



ASSOCIATION FOR CONSUMER RESEARCH

Labovitz School of Business & Economics, University of Minnesota Duluth, 11 E. Superior Street, Suite 210, Duluth, MN 55802

How Surprisingly Little Thoughts Count in Gift-Giving: on Receiver'S Motivated Appreciation For Giver'S Thoughts

Yan Zhang, National University of Singapore, Singapore

Nicholas Epley, University of Chicago, USA

Although people say “it is the thought that counts” for a gift, thoughts count for very little unless gift receivers were motivated or otherwise triggered to consider a gift giver’s thoughts, such as when a friend’s gift has relatively little objective value, or is considered to be objectively undesirable.

[to cite]:

Yan Zhang and Nicholas Epley (2011) , "How Surprisingly Little Thoughts Count in Gift-Giving: on Receiver'S Motivated Appreciation For Giver'S Thoughts", in NA - Advances in Consumer Research Volume 39, eds. Rohini Ahluwalia, Tanya L. Chartrand, and Rebecca K. Ratner, Duluth, MN : Association for Consumer Research, Pages: 213-214.

[url]:

<http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/1009990/volumes/v39/NA-39>

[copyright notice]:

This work is copyrighted by The Association for Consumer Research. For permission to copy or use this work in whole or in part, please contact the Copyright Clearance Center at <http://www.copyright.com/>.

When Gifts Go Unappreciated

Chair: Mary Steffel, University of Florida, USA

Paper #1: How Surprisingly Little Thoughts Count in Gift-Giving: On Receiver's Motivated Appreciation for Giver's Thoughts

Yan Zhang, National University of Singapore, Singapore
Nicholas Epley, University of Chicago, USA

Paper #2: Social Comparison in Decisions for Others: Considering Multiple Gift Recipients Leads to Unique but Less-Liked Gifts

Mary Steffel, University of Florida, USA
Robyn LeBoeuf, University of Florida, USA

Paper #3: When Do Gifts Help Charitable Giving and When Do They Hurt?

George E. Newman, Yale University, USA
Y. Jeremy Shen, Yale University, USA

SESSION OVERVIEW

Consumers invest considerable time and money annually on selecting gifts for others: The average American spends 15 hours gift shopping and more than \$800 on gifts during the holidays alone, according to Consumer Reports. Despite the considerable investment made by givers, these gifts often fail to have the intended effect on recipients. According to Waldfogel (1993), gifts produce about 10% less satisfaction than would have been produced if the recipients had spent the same amount on themselves. The objective of this symposium is to explore the how discrepancies between giver and recipient perspectives can lead givers to invest time and resources into gifts that fail to have the intended effect on recipients.

First, Yan Zhang and Nicholas Epley will demonstrate that although gift givers believe that investing more thought into gifts will increase recipient appreciation, thoughts count for very little unless gift receivers are motivated or otherwise triggered to consider a gift giver's thoughts, such as when a friend's gift has relatively little objective value, or is considered to be objectively undesirable. Next, Mary Steffel and Robyn LeBeouf will show that, when givers select gifts for multiple recipients, they strive to personalize gifts so as to convey an understanding of recipients' unique identities. Yet this leads them to pass up gifts that would be better liked in favor of unique gifts, even when recipients will never compare gifts. George Newman and Y. Jeremy Shen will then show that, contrary to the common-sense notion that offering a thank-you gift might encourage reciprocity, in the context of charitable giving, people are actually less likely to donate when they are given a thank-you gift for donation. Finally, for the last 15 minutes of the session, Susan Broniarczyk will provide comments on the talks and discuss broader themes and future research directions.

Together, these studies contribute to consumer theory by illuminating how psychological factors such as attention, motivation, comparisons, and incentives lead gift givers to invest time and resources into gifts that fail to have the intended effect on recipient liking and reciprocation. They further suggest practical advice to givers for better anticipating when to give a gift, what gift to give, and how to present it in such a way as to elicit the intended response. This research is of broad interest to researchers in consumer psychology in general and to researchers in gift giving, prosocial behavior, and judgment and decision making in particular.

How Surprisingly Little Thoughts Count in Gift-Giving: On Receiver's Motivated Appreciation for Giver's Thoughts

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Gift-giving is a social exchange that includes both the objective value of a gift as well as the symbolic meaning of the exchange itself. The objective value of a gift is sometimes considered to be of secondary importance in people's evaluations of a gift, as when people claim, "it's the thought that counts," suggesting that a thoughtful gift will be appreciated more than a thoughtless gift. Based on this belief, gift givers spend a lot of time and effort to choose or design gifts, expecting that their time and effort will be appreciated when the gift is delivered.

However, because it often takes motivation and attentional resources to consider another person's thoughts, we predicted that thoughts would count for very little in evaluating gift exchanges unless gift receivers were motivated or otherwise triggered to consider a gift giver's thoughts. The tendency to focus on one self's feeling suggests that how appreciative receivers feel toward a giver would be largely determined by how they feel about the gift, but not so much by factors that are not pertinent to the gift itself, such as giver's thoughts and intentions, suggesting that thoughts would count very little for receivers.

People only consider others' thought in certain situations. For instance, when others' behavior is inconsistent with one's expectations or social norms, people tend to make sense of such behaviors by appealing to underlying intentions, goals, or thoughts. In the context of gift giving and receiving, we suggest that gift receivers are motivated to think about givers' intentions and reasons of choosing a specific gift when they receive gifts that are undesirable, or of very little objective value. People usually expect to receive desirable gifts or gifts of some value to them. A gift that is undesirable or of very little objective value violates this expectation. If there is no objective value in another person's act of kindness, then a receiver would try to explain this seemingly meaningless act of kindness by justifying the symbolic meanings of this act. Receivers then shift their attention to givers' thoughts and underlying reasons of their gift choices. As a result, a receiver's gratitude would be largely influenced by the amount of apparent thought another person put into the act. Gift givers, on the other hand, are directly aware of the amount of thought they put into their gift, and therefore predict that their thoughts will "count" more than they actually do.

Four studies confirmed this prediction. In the first study, participants recalled either a past gift-giving or a gift-receiving experience. They were also instructed to recall either a liked or a disliked gift. As predicted, receivers' appreciation for desirable gifts was not correlated with how much thought they believed givers invested. For undesirable gifts, however, receivers' appreciation was highly correlated with how much thought they believed givers invested. Givers, on the contrary, predicted that their thought would be appreciated if receivers liked the gift, and that their thought would be dismissed if receivers disliked the gift. Response time results show that receivers took longer to answer the appreciation questions for undesirable gifts than for desirable gifts, suggesting that thinking about giver's thoughts takes extra effort from receivers. We replicated these results in a second study with Mother's Day gifts.

We further suggest that this inconsistency between givers and receivers would only happen between acquaintances but not strangers. For gifts given by strangers, receivers do not need to make sense of receiving an undesirable gift, so they would not consider giver's thoughts even when a gift is bad. Consistent with our predictions, a third study that involved real gift exchange returned results similar to the first two recall studies among acquaintances, but not among strangers.

The fourth experiment found that although thought counts very little in most cases, investing thoughts into a gift made givers feel more socially connected with receivers, which may help maintain and develop the relationship between givers and receivers.

This research has important implications in how to manage gift-exchanges. When choosing gifts, most people want their thoughts to be appreciated. However, our research shows that people receive extra credit for their thoughts only when they had chosen gifts disliked by receivers. Since a desirable gift is highly appreciated regardless of whether givers invest thoughts or not, maybe the most important thing for gift givers is to choose the right gift rather than investing enough thought. It is the thought that counts, this research suggests, but only when giving loved ones bad gifts.

Social Comparison in Decisions for Others: Considering Multiple Gift Recipients Leads to Personalized but Less-Liked Gifts

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Gift giving is a challenge, and sometimes, this challenge is compounded by having to choose gifts for multiple recipients. Having multiple recipients in mind not only means that more gifts are needed, but it may change what givers focus on when making gift selections. We hypothesize that, when people select gifts for multiple recipients, they focus on what differentiates the recipients instead of on what each would like best, leading givers to select unique gifts over gifts that would be better liked.

There are at least two reasons why such an effect might arise. First, givers may actually perceive recipients differently when they are presented together versus separately (e.g., Hsee 1996). Alternatively, givers may want to personalize gifts in order to convey an understanding of recipients' unique identities (e.g., Belk 1996; Schwartz 1967), and this personalization motive may be highlighted in the multiple-recipient context. Although it may be important to differentiate gifts when recipients are likely to compare gifts, if recipients are unlikely to do so, then it makes less sense for givers to pass up gifts that would be better liked in favor of unique gifts.

Studies 1-3 explore whether givers who are purchasing items for multiple recipients favor unique gifts over better liked gifts. In each study, givers selected a gift for one recipient or two unacquainted recipients from a list of options in which one gift would clearly be better liked by both recipients. For example, in one study, participants selected a birthday card for one or two recipients: the target recipient and another recipient who was shown laughing (suggesting that he had a better sense of humor). Although most givers in the one-recipient condition (70%) gave the target recipient the card that was rated funniest in a pre-test, in the two-recipient condition, only a minority gave him this card (26%), $\chi^2(1) = 9.03, p = .003$. This happened despite the fact that givers who gave one of the other cards predicted that the target recipient would enjoy that card less than did givers who gave the funny card, $t(45) = 2.38, p = .02, d = .68$.

Study 4 examined a perceptual account for the current effects. Givers either chose a gift for one friend, chose a gift for two friends,

or considered both friends but only choose a gift for one. One of the available gifts was clearly the most appropriate gift. Some givers gave an item and others predicted which item the recipient(s) would choose. A contrast analysis indicated that givers were less likely to give the target recipient the better gift when they selected gifts for both her and another recipient (42%) than when they considered the target recipient alone (86%) or considered both recipients but selected a gift for the target recipient only (82%), $z = 3.88, p < .001$. Givers predicted that the target recipient would choose the better gift for herself regardless of condition, $\chi^2(2, N = 168) = .42$. Thus, merely considering two people together does not alter perceptions of recipients' tastes and does not drive the tendency to differentiate gifts.

Studies 5 and 6 examined whether givers differentiate gifts to convey their understanding of recipients' identities. In Study 5, participants chose between the movies *Up!* and *Star Trek* for a recipient who had a main interest in animation and a secondary interest in science fiction. Participants chose which movie would convey a better understanding of the recipient. Half of each sample considered this choice in isolation, and the other half considered this choice in the context of having already chosen to give *Up!* to another friend. Fewer thought that *Up!* conveyed a better understanding of the target when they were also giving *Up!* to another recipient (52%) than when they were getting it only for the target recipient (97%), $\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 17.39, p < .001$.

In study 6, givers imagined selecting gifts for two close friends, for whom they would put considerable thought into their gift choices, or for two casual acquaintances. Both recipients preferred animated movies, but the target recipient had a secondary interest in science fiction. That target recipient was less likely to receive the better gift (the animated movie) in the close-friends condition (31%) than in the casual-acquaintances condition (47%), $\chi^2(1, N = 157) = 3.97, p < .05$, indicating that givers were less likely to diversify their gift choices for casual acquaintances. Thus, the more motivated givers are to put thought into their selections, the more likely they are pass up better liked gifts for unique gifts.

Finally, study 7 explored whether focusing givers' attention on recipient liking, by asking them to first predict which items recipients would choose for themselves, might encourage givers to select gifts that maximize recipient liking. Indeed, givers who first predicted which items recipients would choose for themselves were more willing to give two recipients the same gift than those in the control condition, who were more likely to diversify their gift selections. (Seventy-six percent gave the target recipient the better gift in the predict-liking condition and 54% did so in the control condition, $\chi^2(1, N = 73) = 3.93, p < .05$.)

In sum, the social context in which a gift is selected influences gift choices. When people select gifts for multiple recipients, they focus on what differentiates recipients rather than what each recipient would like best. This leads givers to pass up gifts that they believe would be better liked for unique gifts. This tendency is rooted in the motivation to convey an understanding of recipients' unique identities and is ameliorated by encouraging givers to consider which items recipients would choose for themselves.

REFERENCES

- Belk, Russell W. (1996), "The Perfect Gift," in *Gift Giving: A Research Anthology*, ed. Cele Otnes and Richard F. Beltramini, Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.
- Hsee, Christopher K. (1996), "The Evaluability Hypothesis: An Explanation for Preference Reversals Between Joint and Separate Evaluations of Alternatives," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67, 3, 247-257.