

In press, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*

Cover Page/Corresponding Author Information:

Julian Givi

240-B Posner Hall

Carnegie Mellon University

Pittsburgh PA, 15213

412-498-1153

Word Count: 2,385 (Body) + 101 (Abstract) = 2,486

Why Certain Gifts Are Great to Give But Not to Get: A Framework for Understanding Errors in  
Gift Giving

Jeff Galak

Julian Givi<sup>1</sup>

Elanor F. Williams

**Authors' Note**

Jeff Galak ([jgalak@cmu.edu](mailto:jgalak@cmu.edu)) is Associate Professor of Marketing, Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA. Julian Givi ([jgivi@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:jgivi@andrew.cmu.edu)) is a Doctoral Candidate at the Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA. Elanor F. Williams ([ewilliams@ucsd.edu](mailto:ewilliams@ucsd.edu)) is an Assistant Research Scientist at the Rady School of Management at the University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA. All authors contributed equally and author order is determined alphabetically. Address correspondence to Julian Givi, 240-B Posner Hall, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh PA, 15213. We thank Ian Dennis for his work in designing Figure 1.

Abstract (101 Words): We propose that many giver-recipient discrepancies in the gift giving literature can be explained, at least partially, by the notion that when evaluating the quality of a gift, givers primarily focus on the ‘moment of exchange,’ whereas recipients primarily focus on how valuable a gift will be once owned. In this review, we summarize the variety of errors givers make, and, more critically, position these errors within our newly developed framework. We hope this framework will provide a single point of reference for those interested in gift giving and spur novel predictions about the causes and consequences of miscalibrated gift choice.

Key Words: Gift giving, Self-other decision-making, Prosocial behavior.

A prominent finding in social psychology is that people often err in their predictions of others' preferences (e.g., Hsee & Weber, 2007). In recent years, this self-other mismatch has been well documented in the domain of gift giving. Though gifts are typically given with the best of intentions, there can be major consequences for giving ill-chosen gifts. For instance, recipients become annoyed if a gift does not match their preferences, potentially weakening the relationship between giver and recipient (Dunn, Huntsinger, Lun, & Sinclair, 2008). At best, a poorly chosen gift will irritate the recipient, and at worst, drive the giver and recipient apart (Ruth, Otnes, & Brunel, 1999).

That said, research in this area lacks a unifying explanation for why such errors occur. In this review, we propose that many giver-recipient discrepancies can be at least partially explained by the notion that when evaluating the quality of a gift, givers primarily focus on the 'moment of the exchange,' whereas recipients instead mostly focus on how valuable a gift will be throughout their ownership of it. When considering what makes a gift "valuable," givers interpret that to mean that the gift will make the recipient feel delighted, impressed, surprised, and/or touched when they receive and open it, whereas recipients interpret value to be factors that allow them to better utilize and enjoy a gift during their subsequent ownership. Therefore, givers will prize aspects of a gift that make it seem optimal when initially gifted (e.g., surprise, desirability, etc.), while recipients will appreciate aspects of a gift that make it better to own (e.g., usefulness, versatility, etc.; see Figure 1). These errors can be more generally categorized as based on asymmetries in giver and recipient evaluations of particular 1) aspects of the gift; 2) aspects of the giver; or 3) aspects of the recipient.

In what follows, we review literature empirically documenting errors that gift givers make (see Table 1), suggest gift giving rules that givers are trying to satisfy in their gift choices, and discuss how our framework can explain many, if not all, of these errors.

## **GIFT GIVING ERRORS**

### **Aspects of the Gift**

Givers often try to ensure that their gifts meet certain criteria that will make them seem like “good gifts;” these criteria may or may not be valued by recipients. Papers exploring these errors investigate how certain qualities of a gift, like desirability and tangibility, are valued by givers and recipients.

Rule: Gifts should be desirable

*Existing Findings.* To many givers, a “good gift” is highly desirable. Thus, givers choose gifts that are more fun and less useful than recipients want (Williams & Rosenzweig, 2016), and gifts that are desirable (i.e., high quality) but not particularly feasible (i.e., easy to use), even though recipients prefer more feasible but less desirable gifts (Baskin, Wakslak, Trope, & Novemsky, 2014). Existing literature suggests this occurs because givers consider gifts through an abstract lens, while recipients construe gifts more concretely (Baskin et al., 2014).

*Current Framework.* When a giver chooses a highly desirable gift, they are hoping that the recipient will be dazzled when they open it. In contrast, recipients care greatly about their ability to use or enjoy the gift and prefer more feasible or useful gifts. In other words, givers choose overly desirable gifts because they seem likely to be more appreciated during the gift

exchange. However, the recipient is likely to be less satisfied in the end with a gift whose value is hard to extract.

Rule: Gifts should be enjoyed immediately

*Existing Findings.* Givers frequently choose gifts that can be enjoyed as soon as they are opened, choosing, for instance, a smaller bouquet of roses in bloom over a larger bouquet of buds (Yang & Urminsky, 2015) or a less expensive but fully-paid blender over an equal-value deposit toward a top-of-the-line blender (Kupor, Flynn, & Norton, 2016). Recipients, however, are willing to wait for the higher quality gift. This may occur because givers perceive complete gifts as more thoughtful, while recipients think better gifts are more thoughtful (even when incomplete; Kupor et al., 2016).

*Current Framework.* Partial but higher quality gifts may not be greatly appreciated when initially received, but provide more value whenever they are ready for consumption. In other words, givers view partial gifts negatively because of their lower ability to generate an immediate positive reaction. In contrast, recipients prefer higher quality gifts, regardless of completeness, because they will eventually provide the most value.

Rule: Gifts should be tangible

*Existing Finding.* Givers typically opt for material gifts, like an iPad or a sweater, but recipients derive more happiness from experiential gifts, like tickets to a basketball game or a nice dinner out. Givers may opt for material gifts because they require less knowledge of the recipient (Goodman & Lim, 2014).

*Current Framework.* Experiences are usually consumed after an exchange, whereas material gifts are frequently ready for use as soon as they are opened. Further, material gifts are more likely to be something that can be given to and opened by the recipient. To that end, givers are likely to favor material gifts because of their immediate utility. In contrast, experiential gifts, though actually preferred by recipients, are avoided by givers as they seem less likely to elicit a strong positive response at the moment of exchange.

### **Aspects of the Giver**

Givers hold certain beliefs about how they should act when choosing and giving gifts. These inputs by the giver, like the thought put into and price paid for a gift, are valued differently by givers and recipients.

Rule: Givers should surprise their recipients

*Existing Finding.* One mismatch occurs when givers predict recipients' appreciation of explicitly requested (e.g., a gift on a gift registry) versus unrequested (e.g., a gift thought of by the giver) gifts. Givers think recipients appreciate both kinds of gifts equally; however, gift recipients are more appreciative of gifts they request, because they think such gifts are more thoughtful (Gino & Flynn, 2011).

*Current Framework.* Givers value that an unrequested gift potentially can surprise the recipient when they open it, and demonstrates that the giver actively thought of, and searched for, a gift. That is, givers choose unrequested gifts believing that, even though a requested gift clearly matches the recipient's preferences, an unrequested gift will likely result in a particularly

positive gift exchange. Recipients, on the other hand, favor gifts they explicitly request, because such gifts will ultimately be most valuable.

Rule: Givers should be generous

*Existing Findings.* Givers err in predicting how much recipients value the resources expended to obtain a gift. Givers believe the amount of thought they put into a gift plays a significant part in the recipient's assessment of that gift, when the gift's absolute quality matters more. Givers know how they chose a gift, but recipients need a "trigger" to consider the giver's efforts (Zhang & Epley, 2012). Givers and recipients also differ in the importance they place on a gift's price. Givers think that more expensive gifts seem more thoughtful; recipients do not (Flynn & Adams, 2009).

*Current Framework.* Thoughtfulness and price are not necessarily predictive of how much a recipient will use or enjoy a gift, meaning they are unlikely to have a major impact on recipients' happiness with a gift while they consume it, and thus will not be valued by the recipient. Nonetheless, givers are more influenced by aspects that could impress the recipient upon opening it, such as price.

### **Aspects of the Recipient**

Givers often try to express something about the recipient in their gift choices, including their knowledge of the recipient and the importance of their relationship with them. Recipients do not always appreciate these expressions, however, leading to mismatches in gift preferences.

Rule: Gifts should reflect their recipients



*Existing Findings.* Givers prefer to give gifts that are tailored to reflect the recipient, like a gift card to the recipient's favorite store, whereas recipients prefer more versatile gifts, like a Visa gift card that can be used at any store. This may be because givers focus on recipients' distinctive traits, while recipients are perhaps more aware of their numerous, diverse wants and needs (Steffel, Williams, & LeBoeuf, 2015). Givers also sometime pass up gifts that are best in an absolute sense to instead select gifts reflecting each recipient's unique traits. For instance, a Pittsburgh resident who loves the Pittsburgh Steelers but also likes the Buffalo Bills might receive a Bills jersey from his neighbor, who knowingly chooses it based not on his strongest preference, but on his unique (relative to other Pittsburgh residents) preference for the Bills. Giving unique gifts to each recipient feels more thoughtful to the giver (Steffel & LeBoeuf, 2014), but ultimately can provide the recipients with inferior gifts.

*Current Framework.* Gifts reflecting the unique characteristics of a recipient may initially impress recipients when they open the gift, as they signal that the giver knows the recipient well. Givers, therefore, tailor gifts to the recipient because they hope that recipients will feel particularly great when they open the gift. Recipients, however, are more concerned with their ability to get value out of a gift, and thus appreciate more versatile and more preferred gifts.

Rule: Gifts should symbolize the recipient's relationship with the giver

*Existing Finding.* Gift givers overestimate how much recipients, especially more distant friends, appreciate socially responsible gifts. Givers believe that gifts like donations to charities on behalf of the recipient will be more highly appreciated than they are, because givers focus too heavily on the idea that the charitable gift symbolizes commitment to their relationship, especially for someone they are not close to (Cavanaugh, Gino, & Fitzsimmons, 2015). Though

the notion of signaling commitment to a relationship certainly involves both givers and recipients, givers incorrectly believe that recipients prioritize a gift's potential to reflect or even strengthen a relationship, when they actually prefer gifts they can personally use and enjoy.

*Current Framework.* Givers think about the 'warm glow' (Andreoni, 1990) that they expect recipients to feel about the gift (and the giver) when they open the gift. However, socially responsible gifts provide the recipient with little ownership value, and thus recipients are less enthusiastic about them than traditional gifts.

## **DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

Our framework can at least partially explain many gift giving mismatches. Of course, empirical investigations into the predictions and assumptions we have made are necessary. There is already work in progress demonstrating that givers overly value recipients' affective reactions (Yang & Urminsky, 2015), and that the framework described here explains why givers prefer hedonic items, and recipients utilitarian items (Williams & Rosenzweig, 2016), but a number of hypotheses remain to be tested. We touch on some below.

### **Psychological Process**

One important task is determining the exact psychological process leading givers to focus primarily on gift exchange rather than gift ownership. At least three possibilities are plausible: 1) Givers believe recipients truly prefer gifts that are better at the moment of the exchange over gifts providing value throughout ownership, and think they are making good choices; 2) Givers realize that recipients prefer gifts that provide value throughout ownership, but opt to give gifts that are better at the moment of exchange to satisfy their own motives, like appearing to be a

“great gift giver,” intentionally choosing suboptimal gifts; and 3) Givers are so focused on the exchange that they fail to consider how good a gift will be throughout the recipient’s ownership of it, and do not realize they are making an error (a form of focalism; Wilson, Wheatley, Meyers, Gilbert, & Axsom, 2000). We do not attempt here to answer the question of which of these (or other) scenarios is most likely, but it is certainly worth addressing.

### New Predictions

The present framework prompts a number of new predictions about gift giving behavior. It suggests that context might exacerbate giver-recipient discrepancies: for example, givers may err more when they know gifts will be opened in public (e.g., a birthday party) rather than in private (e.g., wedding gifts). The messages gifts send should matter, too: givers and recipients may differ in their evaluation of gifts meant to help the recipient meet personal goals, like a gym membership or a Fitbit. Givers may worry these gifts will make for an awkward exchange and avoid them, but recipients may appreciate such gifts more than expected because of their usefulness and relevance to their goals. Givers may look for ways to expand or extend the moment of exchange, like opting for multiple, smaller gifts, rather than a single, larger gift. The segregation of gifts may cause them to be treated as multiple ‘gains’ and therefore increase their valuation at the exchange (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). Givers may also look for other ways to make gifts impressive when they are opened, perhaps choosing risky gifts with the potential to be ‘home runs’ (e.g., a vacation to Alaska), when recipients may instead prefer safer options that are sure to give them value (e.g., a vacation to Hawaii). Finally, recipients may become less satisfied with a gift over time. Since mismatches generally occur because givers underweight what

owning the gift will be like for the recipient, the inaptness of a gift may become more apparent as the moment of exchange becomes more distant.

### Giving Better Gifts

Given the widespread nature of giver-recipient mismatches, how can givers be encouraged to choose better gifts? The obvious answer is to recommend that givers choose gifts based on how valuable they will be to the recipient throughout their ownership of the gift, rather than how good a gift will seem when the recipient opens it. This recommendation is most likely to help if givers are unaware of their misplaced focus. However, if givers err because they are acting selfishly, this advice may be less helpful, and finding ways to allow them to impress the recipient separate from the gift itself may be more effective. Finally, if focalism underlies these types of errors, then perhaps advising givers to put themselves in their recipient's shoes will help them consider how gifts might provide value to the recipient once the wrapping paper comes off. People exchange gifts to strengthen relationships and make each other happy, but do not always manage to meet those goals. We hope our review prompts researchers, and givers, to explore ways to make recipients happier with the gifts they receive.

## References

- Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure altruism and donations to public goods: a theory of warm-glow giving. *The Economic Journal*, *100*, 464-477.
- Baskin, E., Wakslak C., Trope, Y., & Novemsky, N. (2014). Why feasibility matters more to gift receivers than to givers: A construal-level approach to gift giving. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *41*, 122-134.
- Cavanaugh, L., Gino, F., & Fitzsimons G. (2015). When doing good is bad in gift-giving: Mispredicting appreciation of socially-responsible gifts. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *131*, 178-189.
- Dunn, E. W., Huntsinger, J., Lun, J., & Sinclair, S. (2008). The gift of similarity: How good and bad gifts influence relationships. *Social Cognition*, *26*, 469-481.
- 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.
- Gino, F. & Flynn, F. J. (2011). Give them what they want: The benefits of explicitness in gift exchange. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*, 915-922.
- Goodman, J., & Lim, S. (2014). Giving happiness: Do experiential gifts lead to more happiness? Paper presented at Association for Consumer Research, Baltimore, MD.
- Hsee, C. K., & Weber, E. U. (1997). A fundamental prediction error: Self-others discrepancies in risk preference. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *126*, 45-53.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, *47*, 263-291.

- Kupor, D., Flynn, F. J., & Norton, M. I. (2016). Half a gift is not half-hearted: A giver-receiver asymmetry in preferences for partial gifts. Under revision at the *Journal of Consumer Psychology*.
- Ruth, J. A., Otnes, C. C., & Brunel, F. F. (1999). Gift receipt and the reformulation of interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25, 385-402.
- Steffel, M., & LeBoeuf, R. A. (2014). Over-individuation in gift giving: Shopping for multiple recipients leads givers to choose unique but less preferred gifts. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40, 1167-1180.
- Steffel, M., Williams, E. F., & LeBoeuf, R. A. (2015). Overly specific gift giving: Givers choose personalized but less-versatile and less-preferred gifts. Under revision at the *Journal of Consumer Research*.
- Williams, E. F., & Rosenzweig, E. (2016). Go ahead, give them the blender! Giver and recipient preferences for hedonic and utilitarian gifts. Unpublished manuscript. University of California, San Diego.
- Wilson, T. D., Wheatley, T., Meyers, J. M., Gilbert, D. T., & Axson, D. (2000). Focalism: a source of durability bias in affective forecasting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 821-836.
- Yang, A., & Urminsky, O. (2015). Smile-seeking givers and value-seeking recipients: Why gift choices and recipient preferences diverge. Unpublished Manuscript. University of Chicago.
- Zhang, Y., & Epley, N. (2012). Exaggerated, mispredicted, and misplaced: When “it’s the thought that counts” in gift exchanges. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 141, 667-681.

### Recommended Readings:

Otnes, C., & Beltramini, R. F. (Eds.). (1996). *Gift giving: A research anthology*. Popular Press.

A collection of essays investigating what motivates gift exchanges, how values and culture influences gift giving, how a gift should be defined, and suggestions for future research.

Pronin, E. (2008). How we see ourselves and how we see others. *Science*, 320, 1177-1180.

A review of the self-other literature, highlighting the fact that people's view of themselves is strongly influenced by their internal emotions and cognitions, while their perception of others is largely influenced by what they can observe externally.

Yang, A., & Urminsky, O. (2015). (See References). Series of studies demonstrating that givers derive pleasure from the affective reaction of recipients, whereas recipients value gifts that improve their overall welfare.

**Table 1.** Giver-recipient discrepancies in gift preferences.

	<b>Gift Giving Rule</b>	<b>Givers' Preferences</b>	<b>Recipients' Preferences</b>	<b>Why the Mismatch, Based on New Framework?</b>	
<b>Aspects of the Gift</b>	Gifts should be desirable.	Desirable Gifts	Feasible Gifts	<i>Giver:</i> Desirable gifts dazzle when opened.	<i>Recipient:</i> Feasible gifts provide sure value.
	Gifts should be enjoyed immediately.	Lesser but Complete Gifts	Better and Incomplete Gifts	<i>Giver:</i> Lesser, complete gifts are appreciated when opened.	<i>Recipient:</i> Better, incomplete gifts will eventually provide most value.
	Gifts should be tangible.	Material Gifts	Experiential Gifts	<i>Giver:</i> Material gifts get unwrapped and used at exchange.	<i>Recipient:</i> Experiences provide more overall happiness.
<b>Aspects of the Giver</b>	Givers should surprise their recipients.	Unrequested Gifts	Requested Gifts	<i>Giver:</i> Unrequested gifts will surprise.	<i>Recipient:</i> I know that what I ask for will provide value.
	Givers should be generous.	Thoughtful and Expensive Gifts	Thoughts and Price are Unimportant	<i>Giver:</i> Thoughtful and expensive gifts signal generosity.	<i>Recipient:</i> Value does not always correspond with thought or price.
<b>Aspects of the Recipient</b>	Gifts should reflect their recipients.	Specific and Unique Gifts	General Gifts and Gifts That Reflect Most Important Interests	<i>Giver:</i> Gifts reflecting specific and unique interests signal knowledge of recipient.	<i>Recipient:</i> Versatile gifts, and gifts that reflect the interests I care about, provide most value.
	Gifts should symbolize the giver-recipient relationship.	Socially Responsible Gifts	Traditional Gifts	<i>Giver:</i> The recipient will feel a 'warm glow' when receiving a socially responsible gift.	<i>Recipient:</i> A socially responsible gift provides me with little ownership value.

Note: The first column contains the gift giving rules. The second and third columns contain the types of gifts givers prefer to give and recipients prefer to receive, respectively. The fourth and fifth columns are the proposed thought processes of givers and recipients, respectively.



**Figure 1.** Infographic. Errors in Gift Giving: Select Examples of How Givers Focus on the Moment of Gift Exchange, but Recipients Focus on Gift Ownership

