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ABSTRACT

Sequencing of power strategies as a function of gender and birth order was explored. It was hypothesized that girls and first and/or only born children would use weaker strategies in an ordering sequence than boys and later born children. Seventh, eighth and ninth graders ( $n=195$ ) completed questionnaires indicating which of twelve strategies they use first, second and third to get their way with their mothers. The expected gender and birth order power differences in strategy use emerged primarily for the third strategy after the initial and second strategies were unsuccessful. Support for the power hypothesis was mixed for the first and second strategies with regard to gender. Birth order differences early in the sequence suggest that first and/or only born children use more interactive strategies than later born children.
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## INTRODUCTION

A number of studies have examined gender differences in interpersonal power (Cowan, Drinkard \& MacGavin, 1984; Cowan \& Avants, in press; Falbo \& Peplau, 1980; Kipnis, 1976; and Johnson, 1978). In general, interpersonal power has been defined as the ability to make another person believe, feel or do something that he/she would not have done voluntarily (Johnson, 1978). Although researchers have differed somewhat in their definitions of interpersonal power, Smith (1970) noted a consensus among them in their conceptual definitions, reporting that power is multidimensional in nature and includes sociostructural, interactional and outcome components.

The notion of power as multidimensional has been conceptualized by Cromwell and 01 son (1975) to include three distinct divisions: power bases, power processes and power outcomes. French and Raven (1959) outlined the following six power bases: l) legitimate: the influencee's belief that the influencer may control the influencee's thoughts, feelings or behavior; 2) referent: the influencee's desire to identify with the influencer; 3) reward: the influencer's ability to reward the influencee; 4) expert: involving the influencee's notion of superior knowledge and expertise of the influencer; 5) coercive: the influencer's
ability to punish the influencee; and 6) informational: the content of the request rather than the qualities of the influencer making the request. Power processes, on the other hand, involve the means people employ to control the decision-making interactions. Whereas power is conceptualized as the ability to influence, social influence or persuasion refers to the social influence process itself. Finally, power outcomes are indicative of which person has ultimate control of the decision-making process.

Johnson (1978) notes that the social interactions that emerge between actors and their targets is related to the powerholder's resources. Since men and women are considered to be different in status, with corresponding differential availability of power bases, they use different forms of influence when interacting with each other (Falbo \& Peplau, 1980). Investigations of adult power strategies in both intimate relationships (Falbo \& Peplau 1980; Howard 1986) and in organizational situations (Instone, Major \& Bunker, 1983) explain strategy use in terms of power differentials.

The parent-child relationship affords a clear example of power inequality. Adults, particularly parents, exert considerable power over children. Legitimate, reward, coercive, referent, informational and expert power are the types of power exerted over children by their parents. Legitimate power is exerted over children, in the sense that this culture sanctions parents to be the most powerful
influencers of children. Parents are able to exert reward and coercive power over children due to the parents' greater availability of tangible resources. Parents also have greater expert and informational power due to their increased age, experience and education. Children are susceptible to parental behavioral and fate control (Kelley \& Thibaut, 1978) as they depend more on their parents for the quality of their lives than their parents depend on them.

The literature on parent-child socialization has not explored fully interpersonal power from a bilateral perspective, but rather from that of parent to child (Bell, 1968; Huston, 1983). Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) investigated children's behavior in terms of parental consequences. Baumrind (1967) and Baumrind and Black (1967) examined parenting styles with regard to children's cognitive, socioemotional and sex-role development. Bandura (1977) and other social learning theorists, viewed parents both as models and as direct and vicarious agents of consequences and rewards. These studies have not explored the specific persuasion strategies used by children to influence their parents.

Studies of children's influence strategies have examined developmental processes from a cognitive perspective and have focused on children's communicative competence (Haslett, 1983; Piche, Rubin \& Michlin, 1978) as
well as their ability to take on the target's perspective (Clark \& Delia, 1976; Delia, Kline \& Burleson, 1979; Eisenberg \& Garvey, 1981; Flavell, Botkin, Fry, Wright \& Jarvis, 1968). The cognitive literature does not elucidate the social influence aspects of relationships but rather examines cognitive and developmental changes in social influence strategies. In addition, the cognitive literature does not attend to the inherent power differential between children and their parents. Considering the relative paucity of studies concerning bilateral influence in unequal power relationships, studies of children's influence strategies may facilitate understanding of adult influence strategies. Investigations of girls' and boys' social influence strategies may facilitate interpretation of gender differences in adult social influence strategies. Studies in adult selection of social influence strategies have suggested that women use more indirect (e.g. manipulative) strategies than men, particularly when interacting with members of the opposite gender (Falbo \& Peplau, 1980; Johnson, 1978). One interpretation of these findings is that women have less power relative to men and therefore use lower (i.e. indirect) power strategies when attempting to influence a male target (Howard, 1986). This approach may be labeled a structural or social contextual interpretation of gender differences. The aforementioned interpretation views gender
differences in the use of power strategies within the context of gender inequality. Support for this
interpretation was provided by Cowan, Drinkard and MacGavin (1984) in their study of gender, age and target differences in children's influence strategies. Cowan et. al. (1984) investigated children's power strategies using Goodchild's, Quadro's and Raven's (1975) open-ended essay technique. Questionnaires were distributed to sixth, ninth and twelfth graders asking them how they get their way with their mothers, fathers and best friends. Fathers were expected to have more power vis-a-vis children than mothers, and mothers more power than same sex friends. Using Falbo and Peplau's (1980) factors, the twelve strategies were grouped into three sets of strategies: unilateral/bilateral, direct/indirect and weak/strong. As predicted, significant multivariate effects emerged for target but not for gender. Univariate effects emerged for the three investigated dimensions: bilateral-unilateral, direct-indirect and strong-weak. Parents were the recipients of the less powerful strategies (indirect, unilateral, weak) whereas same sex friends were the recipients of bilateral, direct and strong strategies. In addition the children used less bilateral and direct strategies with fathers than with both mothers and friends. The use of negative affect was the only finding not consistent with the expected power strategy used with regard to a specific target. Children used
negative affect more with their mothers than with their fathers. Since negative affect is considered both unilateral and indirect, it was predicted that this strategy would be targeted toward the more powerful father than with the less powerful mother. Since Cowan et al. (1984) observed no gender differences, their interpretation was that strategy choice is dependent on the power of the target in relation to the actor.

An alternative interpretation to the structural interpretation would be that socialization exerts different influences upon men and women and results in personality or trait differences in men and women in the use of power strategies to get one's way. For example, this interpretation suggests that through the socialization process, women learn to be indirect and manipulative and men direct and bilateral in their characteristic means of influence. The plausibility of this hypothesis further suggests a gender differentiated power base within the family itself; that girls are permitted less freedom and autonomy than are boys and have less powerful positions in the family. The characteristics of being in a less powerful position are then generalized to adult relationships where women continue to exert less power in relation to their more powerful targets. Consequently, this model suggests that the adult usage of lower power strategies is difficult to modify and is and relatively unresponsive to situational

## parameters.

Consistent with the interpretation of a gender differentiated power base within the family are Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg's (1970) findings that girls repeatedly pleaded more with parents than did boys. Block (1984) corroborated these findings by demonstrating that parents of boys emphasize autonomy and control of affect, whereas parents of girls are more restrictive, protective and exercise more supervision over their daughters. The Cowan and Avants study (in press) evaluated twelve strategies reported by seventh, eighth, and ninth graders to get their way with their mothers. These strategies emerged primarily from the content analysis of essays in the Cowan et al. (1984) study. The strategies which emerged from this analysis were: ask, bargain, positive feelings (affect), do as you please (laissez-faire), tell, negative feelings (affect), persistence, beg and plead, get angry, cry, good deeds first (elicit reciprocity) and reason. Get angry and cry were added to the strategies and enlisting the aid of an advocate was dropped. These strategies were evaluated using principle components analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation performed on them. Three factors emerged with eigenvalues exceeding l.0. Factor 1 included the following strategies: ask, bargain, positive affect, eliciting reciprocity and reasoning and was labeled egalitarian strategies. Persistence, begging and pleading, and negative affect
composed factor 2 and was labeled anticipating noncompliance strategies. Factor 3 included laissez-faire, tell and not ask and was labeled autonomous strategies. The labeling of these factors was based on the content of each of the strategy sets, as well as on a theoretical model differentiating strategies according to implied power.

Girls reported using a higher frequency of strategies to get their way with their mothers than did boys. Girls also reported using more of the anticipating noncompliance factor strategies than did boys. Boys, on the other hand, reported more frequent use of the autonomous factor strategies than did girls. No gender differences in egalitarian strategies were found. Thus, in this later study of children's strategies, gender differences in power emerged within the family prior to adulthood.

In addition to a familial power differential between boys and girls, there might also be a power differential between first and later born siblings toward their parental targets. Several studies lend support to the interpretation that first born children have less power with parental targets than their later born siblings. First born children acquiesce and apologize in response to parental anger whereas later born children become angry (Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg, 1970). In addition, mothers expect more of first-borns (Cushna, 1966; Lasko, 1954) and interact more frequently with them (Cohen \& Beckwith, 1977; Jacobs and

Moss, 1976).
Studies in birth-order effects with regard to persuasion techniques have focused on children attempting to get their way with siblings and peers, rather than with parental targets (Bragg, Ostrowski and Finley, 1977; SuttonSmith and Rosenberg 1965; 1968). Although Bragg et al. (1977), in analyzing the type and frequency of the different persuasion strategies, found that the observed differences were a function of the age of the target and not the status of the actor's birth order, the target's age did not exceed thirteen years.

Many of the aforementioned studies have focused on the specific social influence strategies used to get one's way. However, there has been little research examining the ordering of these strategies. Schank and Abelson (1977) assumed that strategy selection was sequenced such that once an initial strategy fails the actor will select a subsequent strategy further along in the sequence. Schank and Abelson (1977) enumerated what they considered a standard set of persuasion methods. These methods included: ask, invoke a theme, inform of a personal reason, bargain for an object, bargain for a personal favor and threaten. Should these methods fail in influencing the target, Schank and Abelson hypothesized that the actor would resort to a set of auxiliary methods. Since Schank and Abelson (1977) did not offer empirical support for their hypothesis, Rule, Bisanz
and Kohn (1985) investigated this ordering assumption, using a college sample. Rule et. al. (1985) included the additional methods of invoking altruism, moral principles and social norms. Rule et, al. found that asking and selforienting strategies occurred earlier in the ordering sequence, whereas dyad-oriented, socially-oriented and negative strategies followed, respectively, later in the sequence.

Rule et. al. (1985) based their ordering sequence hypotheses on a power strategy taxonomy which was delineated by the development of stages in moral reasoning. Support for this ordering sequence thus raises the question of the relationship between moral reasoning and interpersonal power. Therefore, Rule et. al. (1985) stressed the importance of investigating the relation between sequencing and its developmental acquisition. Although these researchers hypothesized that sequencing acquisition follows a developmental pattern, they presented no evidence about the acquisition of the sequence.

Since social principles were found to be used later in the sequence, it appears that people would rather save these strategies for later; so as not to weaken the more effective strategies by using them initially. Rule et. al. (1985) also reasoned that aggressive tactics, by virtue of their negative aspects, were also used as a last resort to get one's way. Rule et. al. (1985) found no gender differences
in the sequential ordering of power strategies.
A further understanding of the ordering sequence might be facilitated by viewing this ordering sequence in relation to the power differential between the actor and the target of influence. If, as Cowan and Avants (in press) suggest, girls have less power within the family than boys, they may use more powerful strategies (e.g. not ask, tell) initially in the ordering sequence, resorting to less powerful strategies (e.g. beg and plead, cry) as their initial attempts at persuasion fail. Boys, on the other hand, if considered to have greater power within the family, would be expected to employ higher power strategies (e.g. tell, do as they please) throughout the ordering sequence.

The relation between interpersonal power and the ordering of sequential power strategies can also be examined with regard to birth order. As stated earlier, Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1979) have observed that when asked about parents getting angry, more first born children mentioned acquiescing and apologizing while later born children reported getting angry. Although first born children have been shown to have greater power with their siblings (Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg, 1970), it may be that they have less power than do later borns with regard to their parents. Consequently, the sequential ordering of their power strategies would reflect less power than the ordering of later borns and would also be expected to be similar to the
ordering of girls versus boys.
The purpose of the present study is to explore the relation between the sequential ordering strategies used by girls and boys and by first born and later born children. The present study examined the twelve strategies that emerged in the Cowan et. al. (1984) study with respect to their three factors. It was predicted that both girls and first born children, who are hypothesized to have less power in relation to parental targets, would demonstrate high power strategies early in the sequence and resort to low power strategies later in the sequence. Boys and later born children, hypothesized to have more power than girls and first born children relative to their parental targets, were predicted to use high power strategies both initially and throughout the ordering sequence.

## Subjects

Volunteer subjects consisted of 110 girls and 85 boys ( $\mathrm{n}=195$ ). This sample was composed of 136 Caucasians, 20 Blacks, 30 Hispanics and three children of ethnic groups not listed. The sample was obtained from the seventh, eighth and ninth grades of three junior high schools from San Bernardino County, California. Since seven of the original 202 children lived with someone other than their mother, their data were not used. Children from single parent homes were included providing they were living with their mothers. The children's mean ages were as follows: seventh grade girls $12.4(n=64) ;$ seventh grade boys $12.7(n=56) ;$ eighth/ninth grade girls $13.7(n=46)$ and eighth/ninth grade boys $13.9(n=29)$.

## Materials

The current study utilized data collected, but not analyzed, by Cowan and Avants (in press). Cowan and Avants analyzed and reported the findings from the first two parts of the questionnaire; this study analyzed the third part of the questionnaire. Part 1 of the the questionnaire (described here to assist in elucidating the context for Part 3 and included in Appendix A) was labeled, "How I get my way with my mother when $I$ want to do something that is
important to me." Part 1 provided the list of strategies, their definitions and subsequent examples. The strategies are as follows: ask, bargain, do it myself, positive feelings, tell, negative feelings, persistence, beg and plead, good deeds first, reason, cry, get angry and something not listed. A category entitled "something not listed" could be used by the children to fill in any strategy they use, with rated frequency, which was not one of the listed strategies. The strategies are illustrated in Table 1 with their corresponding definitions and examples.

Table 1
Strategy Definitions and Examples

| Strategy | Definition | Example |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ask | Actor makes a simple request. | I just ask. |
| Bargaining | Actor and target arrive at a mutually agreable decision. | I will do a task in return for what I want. |
| Positive Affect | Actor acts nice to put target in a good mood. | I act nice. |
| LaissezFaire | Actor does what he/she wants regardless of the target's wishes. | I do what I want anyway. |
| Tell | A direct statement of desire. | ```I'm going to the party to- night.``` |
| Negative Affect | Actor acts sad or angry to induce negative feelings in target, particularly guilt. | I act sad. <br> I go to my room. |


| Strategy | Definition | Example |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Persistence | Continuous attempts to influence or wear down the target. | I bug the person until I get my way. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Beg and } \\ & \text { Plead } \end{aligned}$ | Simple statements about begging. | I beg for permission. I plead to go. |
| Get Angry | Actor demonstrates anger in order to influence target. | I get mad and yell. |
| Cry | Actor cries to influence to influence target. | I cry and I get my way. |
| Good Deeds First | Unilateral activity designed to influence target. | I take out the trash before asking. |
| Reasoning | Rationale used to get one's way. | I explain why $I$ want something and give reasons. |
| Children rated both the frequency and effectiveness of each strategy. The first scale measured the frequency of the children's use of each strategy. This scale was a fivepoint scale ranging from "never" to "always". The second scale, another five-point scale, ranging from "not at all successful" to "very successful", measured the children's perceived success in using these strategies. <br> Part 2 was labeled, "How my mother gets her way with me when it is important to her." Part 2 included a list of |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

twelve mothers' strategies, identical to those of the children with the exception of "do as I please." "Do as I please" was renamed "does it herself" since both of these laissez-faire strategies do not involve the target of influence. Three sets of scales followed the strategy definitions and examples for Part 2. The first scale measured the frequency of the mothers, usage of the strategies as perceived by their children. This scale was a five-point scale ranging from "never" to "always". The second scale, another five-point scale, ranging from "not at all successful" to "very successful", measured the mothers' success in using these strategies. The third scale measured the children's liking for each of the strategies. This preference scale was a six point scale ranging from "very much dislike" to "very much like."

Part 3 of the questionnaire was composed of the strategies listed on three separate pages with corresponding spaces available where a check mark could be placed. At the top of the first page was the first set of printed directions instructing the children to, "Think of the first thing you are likely to do to get your way with your mother when it is important to you. Put a check mark next to the way you would use first. You can check more than one line if you use more than one way first." After this section was completed the children were presented with the question, "How often would you give up if the first thing you tried
did not work?" with a five-point scale ranging from "never" to "always." The second page was identical to the first page with the exception of the directions. The second set of instructions read, "What would $I$ do next or second if the first thing $I$ tried did not work. Put a check mark next to the way you would use second. You can check more than one line if you use more than one way second." Once this section was completed a five-point scale ranging from "never" to "always" was provided with the printed instructions, "How often would you give up if the second thing you tried did not work?" The third set of instructions, printed at the top of the third page were, "What $I$ would do third if the second thing I did to get my way did not work. Put a check next to the way you would use third. You can check more than one line if you use more than one way third." Unlike pages one and two, page three did not include a scale evaluating the frequency of giving up if the third strategy or strategies was unsuccessful. The checklist format was provided because pilot data indicated that children found it difficult to rate each strategy on scales depending on whether they were likely to use it first, second or third.

## Procedure

A female experimenter visited the classrooms and asked children to volunteer for a study on how they get their way with their mothers. Children who were interested took home
a permission slip for their mothers' signatures. At a later date, the experimenter returned and administered the questionnaire to those volunteers who returned permission slips indicating parental approval. The experimenter reviewed each part of the questionnaire separately to ensure that the participants understood each task. The subjects completed the three parts of the questionnaire in their classrooms. The experimenter was available to explain strategies and to answer any questions.

## Analysis

First-born children were combined with only-born children to form one group of subjects ( $\underline{n}=82$ ). Later born children composed the second subject group ( $\underline{n}=113$ ). The first and only borns' sequencing of strategies was then compared to the strategy sequencing of the later-born children. Phi Coefficient analyses for each strategy (first, second and third) were performed to assess the effects of gender, birth order and gender interacting with birth order. Analyses of variance was used to test the effects of gender, birth order and gender interacting with birth order on the questions assessing frequency of giving up.

## RESULTS

Separate Phi Coefficients were performed to analyze the influence of sex, birth order and sex by birth order interaction on the sequencing of each of the twelve strategies. Due to the exploratory nature of this research, marginally significant findings (. $05<\mathrm{p}<.10$ ) are also presented as well as those significant at the $p<.05$ level. Anticipating Noncompliance Strategies

Anticipating noncompliance strategies are low power strategies that appear to be comprised of those acts (persistence, crying, getting angry, begging and pleading and negative affect) which loaded on Factor 1 in the Cowan and Avants study (in press). Table 2 presents the percent usage first, second and third and significance levels for persistence by gender, birth order and gender $X$ birth order. The relationship between gender and persistence indicated that more boys used persistence than girls second ( $\underline{r}=.15$ ), whereas girls equaled boys in their use of persistence first and third. Persistence was not significantly related to birth order either first, second or third; however, an interaction effect was found in the use of persistence both second and third. More later born (LB) boys used persistence than LB born girls second ( $\underline{r}=.25$ ); and LB girls used persistence significantly more than LB boys third
( $\underline{r}=.20$ ). There were no gender differences between first and only born (FOB) boys and FOB girls.

Table 2
Percent_distribution_of_Persistence_by_Gender_and
-Gender_X_Birth Order
Gender
Gender X Birth Order

| Sequence | $\underline{F}$ | $\underline{M}$ | FOBF | FOBM | LBE | LBM |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 110 | 85 | 47 | 35 | 63 | 50 |


| First | 9.1 | 9.4 | 8.5 | 14.3 | 9.5 | 6 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Second | $11.8^{a}$ | 23.5 | 17 | 20 | $7.9^{b}$ | $26^{b}$ |
| Third | 23.6 | 18.8 | 21.3 | 31.4 | $25.4{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $10{ }^{\text {c }}$ |

Note. $\quad F=$ Female. $M=$ Male. $\quad$ FOBF $=$ First and/or only born female. $F O B M=$ First and/or only born male. LBF $=$ Later born female. $L B M=$ Later born male.
$\mathbf{a}=\mathbf{p}<.015 . \quad \mathbf{b}=\mathbf{p}<.004 . \quad \mathbf{c}=\mathbf{p}<.018$.

Table 3 presents the percent usage first, second and third and significance levels for cry by gender and birth order. Table 4 presents the percent usage first, second and third and significance levels for cry by gender $X$ birth order. Girls tended to cry more as a first strategy than boys ( $\underline{r}=.09$ ) and cried more than boys third ( $\underline{r}=.12$ ). First and only borns cried more second ( $\underline{r}<-.16$ ) and tended to cry more third ( $\underline{r}=-.09$ ) than later borns. An interaction effect between birth order and and gender indicated differences between FOB girls and FOB boys with
regard to crying. $F O B$ girls reported crying more third than FOB boys ( $\underline{r}=-.22$ ) and both LB girls and boys.

Table 3
Percent_Distribution_of_Cry_by_Gender_and_Birth_order

| Gender |  |  | Bigth Order |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sequence | F | $\underline{M}$ | FOB | LB |
| N | 110 | 85 | 82 | 113 |
|  | a | a. |  |  |
| First | 1.8 | 0 | 1.2 | 0. |
| Second | 4.5 | $4.7$ | $8.5^{c}$ |  |
| Third | 18.2 | 9.4 | 18.3 | 11. |
| Note. $\quad$ FE $=$ Female. $\mathrm{MA}=$ Male. $\quad \mathrm{FOB}=$ First and/or only |  |  |  |  |
| born children. LB = Later born children. |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{a}=\mathrm{p}<$. | b $=$ | . 042. | . 013. | $=\mathrm{p}<$ |

Table 4
Percent_Distribution_of_Cry_by_Gender_X_Birth_order

| Sequence | FOBF | FOBM | LBF | LBM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N | 47 | 35 | 63 | 50 |


| First | 2.1 | 0 | 1.6 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Second | 8.5 | 8.6 | 1.6 | 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Third | $25.5^{a}$ | $8.6^{a}$ | 12.7 | 10 |

Note. FOBF = First and/or only born female. FOBM = First and/or only born male. LBF = Later born female.

LBM = Later born male.
$a=p<.025$.

Table 5 presents the percent usage first, second and third and significance levels for begging and pleading by birth order. Begging and pleading was not significantly related to gender. A birth order effect was observed with begging and pleading used more second by FOB children than later born children ( $\underline{r}=.13$ ). No gender by birth order interaction was found.

Table 5
Percent_Distribution_of_Begging_and_Pleading_by_Birth_order_

| Sequence | $\underline{F Q B}$ | $\underline{\text { LB }}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| N | 82 | 113 |
| First | 13.4 | 13.3 |
| Second | $30.5^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $19.5^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| Third | 32.9 | 26.5 |

Note. $\quad F O B=$ First and/or only born children. $\quad$ LB $=$ Later born children.
$a=p<.038$.

Table 6 presents the percent usage first, second and third and significance levels for getting angry by gender and gender $X$ birth order. Getting angry tended to be used by more boys than girls first ( $\underline{r}=.11$ ); but was not significantly different second or third. Getting angry was not significantly related to birth order either first, second or third. An interaction effect was found where more FOB boys reported getting angry first than $F O B$ girls (r $=.18$ )

Table 6
Percent_Distribution_of_Getting_Angry_by_Gender_and Gender_X_Birth_Order

## Gender

| Sequence | F | $\underline{M}$ | FOBE | FOBBM | LBE | LBM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 110 | 85 | 47 | 35 | 63 | 50 |
|  | a | a | b | b |  |  |
| First | 5.5 | 11.8 | 4.3 | 14.3 | 6.3 | 10 |
| Second | 12.7 | 11.8 | 14.9 | 14.3 | 11.1 | 10 |
| Third | 31.8 | 30.6 | 36.2 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 32 |

№te. $\quad F=$ Female. $M=M a l e . \quad F O B F=F i r s t$ andor only born female. $F O B M=$ First and/or only born male. LBF = Later born female. LBM = Later born male.

```
a}=\textrm{p}<.056. b=p<.055
```

Egalitarian Strategies
Egalitarian strategies consist of those acts (performing good deeds first, using positive affect, bargaining and reasoning) which loaded on Factor 2. These strategies suggest a set of strategies between high and low power strategies implying reciprocity and mutual respect.

Table 7 presents the percent usage first, second and third and significance levels for performing good deeds first by gender $X$ birth order. Performing good deeds first to get one's way was not significantly related to gender or birth order. However, an interaction tendency was observed with LB girls using good deeds first as an initial strategy
more than LB born boys ( $\underline{r}=-.13$ ).

Table 7
Percent_Distribution_of_Performing_Good_Deeds_First
by_Gender_X_Birth_order $\qquad$

| Seguence | FOBF | FOBM | LBE | LBM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 47 | 35 | 63 | 50 |
| First | 25.5 | 25.7 | 23.8 | 28 |
| Second | 14.9 | 22.9 | $22.2{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $12^{\text {a }}$ |
| Third | 17 | 11.4 | 11.1 | 10 |

Note. $F O B F=$ First and/or only born female. $\quad$ FOBM $=$ First and/or only born male. $L B F=$ Later born female.

LBM = Later born male.
$\mathbf{a}=\mathbf{p}<.080$.

Table 8 presents the percent first, second and third and significance levels for the use of positive feelings by birth order. No gender effect was found in the use of positive feelings first, second or third. A birth order effect was observed with first and only born children using positive feelings first more than later born children ( $\underline{x}=$ -. 12). No interactions were found between gender and birth order.

| Table 8 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent_distribution_of_Positive_Feelings_by_birth_order |  |  |
| Sequence | FOB | LB |
| N | 82 | 113 |
|  | a | a |
| First | 12.2 | 5.7 |
| Second | 17.1 | 12.4 |
| Third | 14.6 | 10.6 |
| Note. $\quad$ FOB $=$ First and/or only born children. $\quad$ LB $=$ Later |  |  |
| born children. |  |  |
| $\mathbf{a}=\mathbf{p}<$ |  |  |

Table 9 presents the percent usage first, second and third and significance levels for bargaining by gender and birth order. Table 10 presents the percent usage first, second and third and significance levels for bargaining by gender $X$ birth order. Marginally more boys tended to use bargaining third than girls $(\underline{r}=.09)$ whereas no gender effects were observed first and second. First and only borns used bargaining more second ( $\underline{r}=.14$ ) with no differences noted first and third. An interaction effect was observed with marginally more LB boys using bargaining second than LB girls ( $\underline{r}=.14$ ). In addition, more FOB boys used bargaining third than $F O B$ girls ( $\underline{r}=.29$ ).

Table 9
Percent Distribution of Bargaining by Gender and Birth Order

| Gender |  |  | Bigrth order |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seguence | F | M | F $\underline{O} \underline{B}$ | LB |
| N | 110 | 85 | 82 | 113 |
| First | 15.5 | 17.6 | 15.9 | 16.8 |
| Second | 38.2 | 43.5 | $48.8{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $34.5{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| Third | $16.4{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $23.5{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 23.2 | 16.8 |
| $F=$ Female,$\quad M=$ Male,$\quad F O B=$ First and/or only born |  |  |  |  |
| children. LB = Later born children. |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{a}=\mathrm{p}<$ | $\mathrm{b}=$ | 023. |  |  |

Table 10
Percent_Distribution_of_Bargaining_by_Gender_X_Birth_Order

| Sequence | FOBF | FOBM | LBEF | LBM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 47 | 35 | 63 | 50 |
| First | 14.9 | 17.1 | 15.9 | 18 |
| Second | 51.1 | 45.7 | $28.6{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $42^{\text {a }}$ |
| Third | $12.8{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $37.1{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 19 | 14 |

Note. $\quad$ FOBF $=$ First andor only born female. $\quad$ FOBM $=$ First and/or only born male. LBF = Later born female.

LBM $=$ Later born male.
$\mathbf{a}=\mathbf{p}<.069 . \quad \mathbf{b}=\mathbf{p}<.005$.

Table 11 presents the percent usage first, second and
third and significance levels for reasoning by gender and birth order. Table 12 presents the percent usage first, second and third and significance levels for reasoning by gender $X$ birth order. Reasoning was used by more girls second ( $\underline{r}=-.12$ ) than boys. First and only born children marginally used reasoning more first ( $\underline{r}=-.09$ ) and second than later borns ( $\underline{r}=-13$ ). Reasoning was found to interact, with both sex and birth order. Later born boys used reasoning more first ( $\underline{r}=.17$ ) and less second ( $\underline{r}=-.26$ ) than later born girls. FOB boys used reasoning more third than $F O B$ girls ( $\underline{r}=.20$ ).

Table ll
Percent_Distribution_of_Reasoning_by_Gender_and_Birth Order
Gender
Birth Order

Sequence

N

First
Second
$31.8^{\text {a }}$
19.1

Third
23.5
29.4
$21.2^{a}$

F읍

82
30.5
$34.1^{\text {c }}$
22
b

LB

113
b
22.1
$22.1^{c}$
20.4

Note. $\quad F=$ Female. $M=$ Male. $\quad F O B=$ First and/or only born children. LB $=$ Later born children.

```
a=p<.049. b = p<.094. c=p< .032.
```

Table 12
Percent_Distribution_of_Reasoning_by_Gender_x_Birth
Order

| Seguence | FOBF | FOBM | LBF | LBM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 47 | 35 | 63 | 50 |
| First | 31.9 | 28.6 | $15.9{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $30^{\text {a }}$ |
| Second | 31.9 | 37.1 | $31.7{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $10^{\text {b }}$ |
|  | c | c |  |  |
| Third | 14.9 | 31.4 | 22.2 | 18 |

Note. FOBF $=$ First and/or only born female. $\quad$ FOBM $=$ First and/or only born male. LBF = Later born female.

LBM $=$ Later born male.
$a=p<.037 . \quad b=p<.003 . c=p<.038$.

Autonomous Strategies
Autonomous strategies are those strategies which suggest either that there will be low resistance on the part of the target or disregard of the target's response. Telling, doing as one pleases and not asking fall into this category and imply high power on the part of the actor.

Table 13 presents the percent usage first, second and third for tell by gender and birth order. Table 14 presents the percent usage first, second and third for tell by gender X birth order. More girls tended to use tell than boys to get their way first ( $\underline{r}=-.09$ ), whereas more boys tended to use tell than girls to get their way third ( $\underline{r}=.09$ ). Later
borns used telling to get their way third more than first and only borns ( $\underline{r}=.12$ ). The interaction of gender and birth order indicates that fewer LB boys tended to use tell than later born girls ( $\underline{r}=.13$ ) initially, whereas fewer FOB girls had a tendency to use tell than FOB boys (r $=.15$ ) third.

Table 13
Percent_Distribution_of_Tell_by_Gender_and_Birth_order

## Gender

Birth Order


Note. $\quad F=$ Female. $M=$ Male. $\quad F O B=$ First and/or only born children. $L B=$ Later born children.
$a=\mathbf{p}<.10$.
$\mathrm{b}=\mathrm{p}<.093$.
$c=p<.053$.

Table 14
Percent_Distribution_of_Tell_by_Gender_x_Birth_order

| Sequence | FOB ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | FOBM | LBF | $\underline{\text { LBM }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 47 | 35 | 63 | 50 |
|  |  |  | $11 .{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $4^{\text {a }}$ |
| First | 10.6 | 8.6 | 11.1 | 4 |
| Second | 4.3 | 11.4 | 9.5 | 6 |
|  | b | b |  |  |
| Third | 2.1 | 8.6 | 9.5 | 14 |

Note. $\quad$ FOBF $=$ First and/or only born female. $\quad$ FOBM $=$ First and/or only born male. $L B F=$ Later born female.

LBM $=$ Later born male.
$a=p<.084 . \quad b=p<.092$.

Table 15 presents the percent usage first, second and third and significance levels for laissez-faire by gender and birth order. More boys tended to use laissez-faire than girls second $(\underline{r}=-.11)$. They significantly used laissez-faire more third ( $\underline{r}=.20$ ). Birth order was not related to using laissez-faire but an interaction was observed. More $F O B$ boys used laissez-faire to get their way than $F O B$ born girls ( $\underline{r}=.26$ ). LB girls used laissez-faire significantly more often as a first strategy ( $\underline{r}=-.17$ ) and marginally more often as a second strategy than LB boys ( $\underline{r}$ =.12). The use of laissez-faire third was employed marginally more by FOB boys than $F O B$ girls ( $\underline{r}=.24$ ). In addition, more LB boys used laissez-faire third than LB
girls ( $\underline{r}=.18$ ). FOB boys used laissez-faire third more than the other three groups.

Table 15
Percent_Distribution_of_Laissez=Faire_by_Gender_and Gender_X_Birth_order $\qquad$

|  | Gender |  | Gender $\underline{X}$ Bir $\underline{r} \underline{\underline{h}}$ Order |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sequence | F | M | FOBF | FOBM | L $\underline{B}^{\mathbf{F}}$ | L B M |
| N | 110 | 85 | 47 | 35 | 63 | 50 |
|  |  |  | c | c | d | d |
| First | 3.6 | 4.7 | 0 | 11.4 | 6.3 | 0 |
| Second | $1.8{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $5.9{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2.1 | 5.7 | $1.6{ }^{\text {e }}$ | $6{ }^{\text {e }}$ |
|  | b | b | f | f | g | g |
| Third | 7.3 | 21.2 | 6.4 | 22.9 | 7.9 | 20 |

Note. $\quad F=$ Female. $M=M a l e . \quad F O B F=F i r s t$ and/or only born female. $F O B M=$ First andor only born male. $\quad$ LBF $=$ Later born female. LBM = Later born male.
$\mathbf{a}=\mathbf{p}<.067$
$\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{p}<.002 . \quad \mathbf{c}=\mathbf{p}<.009$.
$d=p<.035$
$\mathbf{e}=\mathbf{p}<.10 . \quad \mathbf{f}=\mathbf{p}<.015 . \quad \mathrm{g}=\mathrm{p}<.030$.

Table 16 presents the percent first, second and third and significance levels for not ask by birth order and gender $X$ birth order, since not asking can also be considered an autonomous strategy. Not asking involves the strategist's choice in deciding whether or not to ask, the most common strategy, in order to obtain his/her way. No gender effect was observed for not ask. A birth order trend was observed with more later borns tending to not ask initially than $F O B$ children ( $\underline{r}=-.11$ ). No significant
differences were observed in the use of not ask as a second or third strategy. An interaction trend was observed with more LB girls not asking as a third strategy than LB born boys ( $\underline{r}=.14$ ). No interaction effects were noted for not ask either first or second.

Table 16
Percent_Distribution_of_Not_Ask_by_Birth_Order_and Gender_X_Birth_Order

Birth Order

| Sequence | FOB | LB | FOBF | FOBM | LBE | LBM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 82 | 113 | 47 | 35 | 63 | 50 |
| First | 8.5 | $15.9$ | 10.6 | 5.7 | 15.9 | 16 |
| Second | 89 | 89.4 | 91.5 | 85.7 | 55.4 | 44.6 |
| Third | 89 | 93.8 | 91.5 | 85.7 | 96.8 | 90.6 |

Note. $\quad \mathrm{FOB}=$ First and only born children. $\quad \mathrm{LB}=$ Later born children. FOBF = First and/or only born female. FOBM $=$ First andor only born male. LBF = Later born female. LBM = Later born male.
$\mathbf{a}=\mathbf{p}<.064 . \quad \mathbf{b}=\mathbf{p}<.069$.

Table 17 presents the percent first, second and third and significance levels for strategies not listed by gender and gender $X$ birth order. Girls used something not listed more often first than boys ( $\underline{r}=-.13$ ). Birth order was not related to the use of strategies not listed. An interaction
between birth order and sex with regard to strategies not listed revealed that more $L B$ girls marginally used strategies not listed than LB boys first ( $\underline{r}=-.17$ ) and significantly more second ( $\underline{r}=-.15$ ). Data were not collected on the use of strategies not listed as a third strategy in the ordering sequence. However, when using initial and second strategies it appears that girls, particularly LB girls, use more strategies overall than boys.

Table 17
Percent_Distribution_of_Strategies_Not_Listed_by_Gender_and Gender_X_Birth_Order

Gender
$\qquad$
Seguence $\quad \underline{F}$
$N \quad 110$
First $\quad 6.4^{\text {a }}$

Note. $\quad F=$ Female. $M=$ Male. $\quad$ FOBF $=$ First andor only born female. $F O B M=$ First andor only born male. $\quad$ LBF $=$ Later born female. $L B M=$ Later born male.
$a=p<.035$.
$\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{p}<.035$.
$\mathbf{c}=\mathrm{p}<.06$.

Participants who were asked how likely they would be first or second to give up revealed no gender differences, birth order differences or interaction effects in the use of giving up.

## DISCUSSION

The current study hypothesized that first andor only born children would use less powerful influence strategies than later born children in order to get their way with their mothers. In addition, it was hypothesized that girls would also use these weaker strategies more than boys. The findings were mixed for both of these hypotheses.

With regard to birth order, more first andor only born children used positive feelings and reasoning as an initial strategy than later born children. Later born children tended to not ask as an initial strategy more than first and/or only born children. When using the second strategy, more first and/or only born children used bargaining, reasoning and begging and pleading than later born children. Findings for the third strategy revealed that first and/or only born children cried more as a last resort than later born children, whereas more later borns tended to use telling as a last resort than first and/or only borns.

These birth order findings, in aggregate, indicated that first and/or only borns tended to use egalitarian strategies, particularly positive feelings, bargaining and reasoning, as their first and second strategies. These strategies can be considered more interactive strategies and have been shown by Cowan and Avants (in press) to be the
social influence strategies most preferred by mothers. Since first and/or only born children predominantly used these effective strategies both initially and as a second strategy this suggested a greater maturity in the use of persuasion strategies, at least at the beginning and middle of the ordering sequence. The fact that more later borns use not asking as an initial strategy and more first and/or only born children used begging and pleading as a second strategy provided only minimal support for lower power among first and/or only born children in their use of initial and second strategies.

The use by first and/or only borns of these egalitarian strategies, particularly reasoning and bargaining, diminished by their third persuasion attempt, with first and/or only born children using crying more than later borns and later borns telling more than first borns. It appears that after first andor only born children have attempted to get their way using effective strategies, they resorted to an extremely weak power strategy, crying, as a last resort. More later borns, compared to first and/or only borns, failed to ask initially and resorted to telling last, both strong strategies. The first and/or only borns' use of crying as a last resort coupled with the later borns' use of telling third supports the power hypotheses. Cohen and Beckwith (1977) and Jacobs and Moss (1976) have observed that there appears to be more interaction between first born
children and their parents than between parents and later born children. Though first born children seem more interactive with their parents they also seem more dependent on them for approval. Perhaps this combination of first born-parent interaction and first born children's dependency on parents contributed to the first and/or only born children's use of the interactive and more mature strategies early and midway through the strategy sequence while resorting to the weaker strategies, as predicted, by the end of the ordering sequence.

Gender differences were observed in the following anticipating non-compliance strategies: persistence, cry and get angry. These strategies loaded on the Cowan and Avants (in press) Factor 1 and were considered weak power strategies as well as those least preferred by mothers. Boys, particularly later born (LB) boys, used persistence as a second strategy more than girls. This order reversed itself third with more LB girls significantly employing persistence than boys. More boys than girls used getting angry intiallly and first and/or only born (FOB) boys used getting angry more than $F O B$ girls as a second strategy. Contrary to the hypothesis that girls use weaker strategies to get their way, girls did not use persistence more than boys second. The reversed use of persistence by LB girls third indicated that they did resort to this weak strategy after the failure of previous attempts at
persuasion. Girls cried more third suggesting that they availed themselves of this very weak strategy as another last resort to get their way. Although more boys, particularly $F O B$ boys, used getting angry as an initial strategy than girls, this does not necessarily indicate that they were using weaker strategies initially. It is true that getting angry loaded on Cowan and Avants' (in press) Factor 1 ; however, getting angry might be qualitatively different from the other anticipating non-compliance strategies and a more powerful strategy consistent with the male gender role. Although the use of initial and second strategies indicated mixed findings, the data suggest that girls were using weak strategies (persistence and crying) as their final attempts to get their way with their mothers. The results of Factor 2, labeled egalitarian strategies, indicated gender differences for the following strategies: the use of good deeds first, bargaining and reasoning. More LB girls than LB boys used good deeds first as a second strategy. Bargaining was used more by LB born boys second than LB born girls and was used more by boys, particularly LB boys, than girls third. Initially, approximately twice as many LB boys than girls mentioned reasoning, whereas three times as many LB girls than LB boys mentioned reasoning as their second strategy. Gender differences in reasoning for first and/or only borns appeared by the third strategy, with twice as many FOB boys
using reasoning than $F O B$ girls.
The use of these egalitarian strategies is difficult to interpret within a power model. Since these are egalitarian strategies, their use demonstrates neither high nor low power. The use of good deeds first and reasoning might be considered somewhat more conciliatory than bargaining, particularly from a low power person. In this way these results might fit the power model because bargaining is a process involving more exchange and may require a low power person to be more assertive than when using positive feelings or reasoning.

Findings for Factor 3, labeled autonomous strategies, revealed gender differences in the use of tell, laissezfaire (do as one pleases) and not ask. Although most children, approximately $90 \%$, asked as an initial strategy, twice as many females, particularly LB females, than males used tell to get their way. Although no gender differences were noted in the use of tell as a second strategy, four times as many LB boys than LB girls used tell as a last resort strategy. With regard to laissez-faire, more FOB boys used this strategy first than $F O B$ girls. More boys, particularly LB boys, used this strategy second than girls (and LB girls). By the third strategy both FOB boys and LB boys were using this attempt at persuasion significantly more than girls.

Contrary to expectations, LB girls used not ask more
than LB boys last. The use of autonomous strategies, with the exception of $L B$ females' initial use of tell and final use of not ask, provided support that boys are using stronger persuasion strategies throughout the ordering sequence as predicted by the hypothesis.

Overall, although the data were mixed regarding support for gender differences in the use of initial and second strategies, by the third or last resort strategy girls were using the weaker strategies and boys the stronger ones. Thus, the analysis of sequencing of strategies suggests that gender stereotyped strategies tend to emerge when past attempts at persuasion have not been successful. In addition, more girls, particularly LB girls, than boys were using strategies other than the aforementioned ones initially and second. These findings corroborate Cowan, Drinkard and MacGavin's (1984) findings that girls tend to use more strategies overall to get their way than boys. One interpretation might suggest that since girls have less familial power, they might need to try more varied strategies to get their way.

These results provide only minimal support for the power model. An alternative interpretation might suggest that gender differerences in sequencing might emerge as result of an additional sense of powerlessness due to the effects of not having influenced the target in the initial or second persuasion attempts. This increased frustration
might be due to the combination of lower familial power and the powerlessness arising from not being able to influence one's more powerful target. In addition, a stereotypic gender role interpretation might account for women using more strategies than those listed in this study to get their way. In childhood, the female gender role permits a broader repertoire of expression than does the more restricted male repertoire. Perhaps it is this broader repertoire of expression that results in females using more strategies not listed.

Since this research was largely exploratory in nature and a number of the findings were marginally significant, many avenues remain open for further investigation. First, the current study was conducted with questionnaires. Naturalistic observation of children's ordering of power strategies or structured interviews might be a more valid indicator of the relation between social power and gender. Second, birth order differences might be clarified if LB children were compared with regard to the gender of their older siblings. Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1970) have suggested that LB males with older sisters tend to be more powerful within the family than $L B$ males with older brothers. A third avenue would involve incorporating the children's fathers as the targets of influence. Because fathers might prove to be more powerful targets than mothers, gender differences in influence strategies might
emerge earlier in the sequence if fathers were the targets of influence.

APPENDIX A
"HOW I GET MY WAY" QUESTIONNAIRE
MY NAME IS
I AM A
MALE $\qquad$ FEMALE $\qquad$
HOW OLD ARE YOU? $\qquad$
CHECK THE ONE THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR HOME SITUATION:
I LIVE WITH
BOTH PARENTS $\qquad$
MOTHER ALONE $\qquad$
FATHER ALONE $\qquad$
STEPFATHER-MOTHER $\qquad$
STEPMOTHER-FATHER $\qquad$
OTHER $\qquad$
MY ETHNIC GROUP IS
WHITE $\qquad$
BLACK $\qquad$
HISPANIC $\qquad$
ASIAN $\qquad$
OTHER $\qquad$
HOW MANY OLDER SISTERS DO YOU HAVE? $\qquad$
HOW MANY OLDER BROTHERS DO YOU HAVE? $\qquad$
HOW MANY YOUNGER SISTERS DO YOU HAVE? $\qquad$
HOW MANY YOUNGER BROTHERS DO YOU HAVE? $\qquad$

DEFINITIONS AND EXAMPLES OF "HOW I GET MY WAY" WITH MOTHER
ASK: make a simple request.
Example: I just ask her.
BARGAIN: arrive at mutually agreeable solution by discussion. Example: $I$ promise to do a chore in return for what I want.

POSITIVE FEELINGS: act nice or affectionate. Make the other feel good. Example: I hug her and tell her how nice she looks.

DO AS I PLEASE: take independent action anyway. Example: I do what $I$ want to do anyway.

TELL: matter-of-fact statement of what is wanted. Example: I'm going there tonight.

NEGATIVE FEELINGS: act sad, sulk, ignore her, go to my room. Make her feel bad. Example: I act real sad and go to my room.

PERSISTENCE: continue to try to get my way or wear her down. Example: I bug her until I get my way.

BEG AND PLEAD: begging or pleading to get my way. Example: Please, please, please let me go.

GOOD DEEDS FIRST: do something nice before trying to get my way. Example: I clean my room first and then ask.

REASONING: give reasons.
Example: I explain why $I$ want to go, or give my reasons.

CRY: cry to get my way.
GET ANGRY: show anger, yell. Example: I get mad and yell at her.

NOW, WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK OF THE FIRST THING YOU ARE LIKELY TO DO TO GET YOUR WAY WITH YOUR MOTHER WHEN IT IS IMPORTANT TO YOU.

PUT A CHECK MARK NEXT TO THE WAY YOU WOULD USE FIRST. YOU CAN CHECK MORE THAN ONE LINE IF YOU USE MORE THAN ONE WAY FIRST.

USE FIRST
ASK
BARGAIN
POSITIVE FEELINGS $\qquad$
DO AS I PLEASE
TELL
NEGATIVE FEELINGS $\qquad$
PERSISTENCE
BEG AND PLEAD
GOOD DEEDS FIRST $\qquad$
REASON


CRY
GET ANGRY
IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD DO FIRST?

HOW OFTEN WOULD YOU GIVE UP IF THE FIRST THING YOU TRIED DID NOT WORK?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NEVER | ONCE IN | SOMETIMES | OFTEN | ALWAYS |

WHAT I WOULD DO NEXT OR SECOND IF THE FIRST THING I TRIED DID NOT WORK.

PUT A CHECK MARK NEXT TO THE WAY YOU WOULD USE SECOND. YOU CAN CHECK MORE THAN ONE LINE IF YOU USE MORE THAN ONE WAY SECOND.

USE SECOND
ASK

BARGAIN

POSITIVE FEELINGS $\qquad$
DO AS I PLEASE

TELL

NEGATIVE FEELINGS $\qquad$
PERSISTENCE

BEG AND PLEAD

GOOD DEEDS FIRST $\qquad$

REASON

CRY

GET ANGRY
IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD DO SECOND?

HOW OFTEN WOULD YOU GIVE UP IF THE SECOND THING YOU TRIED DID NOT WORK?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NEVER | ONCE IN | SOMETIMES | OFTEN | ALWAYS |

```
WHAT I WOULD DO THIRD IF THE SECOND THING I DID TO GET MY
WAY DID NOT WORK.
PUT A CHECK MARK NEXT TO THE WAY YOU WOULD USE THIRD. YOU
CAN CHECK MORE THAN ONE LINE IF YOU USE MORE THAN ONE WAY
THIRD.
    USE THITRD
ASK
BARGAIN
POSITIVE FEELINGS
```

$\qquad$

```
DO AS I PLEASE
TELL
NEGATIVE FEELINGS
```

$\qquad$

```
PERSISTENCE
BEG AND PLEAD
GOOD DEEDS FIRST
REASON
CRY
GET ANGRY
```
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