nonintentional condition ( $M = 3.46, SD = 2.66$ ),  $t(198) = -2.41, p = .02, d = .34$ . In other words, rerouting the giver’s intentionality made the giver’s action seem less petty. Pettiness ratings for the nonpetty nonintentional condition were marginally lower than those for the petty nonintentional condition,  $t(200) = -1.72, p = .09, d = .24$ .

**Liking.** A one-way ANOVA using liking as the dependent variable revealed a significant impact of condition,  $F(2, 298) = 4.89, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .03$ . Specifically, participants in the petty intentional condition liked the giver less ( $M = 6.05, SD = 1.84$ ) than did those in the nonpetty nonintentional condition ( $M = 6.82, SD = 1.68$ ),  $t(198) = 3.08, p = .002, d = .44$ , and, of importance, than did those in the petty nonintentional condition ( $M = 6.68,$

$SD = 2.02$ ),  $t(198) = 2.32, p = .02, d = .33$ . The latter two conditions did not differ,  $t(200) = .30, p = .51, d = .07$ . Simply put, the negative impact of pettiness (in this context, giving a gift card of \$13.50) on liking was mitigated when participants learned that \$13.50 was one of the options that the giver could choose.

**Perceived transactionality.** The same analysis revealed a significant impact of condition on perceived transactionality,  $F(2, 298) = 14.94, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .09$ . Participants in the petty intentional condition perceived the giver as significantly more transactional ( $M = 5.19, SD = 2.41$ ) than did those in the nonpetty nonintentional condition ( $M = 3.45, SD = 2.02$ ),  $t(198) = -5.53, p < .001, d = .79$ , and also than did those in the petty nonintentional condition ( $M = 4.13, SD = 2.34$ ),  $t(198) = 3.15, p < .01, d = .45$ . Perceived transactionality was higher in the petty nonintentional condition than in the nonpetty nonintentional condition,  $t(200) = -2.21, p = .03, d = .31$ .

**Mediation.** To provide additional evidence for our proposed process account, we conducted a multicategorical mediation analysis using indicator coding with the nonpetty nonintentional condition as the reference group. A 5,000-sample bootstrap analysis showed that the 95% bias-corrected confidence interval for the size of the indirect effect excludes zero for the difference between the nonpetty nonintentional condition and the petty intentional condition (95% CI  $[-.89, -.38]$ ), as well as for the difference between the nonpetty nonintentional condition and the petty nonintentional condition (95% CI  $[-.48, -.03]$ ), suggesting a significant indirect effect (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Transactionality also mediated the difference in liking between the two petty conditions (95% CI  $[-.63, -.15]$ ). This result suggests that petty behaviors with intentionality are associated with greater transactionality compared to the same behaviors without intentionality and, in turn, with lower liking.

## General Discussion

Seven studies identified a novel exchange norm in social exchanges: Pettiness negatively influences communal-sharing relationships, across different measures—from liking to romantic interest to willingness to engage in altruistic behaviors—and different cultures. Critically, we demonstrated that pettiness as a construct is distinct from generosity or stinginess: Even when people gave objectively larger or smaller amounts of money or time, doing so in a petty manner exerted an independent negative effect on relationships. We also documented an underlying mechanism: Intentional petty exchanges in communal-sharing relationships led people to perceive that behavior as more transactional,




Figure 4. Images used in Study 6 for the intentional (Panel a) and nonintentional (Panel b) conditions.

undermining relationships. Finally, we also showed that although other related constructs such as conscientiousness and fastidiousness do predict people's ratings of others, they do not play a mediating role in the effect of pettiness on social evaluation.

Our investigation offers several directions for future research. First, although we have identified one way to preempt the negative impact of petty exchange, there may be instances in which petty behaviors may boost relationship quality. For example, imbuing trivial details with significant meaning (e.g., giving a gift card of \$33 to a friend for her 33rd birthday), or making clear one's underlying thought motivating the behavior could make attention to details feel less transactional. Second, there may be situations in which choosing not to be petty can backfire; for example, nonpetty actions may in some instances lead people to infer carelessness and untrustworthiness. Furthermore, as an increasing number of individuals become familiar with digital payment platforms, attitudes about petty exchanges may shift over time, such that what may be considered as petty by many today may, in the future, be considered normative. As a result, generational differences in attitudes toward petty exchanges may begin to emerge—though we note that across our studies, age of participants did not play a moderating role ( $ps > .19$ ). In sum, future research should explore different factors that may influence the success or failure of social exchange, expanding the understanding of exchange dynamics.

We note that conscientiousness is associated with higher relationship satisfaction for both people who are conscientious themselves and those who have conscientious partners (Dyrenforth, Kashy, Donnellan, & Lucas, 2010; Malouff, Thorsteinsson, Schutte, Bhullar, & Rooke, 2010), consistent with our results from Study 1. Although attention to detail is typical of individuals high in conscientiousness, our results suggest that these often-positive behaviors can have negative effects when such attention is applied to trivial details in social exchanges (e.g., keeping track of the exact amount spent on a date), reflective of people's general preference to exclude market-pricing transactions from everyday relationships (Kozinets, 2002).

Finally, prior research has demonstrated that introducing money into social exchange can reduce people's generosity (Heyman & Ariely, 2004) and cause them to be more resistant to egalitarian allocation of resources (DeVoe & Iyengar, 2010). Although these results suggest that excluding money from communal-sharing relationships may offer one way to preserve them, the modern economy makes it nearly impossible to eliminate money in any relationships, communal-sharing or market-pricing—a trend exacerbated by the rise of new online payment services, as noted earlier. Although being generous with money offers one means to reduce the negative impact of finance on friendship, our results suggest a different and subtle danger for communal-sharing relationships: Inferring pettiness from a partner's attention to trivial details can transform individuals' perception of a relationship into a transactional one even when money is given generously. In sum, when expending resources on others, givers should monitor not only how much they exchange but the manner in which they exchange it.

## References

Abramowitz, J. S., Deacon, B. J., Olatunji, B. O., Wheaton, M. G., Berman, N. C., Losardo, D., . . . Hale, L. R. (2010). Assessment of obsessive-


- compulsive symptom dimensions: Development and evaluation of the Dimensional Obsessive-Compulsive Scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 22, 180–198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018260>
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1–26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x>
- Belk, R. W. (1976). It's the thought that counts: A signed digraph analysis of gift-giving. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 3, 155–162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/208662>
- Caplow, T. (1982). Christmas gifts and kin networks. *American Sociological Review*, 47, 383–392. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2094994>
- Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. (1993). The difference between communal and exchange relationships: What it is and is not. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 684–691. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167293196003>
- Cotterell, N., Eisenberger, R., & Speicher, H. (1992). Inhibiting effects of reciprocity wariness on interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 658–668. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.62.4.658>
- DePaulo, B. M., & Kashy, D. A. (1998). Everyday lies in close and casual relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 63–79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.63>
- DeVoe, S. E., & Iyengar, S. S. (2010). Medium of exchange matters: What's fair for goods is unfair for money. *Psychological Science*, 21, 159–162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797609357749>
- Dunn, E. W., Aknin, L. B., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Spending money on others promotes happiness. *Science*, 319, 1687–1688. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1150952>
- Dyrenforth, P. S., Kashy, D. A., Donnellan, M. B., & Lucas, R. E. (2010). Predicting relationship and life satisfaction from personality in nationally representative samples from three countries: The relative importance of actor, partner, and similarity effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99, 690–702. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020385>
- Fiske, A. P. (1991). Structures of social life. *The four elementary forms of human relations: Communal sharing, authority ranking, equality matching, market pricing*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psychological Review*, 99, 689–723. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.99.4.689>
- Flynn, F. J. (2003). How much should I give and how often? The effects of generosity and frequency of favor exchange on social status and productivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 539–553. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/30040648>
- Flynn, F. J., & Adams, G. S. (2009). Money can't buy love: Asymmetric beliefs about gift price and feelings of appreciation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 404–409. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.11.003>
- Gneezy, U., & Rustichini, A. (2000). Pay enough or don't pay at all. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115, 791–810. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/003355300554917>
- Gould, J., & Gould, C. (1989). *Sexual selection*. New York, NY: Scientific American Library.
- Gray, K., Ward, A. F., & Norton, M. I. (2014). Paying it forward: Generalized reciprocity and the limits of generosity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143, 247–254. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031047>
- Hendrick, S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 50, 93–98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/352430>
- Heyman, J., & Ariely, D. (2004). Effort for payment: A tale of two markets. *Psychological Science*, 15, 787–793. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00757.x>
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Jansen, C. J., & Pollmann, M. M. (2001). On round numbers: Pragmatic aspects of numerical expressions. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 8, 187–201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1076/jqul.8.3.187.4095>
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 102–138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Kozinets, R. V. (2002). Can consumers escape the market? Emancipatory illuminations from burning man. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29, 20–38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/339919>
- Malouff, J. M., Thorsteinsson, E. B., Schutte, N. S., Bhullar, N., & Rooke, S. E. (2010). The five-factor model of personality and relationship satisfaction of intimate partners: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 124–127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.09.004>
- Mason, M. F., Lee, A. J., Wiley, E. A., & Ames, D. R. (2013). Precise offers are potent anchors: Conciliatory counteroffers and attributions of knowledge in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 759–763. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.02.012>
- Mogilner, C., Chance, Z., & Norton, M. I. (2012). Giving time gives you time. *Psychological Science*, 23, 1233–1238. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797612442551>
- Paul, K. (2016). *Venmo is turning our friends into petty jerks*. Retrieved from <http://qz.com/687395/venmo-is-turning-our-friends-into-petty-jerks/>
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 36, 717–731.
- Samuel, D. B., Riddell, A. D., Lynam, D. R., Miller, J. D., & Widiger, T. A. (2012). A five-factor measure of obsessive-compulsive personality traits. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 94, 456–465. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.677885>
- Shore, L. M., Tetrick, L. E., Lynch, P., & Barksdale, K. (2006). Social and economic exchange: Construct development and validation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 837–867. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00046.x>
- Vohs, K. D., Mead, N. L., & Goode, M. R. (2006). The psychological consequences of money. *Science*, 314, 1154–1156. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1132491>

## Appendix A

### Filter Question for Study 2B

For us to make sure that you are actually a Venmo user, please log into your Venmo account. Please log in and click on the menu icon (where the red arrow is pointing).



Which of the following **does not** appear on this menu? (correct answer: C)

- Invite Friends
- Purchases
- Frequently Asked Questions
- Settings
- Transfer to Bank

(Appendices continue)

**Appendix B**  
**Study 2B Stimuli**

Stimuli for the nonpetty communal-sharing (Panel a), petty communal-sharing (Panel b), and market-pricing (Panel c) conditions.

a)

Participant A		Participant B	
Pay or Request		Pay or Request	
Feed Between You		Feed Between You	
TK	You paid Celia Wood 4d Like Comment 1 <b>-10.00</b>	TK	You paid Julia Moore 4d Like Comment 1 <b>-10.00</b>
TK	You paid Tim White Sep 10 Like Comment <b>-35.00</b>	TK	You paid John Corbett Sep 10 Like Comment <b>-35.00</b>
TK	You paid Delia Rose Jun 29 Like Comment <b>-20.00</b>	TK	You paid Emily Wolfords Jun 29 Like Comment <b>-20.00</b>

b)

Participant A		Participant B	
Pay or Request		Pay or Request	
Feed Between You		Feed Between You	
TK	You paid Celia Wood 4d Like Comment 1 <b>-10.00</b>	TK	You paid Julia Moore 4d Like Comment 1 <b>-9.99</b>
TK	You paid Tim White Sep 10 Like Comment <b>-35.00</b>	TK	You paid John Corbett Sep 10 Like Comment <b>-34.95</b>
TK	You paid Delia Rose Jun 29 Like Comment <b>-20.00</b>	TK	You paid Emily Wolfords Jun 29 Like Comment <b>-20.06</b>

c)

Participant A		Participant B	
Pay or Request		Pay or Request	
Feed Between You		Feed Between You	
TK	You paid Celia Wood 4d Like Comment 1 <b>-10.00</b>	TK	You transferred to your bank 4d Like Comment 1 <b>-9.99</b>
TK	You paid Tim White Sep 10 Like Comment <b>-35.00</b>	TK	You transferred to your bank Sep 10 Like Comment <b>-34.95</b>
TK	You paid Delia Rose Jun 29 Like Comment <b>-20.00</b>	TK	You transferred to your bank Jun 29 Like Comment <b>-20.06</b>

Received October 28, 2017  
Revision received March 19, 2018  
Accepted April 24, 2018 ■