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ABSTRACT

The factor structure of power strategies children (6th and 12th graders) use with their parents and the effects of importance of the issue, target, grade, and sex of subject on the emergent factors were examined. The factor analysis isolated three factors subsequently labeled Mature, Intrusive, and Unilateral strategies. When the issue was important, the frequency of Mature strategies increased, and the frequency of Unilateral strategies decreased (in 12th graders). Mothers, relative to fathers, were more frequently the targets of Intrusive and Unilateral strategies and Mature strategies by 12th graders. Twelfth graders also reported more frequent use of Unilateral strategies than 6th graders. Females reported less frequent use of Unilateral and more frequent use of Intrusive strategies than males. Overall, strategies were reported more frequently when the issue was important, mothers were targets, and females were actors. Importance of issue accounted for the largest proportion of the variance, supporting the notion that power strategy use is determined by situational variables, such as importance and target, as much as by individual difference variables such as sex.
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CHILDREN'S USE OF POWER STRATEGIES:
THE EFFECT OF SITUATIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

The study of power relationships and decision-making patterns in intimate relationships has been a major topic in the literature for the past two decades. The concept of interpersonal power has been broadly defined as the ability to influence another individual to do or believe something s/he would not have necessarily done or believed spontaneously (Johnson, 1976). Though slightly different definitions of social power have been used, Smith (1970) observed general agreement among social researchers that power is multidimensional in nature, including socio-structural, interactional, and outcome components.

Cromwell and Olson (1975) conceptualized power as multidimensional including three distinct domains: power bases, power processes and power outcomes. In the context of power bases, French and Raven (1959) delineated six bases of social power including: (1) legitimate, based on the influenced person's belief that the powerful individual has the right to control his/her behavior or opinions; (2) referent, based on the influenced person's desire for identification with the powerful person; (3) reward, based on the ability of the powerful individual to provide rewards for the person influenced; (4) expert,
based on the influenced person's perception of superior knowledge and skill in the powerful individual; (5) coercive power, based on the powerful person's ability to mediate punishment to the influenced person; and (6) informational, based on the content of the influence message rather than on the person who delivers it. In contrast, power processes refer to the interactional techniques which persons use to gain control in the negotiation or decision-making process. Finally, power outcomes address the question of who makes the final decision or ultimately maintains control.

Power can be viewed as an individual characteristic or trait where persons differ in the extent to which they want or need to have an impact on their environment. As individuals differ in the degree to which they feel powerful, these differences appear to reflect environmental realities as much as tempermental dispositions (Lips, 1981). One can also view power as dependent on the situation: the resources controlled by the influencer and the target, the influencer's status relative to those being influenced, and how power resources are perceived by those who are to be influenced. When power differences exist between individuals or groups, these differences may reside in situational factors, and further, these factors may emanate from the broad cultural context.

Economic and social pressures have elicited behavior
patterns and personality characteristics that go with subordinate status. A less powerful group has typically been perceived and defined in terms of the dominant group whether the social relation is gender-linked, racial, or economic and cultural (Rohrbauch, 1979). The stereotypes applied to powerless groups have much in common: passivity, dependence, a happy-go-lucky emotionality and a certain tolerance for and even enjoyment of suffering (Rohrbauch, 1979). The attitudes, feelings, and perceptions surrounding major power and status differences for all oppressed individuals are similar. For women, this subjugation is based not on gender, but on her position relative to the more powerful male. The female has always been defined in male terms, and as males are viewed as more powerful, females are automatically viewed as passive, dependent, and even somewhat helpless (Rohrbauch, 1979). The dependence and passivity that go with the female stereotype has made women vulnerable to rape and beating (Hartman & Ross, 1978), phobias (Fodor, 1974), depression and a general self-deprecation that can cause pervasive feelings of worthlessness and hopelessness (Weissman & Klerman, 1977). Gillespie (1971) has posited a theory of power which emphasizes that women are structurally blocked by social, legal, and psychological barriers from potential power-based resources and, thus, from gaining as much power as their husbands. Gillespie
argued against the personal resource theory and instead posited that, in fact, this is still a caste/class system rationalizing the dominance of the male sex.

Sex differences in the access to and use of power, for the most part, can be traced to status differences between men and women (Lips, 1981). Men having higher ascribed status than women have been automatically granted a certain amount of legitimate power over them. Furthermore, men's higher status has provided them with concrete power resources such as income-producing jobs and such positions of formal authority as legislators, corporate managers and heads of households (Lips, 1981). Men's higher status, according to Lips (1981), has also permitted males to be viewed as experts with all the influence such authority implies.

Interpersonal Power Strategies. Operating from positions of different status with accompanying differential access to bases of power, women and men resort to different styles of influence when dealing with each other. The relationship between resources of the powerholder and means of influence has far-reaching consequences for the kind of social relations that evolve between powerholders and target persons (Johnson, 1976). It has been hypothesized that the style of influence one selects determines not only immediate success; feelings about oneself combined with the feelings of others about
one's role as influencer contribute to future success as well (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970).

Johnson (1976) hypothesized that the exercise of interpersonal power can vary along three dimensions: directness-indirectness, competence-helplessness, and personal resources-concrete resources. Directness-indirectness refers to the openness of any influence attempt as opposed to an influence attempt which employs covert, sneaky, manipulative techniques. The competence-helpless dimension distinguishes between the strong, expert individual who can command compliance readily and the individual citing weakness, illness, or incapacity as justification for compliance. Johnson's third dimension consists of resources which can range from concrete to the very personal. Concrete resources such as money, knowledge, and physical strength, are independent of relationships, and they can be used to back up influence attempts in many instances. In contrast, personal resources depend on a specific relationship. Love, friendship, and approval are examples of personal resources: they are effective only within the context of certain relationships. Johnson also hypothesized that men's power styles are frequently direct, competent, and backed by concrete resources, whereas women's are more likely to be more indirect, helpless, and based on personal resources. These differences in power styles,
according to Johnson, have reinforced the sex-role stereotypes that are entwined with the differences in male-female status.

**Sex Differences in Power Use.** Incorporating her three dimensions with French and Raven's (1959) six power bases of power, Johnson noted stereotypical expectations surrounding male and female use of power. Reward and coercion are expected to be used in a direct, concrete way by men and in an indirect, personal way by women. For example, men have the resources and social approval to offer or withdraw money. Women, in contrast, offer or withdraw affection, friendship, and sexual favors. Men are more likely to make more open threats and promises; women are expected to use more ingratiation. Referent power, according to Johnson, is considered appropriate for both sexes, but as it is primarily personal, it may be considered particularly appropriate for women. Expert power, based on superior skills, knowledge, and trustworthiness, is concrete, competent, and usually direct, so it may be viewed as solely appropriate for men. Informational power is also thought to be used directly by men and indirectly by women. Legitimate power based on the expectation of reciprocity (e.g. "I am entitled to your favor") is expected to be used directly by males. However, legitimate power based on the expectation of social responsibility (e.g. "As I am ill, you owe me a
favor") is strongly stereotyped as female.

Johnson (1976), found some support for her hypothesis that people expect women and men to exercise power differently. Students, who were asked to try to get another to change his or her opinion on a legal case, were presented 15 different methods or types of power. For each method the respondents were asked to indicate whether they felt the influencer was male or female. Johnson found that concrete coercion and competent legitimate, expert, and direct informational power were significantly more expected of males than females. Personal reward and sexuality were seen as significantly more characteristic of females. In addition, Johnson found that people expected male sources of power to be strongly linked to males. However, only two of the proposed female sources of power were more strongly expected of females than males. All power, according to Johnson, is thought of as essentially a male domain. Men are expected to use the "masculine" power strategies such as coercion, but are also allowed to use other strategies that seem appropriate. Women, on the other hand, are expected to adhere to the less aggressive forms of influence, and they are usually considered "out of line" if they adopt direct, competent, concrete influence techniques.

Falbo (1977) examined the relationship between sex, and sex role, and social influence. Falbo hypothesized
that sex-role typing would be more important than sex in accounting for the sex differences in forms of social influence. Based upon the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974), subjects were classified as masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated. The subjects composed essays on "How I Get My Way", which were subsequently coded for the presence or absence of the following forms of influence: assertion, tears, emotional change, subtlety, and reasoning. Falbo found some support for her hypothesis. Persons of either sex who were classified as feminine were more likely to report using tears, subtlety, and emotional changes. Sex differences were found in reasoning; more females than males reported using this strategy. Sex-role differences in the number of strategies reported were found. Specifically, masculine individuals reported the use of fewer strategies than androgynous or feminine ones. Based on these findings, Falbo suggested that sex differences in social influence methods are the result of sex-role socialization.

Cann (1979) examined sex differences in styles of influence within the context of a work situation. In simulated work situations, men and women supervised workers in another room and communicated with workers by written messages. With instructions to increase worker productivity, the supervisors were permitted to threaten and/or reward workers. Cann found that male and female
supervisors did not differ in the methods used in this situation; both sexes relied heavily on persuasion and reward. Men, however, made more influence attempts than women, and men tended to view their own behavior as more aggressive and powerful than women saw theirs.

Kipnis, Stitt, Schmidt, and Price (1983) also studied male and female influence styles in a work situation. They examined the commonly held belief that men are more independent, logical, aggressive, competitive, and better suited to handle managerial positions than the typically gentle, sensitive, passive and accommodating woman. In general, men and women were found to be equally able and willing to display both authoritarian and egalitarian styles of leadership if so instructed.

While the Cann and Kipnis, et al., studies did not reveal sex differences in the form of influence employed, they did suggest that "legitimacy" may be crucial in understanding the sex differences that do exist. In these studies, both men and women were given equally legitimate positions of authority from which to exercise influence. In the real world, however, men have routinely been ascribed higher status than women through positions as heads of households, legislative institutions, business, and the military. It seems reasonable to assume that the more legitimate the power base from which one operates (Lips and Colwill, 1978), the more direct an influencer
can be, whether this legitimacy stems from position, role, social norms or previous agreements (Lips, 1981). Women so often lacking legitimate power relative to men will, therefore, frequently resort to indirect methods of influence (Lips, 1981).

Power is obviously a situational characteristic as well as a personal one (Lips, 1981). As such, the use of power strategies can also be viewed from either an individual difference or a situational perspective. Sex differences, age differences, and personality differences (e.g. sex roles) are examples of individual difference variables that have been studied (Cowan, Drinkard, & McGavin, 1984; Falbo, 1977; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Johnson, 1976). Falbo and Peplau (1980) for example, found sex differences in how adult men and women get their way in intimate relationships. Using a two-dimensional model of power strategies, they found that heterosexual men used more direct and bilateral strategies whereas women used more indirect and unilateral strategies. A bilateral-unilateral dimension classifies strategies according to the degree of actor-target interaction, and a direct-indirect dimension differentiates the extent to which strategies are content-related. While sex differences were found, Falbo and Peplau suggested a more structural interpretation. That is, the gender effect is probably one of differential power between men and women in
intimate relationships. As sex and power are typically confounded, the study of the effects of power differences per se may contribute to a more structural or situational view of sex differences in the use of power strategies.

Using the Falbo and Peplau model, Cowan et al. (1984) investigated the power interpretation of gender differences by studying the effect of varying the target of influence on children's use of power strategies. Fathers were presumed to have more power than mothers, and mothers were presumed to have more power than same-sex friends. Sixth, ninth, and twelfth graders described in an essay format how they influenced their mother, father, or same-sex peer to get their way. As predicted, strong multivariate effects were found for target but no multivariate effects were found for either age or gender. Univariate effects of target were found on all three dimensions studied: bilateral-unilateral, direct-indirect, and strong-weak. Parents received the strategies of the more powerful (indirect, unilateral, weak) while same-sex peers elicited bilateral, direct, and strong strategies. Further, fathers were targeted with less bilateral and direct strategies than mothers or friends. The only finding inconsistent with the expected power ordering of targets was the use of negative affect. Mothers received more negative affect than fathers. As negative affect is both indirect and unilateral, it was expected that the
more powerful father would be targeted with this strategy rather than the less powerful mother.

Sex differences in children's use of power strategies were studied by Sutton-Smith (1970) and Cowan et al. (1984). The only sex difference in the use of an individual strategy found by Cowan et al. was that females used more positive affect (i.e. making the other person feel good or doing something nice for the target) than males. Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1970) found that females reported more frequent pleading with parents. Whereas males used more attack and offense strategies, girls used more reasoning, defense, and making the sibling feel obligated. Further, females used more symbolic techniques with siblings while males used more physical techniques. Although Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg did report sex differences, relatively more birth order differences were found. Sex differences were not the strongest effects found by either Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg or Cowan et al. These studies support the notion that power is dependent upon situational variables. As status and power reside in the relationship between target and actor, power can vary as targets vary; an individual sex difference interpretation, in contrast, depends solely on the actor.

Little research has been done on the contribution of developmental influences in the use of power strategies.
Even though Cowan et al. found no multivariate effect of age, univariate analysis revealed that 9th and 12th graders used more bilateral strategies than sixth graders. Older children reported more reasoning whereas younger children used more persistence and asking. These differences may reflect an increasing power as youngsters enter adolescence. Empirical research has demonstrated that older children are less inclined to accept the legitimacy of parental authority than younger ones (Bowerman & Kinch, 1960; Douvan & Adelson, 1966; Smith, 1977). A second explanation suggested that age differences reflected an increase in more cognitively based strategies with a corresponding decrease in simple, less cognitively based forms of influence.

For children, a close parallel is hypothesized to exist between individual cognitive development and social development (Glachan & Light, 1982). Social structures, like cognitive structures, are altered primarily through social interaction (Borman & Fishbein, 1982). Borman and Fishbein described childhood (ages 4 to 12) as a time when the child develops strong same sex peer relations, strong sibling bonds and important relationships with teachers. Piaget (1970) has described this period of a child's cognitive development. The child, according to Piaget, is completing the development of concrete operations, a developmental stage when operational thinking replaces the
egocentrism of the very young child, with a system of reversible operations, relations and classes which are decentered with respect to self. In the intellectual domain, the child becomes able to attend to multiple features of situations, and thinking begins to show flexibility. Similarly in the social domain, the child becomes able to move freely from one perspective to another so that social cooperation and communication become possible. The third stage of development is late adolescence, a span in the individual's development incorporating the period from about age 12 to age 18. Piaget has termed this stage formal operations, a time during which adolescents develop the ability to formulate general laws and principles and devise hypotheses to explain facts or phenomena. Cognitively, according to Piaget, individuals vary, depending on genetics and social experiences, in the degree to which formal operations are developed; some children never complete this cognitive stage. Piaget (1959) gave a crucial role to social experience in the development of cognitive processes. He indicated that awareness of one's own reasoning processes originates from the need to prove and justify to others what one has asserted, and that to do this, one must reflect critically on one's own reasoning from the perspective of an outside observer. Cognitive processes based upon concrete operational or formal thought, as
described by Piaget, are founded upon society, history, and culture. As higher mental operations are socially formed, and culturally transmitted, it is reasonable to assume that age radically changes the tools of thinking (Borman & Fishbein, 1982). It follows, then, that as social and cognitive skills vary with age, the style of influence children use to persuade others may also vary with age. Older children should be better equipped to assess the variables within a given social situation and select forms of influence that require more complex cognitive and social skill (e.g. reasoning). Younger children would be expected to use simpler techniques (e.g. begging and pleading).

The present study extended the investigation of children's use of power strategies in several ways. First, a new situational variable, importance of issue, was introduced. A particular strategy as well as the number of strategies used in a given situation may depend to a large degree on the importance of the issue to the actor. Secondly, only parental targets were studied. As Cowan et al. found greater target effects between friends and parents than between mothers and fathers, the difference between mothers and fathers may have been masked by the inclusion of peer targets. Not only does peer influence vary with age, but parents also have greater jurisdiction over their children's behavior.
Several methodological differences between the Cowan et al. study and the current study should be noted. Rather than rely on the dimensional model produced by Falbo and Peplau (1980), the present study determined the factor structure of children's strategies by utilizing rating scales of those strategies elicited with the open-ended procedure of Cowan et al. Although the Falbo and Peplau model was successful in predicting target (or power) differences, it was only partially predictive of developmental differences. Strategies, such as begging and pleading and eliciting reciprocity emerged with children that had not been found with adults.

The measurement of strategy use has also been modified. The Cowan et al. study controlled for significant target and sex differences in number of strategies elicited by computing a percentage score (of the strategies used by a given subject). As mothers received more strategies and females reported using more strategies, the percentage score controlled for the spurious influence of gender and target on the occurrence of specific strategies. By using a rating scale rather than a self-elicited procedure, it should be possible to determine if females use more strategies and if mothers are targeted with more strategies as well as the specific strategies (or factors) that are sex, target, age, and importance of issue related.
The sequence of strategies used by children has been neglected in previous studies. Children may utilize a repertoire of strategies, and the use of a particular strategy may depend on the effectiveness of the previous one. Strategy ordering may also reflect the factor structure of the strategies. That is, children may systematically initiate requests with strategies which share similar conceptual factors, whereas successive choices have structural components in common. Thus, it seemed useful to analyze the ordering of strategies used by children to determine if a sequential pattern emerges, and further if that pattern is related to importance of issue, target, sex and age.

In summary, the purpose of the present study was to determine the factor structure of strategies children use with parents and to examine the effects of sex, target, age and importance of issue on emergent factors. No predictions regarding the directional effects of the independent variables on the particular factors can be hypothesized prior to the factor analysis. However, greater frequency of reported use of strategies in general should occur when the issue is important rather than unimportant, when the actor is female rather than male, and when the target is the mother rather than the father. Developmental differences are expected in the use of strategies which depend upon the development of mature
cognitive and social processes and strategies which rely on more simplistic methods. Older children should report more use of cognitive-based strategies such as reasoning, whereas younger children should report more use of simple strategies such as begging and pleading and persistence. Sequential trends should reflect these developmental differences as well.
METHODS

Subjects

The volunteer subjects were 100 students, 50 6th and 50 12th graders from two elementary and one senior high school in the same southern California suburban community. The elementary schools were feeder schools for the high school. A sample of 25 6th-grade males, 25 6th-grade females, 25 12th-grade males, and 25 12th-grade females was drawn from three classes at each grade level. The mean age for 6th grade girls was 11.2 years, 6th grade boys 11.1 years, 12th grade girls 17.0 years, and 12th grade boys 16.9 years.

Materials

The first page of the questionnaire consisted of instructions, strategy definitions, and examples of important and unimportant issues (see Table 1). Examples of important issues included "having your heart set on going to the movies with special friends" and "getting your parents to buy you something you have wanted for weeks"; examples of unimportant issues presented were "wanting to skip your daily chores for just one day" and "getting to watch your favorite TV show when family members want to watch something else." Students were asked how they get what they want on an important and unimportant issue from each parent. The order of four
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask</td>
<td>Make a simple request.</td>
<td>I just ask.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargain</td>
<td>Arrive at mutually agreeable solution.</td>
<td>I promise to do a chore in return for what I want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feelings</td>
<td>Act nice or affectionate.</td>
<td>Make the other person feel good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire (do as you please)</td>
<td>Take independent action; do it anyway.</td>
<td>I do what I want to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell</td>
<td>Matter-of-fact statement of what is wanted.</td>
<td>I'm going there tonight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feelings</td>
<td>Act sad or mad. Make the other person feel bad.</td>
<td>I act real sad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>Continue to try to influence or wear down the other person.</td>
<td>I bug the person until I get my way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg and Plead</td>
<td>Statement about begging or pleading.</td>
<td>Please, please, please let me go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliciting Reciprocity (good deeds first)</td>
<td>Do something nice before before asking.</td>
<td>I clean my room first and then ask.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>Give reasons.</td>
<td>I explain why I want to go, or give my reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>Avoid person and go to someone else first.</td>
<td>I avoid the person and go to the person who will say yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pages headed Father Important, Father Unimportant, Mother Important, Mother Unimportant was randomized; the order of the questions on each page was standardized. Eleven strategies were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from never to always. The 11 strategies included: asking, bargaining, positive affect, laissez-faire, tell, negative affect, persistence, begging and pleading, eliciting reciprocity, reasoning, and evasion. Table 1 presents definitions and examples of each strategy. Forced choice questions addressed the order of strategies used, asking subjects to select first, second, and last resort strategies. An additional strategy, giving up, was added to the last resort category.

Procedure

Female researchers conducted the 30 minute sessions in the classroom. Students were told that the study was investigating the way in which young people get what they want and were advised that there were no right or wrong answers to the questions. Written instructions, strategy definitions with examples of each strategy, and examples of important and unimportant issues were read aloud by the experimenter. Further, instructions on how to complete the scales were demonstrated on the blackboard. At the end of the sessions the nature of the study was explained to all subjects.
RESULTS

Results were analyzed in four steps. First, a principle-components factor analysis was conducted on the 11 power strategies (asking, bargaining, positive affect, negative affect, telling, persistence, begging and pleading, reasoning, laissez-faire, eliciting reciprocity, and evasion) to identify coherent factors. The obtained factors were then analyzed using analysis of variance in a 2(important vs. unimportant) X 2(mother vs. father) X 2(male vs. female) X 2(sixth grade vs. twelfth grade) factorial design to determine the effects of importance, target, sex, and grade on the factor scores. Third, a multivariate analysis of variance of the 11 strategies and univariate analyses of the significant multivariate main effects was conducted to clarify the particular strategies influenced by the independent variables. Finally, descriptive analysis and chi square analysis was conducted on the sequential data. The sequential dependent variables included first, next, and last, and results were examined to determine the effects of importance, target, grade, sex and sex X grade.

Factor Analysis. Principle-components factor analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization
was performed through SPSS on the 11 strategies across conditions. Four factors emerged, accounting for 50% of the variance. As only three of the four eigenvalues exceeded 1.0; the fourth factor was considered unreliable for analysis. Table 2 presents the loading of variance and covariance.

A criterion of .35 was used for inclusion of a variable in interpretation of a factor. Factor 1 included asking, bargaining, positive affect, eliciting reciprocity, and reasoning. These strategies may be viewed as effective and socially acceptable means of interpersonal influence, the types of strategies that parental targets prefer to receive. Bargaining and reasoning require mature thought and more complex cognitive capacities (e.g. argue, persuade, mediate, and negotiate) than the other strategies. Eliciting reciprocity and positive affect are less direct, yet effective and socially acceptable techniques for getting one's way. Factor 1 is labeled Mature strategies.

Factor 2, is comprised of persistence, begging and pleading, and negative affect, and requires repetition, endurance, and tenacity. Factor 2 is likely to be aversive to the target, and is labeled Intrusive strategies. Factor 3, composed of laissez-faire and telling, strong strategies which do not take into account
### TABLE 2

Factor Loadings, Communalities ($h^2$), Percents of Variance and Covariance for Factor Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asking</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos. Affect</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. Affect</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg and Plead</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elit. Recprcty</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evasion</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Mature</th>
<th>Intrusive</th>
<th>Unilateral</th>
<th>Avoidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Variance</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Covariance</td>
<td>36.02</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the responses of the target, and is labeled Unilateral strategies.

Oblique factor analysis after rotation with Kaiser normalization (Delta = 0) reveals that Factor 1 and Factor 2 are negatively correlated, \( (N = 100), r = -0.2671, p < 0.01 \).

Factor analysis of the within subject cells (FI, FU, MI, MU) resulted in variation in the preeminence of the three factors. When the issue was important, the strongest factor was Mature strategies followed by Intrusive strategies regardless of target. When the issue was unimportant, however, Intrusive emerged as the strongest factor. On unimportant issues, the second strongest factor was Unilateral for paternal targets and Mature for maternal targets. Table 3 presents the factors for each condition, the eigenvalues, and the percentage of variance accounted for by the isolated factors.

**Analysis of Factor Scores.** Factor scores were obtained by summing scores on variables that loaded .35 or higher on that factor. Analysis of variance was performed on the four factors, and interaction means were tested using the Tukey B procedure with all reported differences significant beyond the .05 level.

**Effects of Importance.** All three factors showed main effects of importance; however, two of the main effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factors by Within-Group Conditions</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% Common Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FI</strong></td>
<td>F1 = Mature</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2 = Intrusive</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FU</strong></td>
<td>F1 = Intrusive</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2 = Unilateral</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MI</strong></td>
<td>F1 = Mature</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2 = Intrusive</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3 = Evasion</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MU</strong></td>
<td>F1 = Intrusive</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2 = Mature</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were modified by interactions. A main effect of importance on the frequency of Mature strategies (Factor 1) was found, \( F(1, 96) = 26.89, p < .001 \), with higher frequency of Mature strategies when the issue was defined as important (\( M = 15.76 \)) than when unimportant (\( M = 14.29 \)). The main effect of importance on Intrusive strategies (Factor 2), \( F(1, 96) = 33.33, p < .001 \), was modified by both Grade, \( F(1, 96) = 4.99, < .035 \), and Sex, \( F(1, 96) = 11.11, p < .001 \). In general, Intrusive strategies were reported more frequently when the issue was important (\( M = 7.44 \)) than when unimportant (\( M = 6.46 \)). Twelfth graders, however, reported more frequent use of Intrusive strategies when the issue was important (\( M = 7.26 \)) than when unimportant (\( M = 5.93 \)) and 6th graders did not vary (\( M \) important = 7.61, \( M \) unimportant = 7.0). Females used Intrusive strategies more frequently when the issue was important in comparison to unimportant (\( M \) important = 8.54, \( M \) unimportant = 7.01) and males did not differentiate on the basis of importance (\( M \) important = 6.33, \( M \) unimportant = 5.92).

On Factor 3, Unilateral strategies, the main effect of Importance, \( F(1, 96) = 8.33, p < .005 \), (\( M \) important = 4.10, \( M \) unimportant = 4.54) was modified by Grade, \( F(1, 96) = 7.60, p < .007 \). Twelfth graders varied their use of Unilateral strategies and 6th graders did not.
Unilateral strategies were reported more frequently by 12th graders when the issue was unimportant (M = 5.49) than when important (M = 4.62, 6th graders: M important = 3.58, M unimportant = 3.52). Thus, when an issue was defined as important, Mature strategies increased in frequency, Intrusive strategies increased for females, and 12th graders increased Intrusive strategies but reported Unilateral strategies less frequently.

**Effects of Target.** Three main effects of target and one interaction of target and another variable was found. Both Intrusive strategies, $F(1, 96) = 18.43, p < .001$, and Unilateral strategies, $F(1, 96) = 9.98, p < .002$, were used with mothers more than with fathers (Intrusive: M mothers = 7.32, M fathers = 6.59; Unilateral: M mothers = 4.51, M fathers = 4.01). A main effect of Target on Mature strategies, $F(1, 96) = 5.23, p < .023$ was modified by Grade, $F(1, 96) = 6.03, p < .016$, with 12th graders reporting Mature strategies more frequently with their mothers (M = 15.85) than with their fathers (M = 14.75) and more than 6th graders with either target (M mothers = 14.73, M fathers = 14.79).

**Effects of Grade.** Grade showed one main effect and several interactions, affecting responses on all three factor scores. A main effect of grade was found on Unilateral strategies, $F(1, 96) = 17.51, p < .001$, with
12th graders reporting more of these strategies (M = 5.57) than 6th graders (M = 3.59). The interaction of Grade X Importance, as previously described, indicates that 12th graders, as well as using more Unilateral strategies overall, varied their use with importance of the issue and 6th graders did not. The other interactions with grade, reported in the above sections, revealed that older subjects varied their strategies with importance of target more than younger subjects. Twelfth graders varied Mature strategies with the target of influence and Intrusive and Unilateral strategies with the importance of the issue.

**Effects of Sex.** Sex differences were found on two of the three factor scores: Intrusiveness, $F(1,96) = 11.11, p < .001$, and Unilateral strategies, $F(1,96) = 4.29, p < .041$. No sex difference was found in reported use of Mature strategies. Females reported more frequent use of Intrusive strategies (M = 7.77) than males (M = 6.12), and less frequent use of Unilateral strategies (M females = 3.96, M males = 4.68). Sex of subject interacted with importance on one of the factor scores though not qualifying the main effects. As previously reported, females varied the use of Intrusive strategies with importance of the issue, using Intrusive strategies more frequently when the issue was important, and males did not.
Multivariate and Univariate Analyses of Individual Strategies. An alternative analysis was performed on the 11 measures, using MANOVA with subsequent univariate analyses of significant multivariate effects. As in the previous analysis, grade and sex were between-group variables and importance and target were within-group variables. Use of the Wilks test resulted in significant main effects for all four variables: Sex, $F(11, 86) = 2.38, p < .013, \eta^2 = .23$; Grade, $F(11, 86) = 4.55, p < .001, \eta^2 = .37$; Importance, $F(11, 86) = 5.25, p < .001, \eta^2 = .40$; and Target, $F(11, 86) = 3.00, p < .002, \eta^2 = .28$. Two significant multivariate interaction effects were also found: Grade X Target, $F(11, 86) = 2.15, p < .025, \eta^2 = .22$; and Sex X Importance, $F(11, 86) = 3.20, p < .001, \eta^2 = .29$. A marginally significant interaction occurred for Grade X Importance, $F(11, 86) = 1.76, p < .074, \eta^2 = .18$ Interaction means were tested using the Tukey B procedure and all reported differences were significant beyond the .05 level.

Effects of Importance. It was hypothesized that importance of the issue would increase the frequency of strategies. This hypothesis was supported with 8 of the 11 strategies significantly affected by importance of issue. All but laissez-faire showed increases with importance of the issue: asking, $F(1, 96) = 8.19, p < .005$;
bargaining, $F(1,96) = 16.40, p < .001$; positive affect, $F(1,96) = 3.92, p < .05$; laissez-faire, $F(1,96) = 10.21, p < .001$; persistence, $F(1,96) = 33.58, p < .001$; elicit reciprocity, $F(1,96) = 11.00, p < .001$; reasoning, $F(1,96) = 12.21, p < .001$; and begging and pleading, $F(1,96) = 19.69, p < .001$. A marginally significant effect of importance was found for use of negative affect, $F(1,96) = 3.22, p < .076$, and with telling, $F(1,96) = 3.05, p < .084$, with negative affect more frequent when the issue was important and telling more frequent when unimportant. Table 4 presents the mean scores for all the main effects.

Two significant univariate interactions from the marginal Grade X Importance interaction found that both laissez-faire and negative affect strategies varied with importance only for 12th graders. Laissez-faire was reported more frequently when the issue was unimportant by 12th graders ($M_{unimportant} = 2.73, M_{important} = 2.19$), $p < .01$, but not by 6th graders ($M_{unimportant} = 1.65, M_{important} = 1.63$), $F(1,96) = 8.80, p < .001$. Twelfth graders reported more negative affect strategies when the issue was important ($M = 2.08$) than when unimportant ($M = 1.76$) and 6th graders did not vary ($M_{important} = 2.22, M_{unimportant} = 2.24$), $F(1,96) = 4.21, p < .041$.

Importance was modified by sex of subject in two significant Sex X Importance interactions, with females
TABLE 4

Means of Main Effects of Importance, Grade, Target, and Sex on 11 Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>Unimp</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.86***</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargain</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.30***</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.04***</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/Affect</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.57**</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/Recip</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.54***</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/Affect</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; Pltd</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.15***</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persist</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.32***</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/faire</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.19***</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.36*</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evasion</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.10
** p<.05
*** p<.01
varying use of strategies with importance of the issue and males not affected by importance of the issue. Begging and pleading showed a significant Sex X Importance interaction. Females reported using begging and pleading more frequently when the issue was important (M = 2.96) than when unimportant (M = 2.40), \( p < .01 \), and males did not (M important = 2.03, M unimportant = 1.87). Females also used more negative strategies when the issue was important (M = 2.52) than unimportant (M = 2.09), \( p < .01 \), and males did not (M important = 1.74, M unimportant = 1.91), \( F (1,96) = 17.14, p < .001 \).

**Effects of Target.** It was expected that mothers would receive more frequent use of strategies than would fathers. Five of the 11 strategies were significantly affected by target and two marginally affected: laissez-faire, \( F (1,96) = 4.16, p < .044 \); telling, \( F (1,96) = 9.81, p < .002 \); negative affect, \( F (1,96) = 7.85, p < .006 \); persistence, \( F (1,96) = 13.10, p < .001 \); begging and pleading, \( F (1,96) = 5.06, p < .026 \); evasion, \( F (1,96) = 3.17, p < .078 \); and asking, \( F (1,96) = 2.92, p < .091 \). All of the significant and one of the marginally significant main effects of target were in the direction of mothers targeted more frequently than fathers. The only strategy that was reported to be used more frequently (marginally) with fathers was evasion.
Two significant Grade X Target interactions revealed that 6th graders varied the use of negative affect with the target, and 12th graders varied the use of eliciting reciprocity with target. Sixth graders reported more negative affect strategies with their mothers (M = 2.41) than fathers (M = 2.05), \( p < .01 \), and 12th graders did not (M mothers = 1.92, M fathers 1.88), \( F(1,96) = 5.02, p < .027 \). Twelfth graders reported more eliciting reciprocity with their mothers (M = 2.71) than fathers (M = 2.33), \( p < .01 \), and 6th graders did not (M mothers = 2.73, M fathers = 2.91), \( F(1,96) = 12.00, p < .001 \).

**Effects of Grade.** Four significant and one marginal main effect of grade were found. Twelfth graders reported significantly more frequent use of laissez-faire, \( F(1,96) = 18.99, p < .001 \); telling, \( F(1,96) = 7.85, p < .006 \); and reasoning, \( F(1,96) = 6.02, p < .016 \). Sixth graders reported more frequent use of begging and pleading than 12th graders, \( F(1,96) = 5.48, p < .021 \). A marginally significant main effect of grade on negative affect strategies, \( F(1,96) = 3.34, p < .071 \), indicated that 6th graders also reported more negative affect strategies than 12th graders.

Two previously described Grade X Importance interactions found that 12th graders varied both laissez-faire and negative affect strategies according to
the importance of the issue and 6th graders did not. Two previously reported Grade X Target interactions indicated that there was a grade difference in use of negative affect with mothers, with 6th graders reporting more negative affect ($M = 2.41$) than 12th graders ($M = 1.92$) and in eliciting reciprocity, with 12th graders eliciting reciprocity less frequently than their fathers ($M = 2.33$) as their mothers ($M = 2.71$), $p < .01$, and less than 6th graders ($M$ mothers $= 2.73$, $M$ fathers $= 2.91$).

**Effects of Sex.** Females were predicted to report more frequent use of strategies than males. Three of the strategies were significant, and all three strategies were reported more frequently by females than by males: negative affect, $F (1,96) = 7.07$, $p < .001$; persistence, $F (1,96) = 4.23$, $p < .042$; and begging and pleading, $F (1,96) = 11.75$, $p < .001$. Two marginally significant main effects of sex, telling, $F (1,96) = 3.10$, $p < .08$, and laissez-faire, $F (1,96) = 2.89$, $p < .092$, indicated that both telling and laissez-faire tended to be used more frequently by males than females. The significant Sex X Importance interaction described previously, $F (1,96) = 17.14$, $p < .001$, indicated that females used negative affect strategies more than males only when the issue was important ($M$ females $= 2.52$, $M$ males $= 1.91$), $p < .01$.

**Frequency/sequential Analysis.** Children's strategies
designated as first, next, and last were analyzed both by descriptive and chi square procedures. Table 5 presents the frequency and percentage of strategies reported for each sequential step.

**First Strategy Used.** Asking was the primary strategy used by children initially; overall, 64% reported using asking first. No other strategy was used by more than 10% of the children. No significant differences were found for importance of issue, target, sex, or age for asking. When sex and grade were considered, chi square analysis revealed a marginal difference between 6th grade females and 12th grade females, \( X^2 (1, N = 200), p < .10 \). Sixth grade females tended to use asking first more frequently than 12th grade females: 6th grade females 72%, 12th grade females 59%.

Positive affect was employed by 5.25% of the sample. Even though this strategy was minimally used, a significant sex difference was found, \( X^2 (1, N = 400) = 18.14, p < .001 \). Positive affect was utilized almost exclusively by girls; 10% of the girls used positive affect compared to only .5% of the boys. In addition, telling was used first by 9.5% of the children. A significant target effect was found, \( X^2 (1, N = 400) = 4.19, p < .05 \). Twice as many children used telling with mothers than with fathers (6.5% fathers, 12.5% mothers).
### TABLE 5

**Sequence of Power Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>First</th>
<th></th>
<th>Next</th>
<th></th>
<th>Last</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>(Pct.)</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>(Pct.)</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>(Pct.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>64.25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos. Affect</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. Affect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg &amp; Plead</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicit. Recipr.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evasion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Maximum number of responses = 400.
No significant grade effects for telling were found. However, males employed this strategy significantly more than females, $X^2 (1, N = 400) = 7.44, p < .01$. Telling was used by 5.5% of the females and 13.5% of the males.

**Next Strategy Used.** For their next strategy, children reported a wider array of strategies (see Table 5). Overall, 29.3% of the children reported the use of laissez-faire as the next strategy of choice. No significant differences were found for importance of issue or target. A marginal sex effect was found, $X^2 (1, N = 400) = 2.72, p < .10$. Females (33%) tended to use laissez-faire more often than males (25.5%). In addition, 12th graders used laissez-faire significantly more frequently than 6th graders, $X^2 (1, N = 400) = 13.15, p < .001$. Although 37.5% of the 12th graders reported the use of this strategy, only 21% of the 6th graders did so. A breakdown of the data by sex and grade revealed an interesting pattern. Twelfth grade boys used laissez-faire significantly more frequently than 6th grade boys, $X^2 (1, N = 200) = 32.24, p < .001$, and 6th grade girls used laissez-faire significantly more often than 6th grade boys, $X^2 (1, N = 200) = 20.37, p < .001$. Although 43% of the 12th grade males used laissez-faire, only 8% of the 6th grade males reported this strategy. Males appeared to dramatically increase the use of laissez-faire.
with age, whereas females remained consistent in their use of this strategy regardless of age (32% for 12th grade girls, 34% for 6th grade girls).

Persistence was used overall by 14.75% of the sample. No significant effects of importance of issue, target, grade, or sex were found. When both sex and grade were considered, a significant difference was found between 12th grade females and 12th grade males, $X^2 (1, N = 200) = 6.18, p < .01$. Persistence was used by 18% of the 12th grade females, whereas only 6% of the 12th grade males reported use of this strategy. Further, a significant difference was found between 6th grade males and 12th grade males, $X^2 (1, N = 200) = 4.88, p < .05$. Only 6% of 12th grade males used persistence, while 20% of the 6th grade males employed this strategy. Females did not vary their use of persistence with age (15% for 6th grade girls and 18% for 12th grade girls). On unimportant issues, 12th grade males did not use this strategy at all.

Bargaining overall was used by 12.3% of the sample as a second strategy choice. No significant effects were found for importance of issue, target, grade, or sex. By grade and sex, 6th grade males used bargaining more frequently than 12th grade males, $X^2 (1, N = 200) = 4.88, p < .05$. While 20% of the 6th grade males used bargaining, only 9% of the 12th grade males utilized this strategy.
Bargaining was reported by 11% of the 12th grade females and 12% of the 6th grade females. Females, as they grow older, tended to remain consistent with their use of bargaining as they grow older, whereas males decreased the use of this strategy.

Telling was used as a second strategy by 6.5% of the sample. Analysis of telling as an alternative strategy yielded no importance of issue, or target effects. However, significant grade differences were found, $X^2 (1, N = 400) = 6.69, p < .01$. Significantly more 12th graders (15%) used telling as a second strategy than 6th graders (4%). Sex effects were also found, $X^2 (1, N = 400) = 5.25, p < .05$. Although 15% of the males used telling next, only 5% of the females did so. When both grade and sex were taken into account, male usage of telling was consistent regardless of age (13% for 12th grade males, 16% for 6th grade males) whereas female use varied (11% for 12th grade females and 0% for 6th grade females).

Last Strategy Used. Overall, three strategies were predominantly used as a last resort: 32% of the children reported giving up, 29% used negative affect, and 27% used eliciting reciprocity.

Importance of issue and target yielded significant effects on giving up. Twice as many youngsters reported giving up on unimportant issues (22% unimportant vs. 10% important), $X^2 (1, N = 400) = 26.47, p < .001$. In
addition, children reported giving up more readily when father was the target (26%) compared to when mother was the target (38%), $X^2(1, N = 400) = 6.60, p < .01$. Only 6% of the subjects employed giving up when the issue was important and the mother was the target. No significant grade or sex differences were found.

Overall 27% of the sample resorted to eliciting reciprocity as a last choice. No differences were found for importance of issue, target, or grade. However, analysis revealed a significant sex difference, $X^2(1, N = 400) = 14.47, p < .001$. Females (20%) used eliciting reciprocity as a final choice, whereas only 7% of the males use this strategy. When the data was analyzed by grade and sex, a significant pattern emerged. Twelfth grade females used eliciting reciprocity significantly more often than 12th grade males, $X^2(1, N = 200) = 15.38, p < .001$. That is, 19% of the 12th grade females compared to 2% of the 12th grade males reported the use of this strategy. Further, 6th grade males (12%) used eliciting reciprocity significantly more frequently than 12th grade males, $X^2(1, N = 200) = 7.78, p < .01$. Females did not vary the use of this strategy with age, while male usage of eliciting reciprocity declined appreciably with age.

Negative affect also seemed to be frequently utilized as a last resort. No importance of issue, target, or sex differences were found. Marginal age effects were found,
\[ X^2 (1, N = 400) = 3.41, p < .10. \] Negative affect was reported by 15% of the 6th graders, whereas only 9% of the 12th graders used this tactic. When grade and sex were taken into account, significantly more 6th grade males used negative affect than 6th grade females, \[ X^2 (1, N = 200) = 5.65, p < .05, \] and 12th grade males, \[ X^2 (1, N = 200) = 4.07, p < .05. \] Females tended to remain fairly consistent (9% 6th grade girls vs. 11% 12th grade girls), whereas older males reduced the use of negative affect (21% 6th grade boys vs. 7% 12th grade boys).
DISCUSSION

A major goal of this research was to examine the effect of situational variables (e.g. importance, target, and sequential use) and individual variables (e.g. age and sex) on children's use of power strategies. First, it was necessary to determine the factor structure of children's power strategies to identify coherent factors and determine how these factors relate to importance, target, age, and gender.

Three easily comprehensible factors were isolated and were labeled Mature, Intrusive, and Unilateral. The major factor, Mature (Factor 1), includes five relatively positive and socially desirable strategies. The Mature factor seems to be more bilateral than unilateral, but includes both direct and indirect strategies. While Mature strategies include those "good" strategies parents wish to receive, the other factors appear to be variants of less positive strategies. Intrusive (Factor 2) strategies are often offensive to parents, and strategies which load heavily on this factor can be designated as weak. Unilateral (Factor 3) strategies fail to take into account the opinions, thoughts, and feelings of parents and can be characterized as strong. Clearly, Unilateral strategies uniquely imply a lack of concern for the
permission of the target. Thus, the factor structure derived from adults in intimate relationships (Falbo & Peplau, 1980) does not appear appropriate for children in relation to their parents.

The variance unaccounted for may reflect age differences in the interpretation of particular strategies. As will be discussed later, older children seem to approach influence attempts from a more powerful perspective than younger children. It follows, then, that there may be subtle differences in the way children conceptualize certain strategies. For example, adolescents may use persistence and negative affect in more intimidating ways, using anger as a vehicle for potential power. Younger children, however, may interpret the same strategies as whining or crying. It is for future research to refine the developmental influences on the conceptualization of power strategies as they relate to cognitive and social processes.

Another goal of this study was to identify associations between importance, target, grade, and sex and children's power strategy use on the emergent factors. Importance of issue was the strongest main effect, contributing the most variance in the multivariate analysis with additional influence derived by grade, target and sex respectively. This indicates that
situational variables (e.g. importance) are important determinants of children's power strategy use.

**Effects of Importance.** It was hypothesized that important issues would generate more frequent use of strategies in general than unimportant ones. This hypothesis was supported as important issues elicited more frequent use of Mature and Intrusive strategies, and less use of Unilateral strategies by 12th graders. Eight of the 11 individual strategies were significantly affected by importance of issue: asking, bargaining, positive affect, laissez-faire, persistence, eliciting reciprocity, reasoning, and begging and pleading. In addition, marginally significant effects of importance were found for negative affect and telling. All but laissez-faire increased with important issues.

It is not surprising that important issues provide children the motivation to use a variety of strategies to get their way. Power motivation has been described as an instrumental and universal attribute of human beings which arises when people have objectives that can only be satisfied by inducing appropriate behavior in others (Kipnis, 1976). To the extent that children perceive the outcomes of influence attempts as important to them, they will increase efforts to influence outcomes, examine their array of strategies and select those believed to provide
the best chance for success. When children were motivated to get their way, they increased the use of Mature and Intrusive power strategies.

This study demonstrated that children varied Mature strategies as well as weak (Intrusive) and strong (Unilateral) strategies with importance of issue, a situational variable. As power has been described as a dynamic interactive process (Kipnis, 1976), the potential power of an individual and the forms of influence chosen can vary with situations. Mature strategies are those which are not only quite effective, but also most acceptable to parental targets. As it is assumed that parents are more powerful relative to children, the use of these "good" strategies tells us less about the exercise of power between actor and target than does the use of weak and strong strategies. On important issues, 12th graders and females increased the use of Intrusive strategies, tactics which imply dependence. Concerning individual strategies, older children increased the use of negative affect; females increased the use of negative affect and begging and pleading. On unimportant issues, however, 12th graders increased the use of a strong Unilateral strategy, laissez-faire.

These results are understandable in terms of power attribution theory (Kaplowitz, 1978). Kaplowitz has made
the notion of incentive value of a task (importance) analogous to effort, which is based on the time and energy spent. Kaplowitz hypothesized that the exercise of power reflects ability and/or effort. Persons are assumed to have potential power based on their abilities. Conversely, the belief that an individual has expended a great deal of effort will reduce the amount of power attributed to that person. Thus, as one's incentive value (importance of issue) increases, potential power decreases. Using this reasoning, important issues would be expected to elicit not only Mature strategies, but weaker forms of influence as well, while unimportant issues should elicit strong ones.

Effects of Target. It was also hypothesized that a greater number of strategies would be employed when mothers were the targets. This hypothesis was supported as mothers receive more Intrusive, Unilateral, and Mature (from 12th graders) strategies than fathers. The target of influence affected 5 of the 11 individual strategies significantly and 2 marginally. Mothers received more frequent use of laissez-faire, negative affect, persistence, begging and pleading and asking (marginal). Fathers, in contrast, received more frequent use of only one strategy, evasion (marginal). These findings lend support to the Cowan et al., (1984) study which also
indicated that mothers were targeted with more strategies than fathers. If more than one target possesses the commodity sought, a major consideration determining the choice of target is the actor's expectation of success (Tedeschi, Schlenker & Bonoma, 1978). Mothers traditionally have been the primary gatekeepers of children's prerogatives and as such, are subject to more influence attempts than fathers. Consequently, children may have experienced more successful influence attempts with mothers than fathers, and given a choice, will seek out mothers when the need to influence a parent arises. The power of mothers, relative to fathers, cannot be evaluated within the context of these findings as mothers are targeted with almost all strategies, strong and weak, more frequently than fathers. Further, her accessibility in the context of traditional gatekeeper function does not necessarily imply either more or less power.

Overall, target effects are not dependent upon age or sex. No sex of target by sex of subject interactions were found. The use of power strategies does not indicate particular relationships between same-sex or cross-sex parents and offspring. This is somewhat surprising in view of the current interest in specific qualities of mother-son, mother-daughter, father-son, father-daughter relationships (e.g. Salk, 1982).
Effects of Grade. It was also hypothesized that older children would use more mature strategies, those which require developmentally-derived cognitive processes (e.g. reasoning), whereas younger children would use more simple tactics (e.g. begging and pleading). Partial support for this hypothesis was found. In general, the results suggest that age differences in the use of power strategies stem from power differences as well as differences in developmentally-derived cognitive skills. Although older children more frequently used reasoning than younger children, this pattern did not extend to other Mature strategies. Reasoning can be viewed as the primary strategy reflecting what Piaget termed "hypothetico-deductive" or "formal" thought (Piaget, 1970). Faced with a problem, older children can think through all of the logical combination of factors that might account for a situation, deduce the sequences of each of the possible hypotheses, and then test to see which is correct. Piaget (1970) indicates that this higher level of reasoning often leads adolescents to speculate about hypothetical political or social systems, a skill younger children do not possess. This finding is consistent with the Cowan et al. results which indicated that 6th graders used fewer strategies involving reasoning and bargaining and bilateral strategies in general than
It is clear that older children use more powerful forms of influence than younger children. Twelfth graders used more Unilateral laissez-faire and telling than 6th graders. In contrast, younger children more frequently employed begging and pleading and tended to use more negative affect than older children. Cowan et al. also reported that 6th graders used more persistence and asking and more unilateral/direct strategies e.g. begging and pleading than older children. Although 12th graders appeared to retain the negative Intrusive strategies in their repertoire, increasing their use with situational variables, e.g., importance of issue, they also varied Unilateral strategies with importance and Mature strategies with target of influence whereas 6th graders made no such distinctions. This suggests that when choosing power strategies, older children are more sensitive than younger ones to the situational variables involving influence attempts. Intellectually, older children can more readily attend to multiple features in a given situation and their thought processes show more flexibility than that of younger children (Piaget, 1970).

Socially, older children also have an advantage over younger children. Specifically, older children, compared to younger ones, are better able to alternate from one
perspective to another, an ability that enhances cooperation and communication in social situations (Piaget, 1970). For children, social structures, like cognitive structures, are not stable and are altered primarily through social interaction (Borman & Fishbein, 1982). In Piaget's terms, cognitive processes based upon concrete operational or formal thought are grounded upon social, historical and cultural foundations (Piaget, 1970). As higher mental operations are socially formed and culturally transmitted, it follows that adolescents approach influence attempts from a substantially different perspective than younger children. This different perspective appears to reflect, not only the ability to assess varying situational contexts and select those strategies determined to influence others successfully (a developmental cognitive social skill), but also differences in status and power.

Although adolescents increase Intrusive strategies on important issues, these negative strategies apparently have been successful in the past. As adolescence is a time when children vacillate between childish behavior and more mature behavior expected by adults, it is not surprising that they can alternate between immature, dependent behavior on the one hand, and mature, autonomous behavior on the other. Empirical research has shown that
older children are more autonomous and independent from parents than younger children (e.g. Bowerman & Kinch, 1960; Douvan & Adelson, 1966). It can be assumed that culturally-derived role expectations associated with age status encourages greater autonomy for older children, and thus adolescents would be more resistant to accepting the legitimacy of parental control than would younger children.

Effects of Sex. The prediction that females would report more frequent use of strategies than males was generally supported. It should be noted that females reported using the five Mature strategies as frequently as males. In addition, females employed more Intrusive strategies (negative affect, persistence, begging and pleading) than males. The sole category utilized more frequently by males than females was Unilateral with marginal sex differences in the use of laissez-faire and telling.

These results suggest a power difference between males and females. That is, females used more of the negative weak Intrusive strategies, whereas males used more of the strong Unilateral forms of influence. This finding is consistent with Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1970), who found that females reported more frequent use of pleading with parents. Sex differences in power
strategy use seem to reflect a status difference between males and females which stems from different cultural attitudes and expectations. Research has demonstrated that autonomy and independence from parents is more crucial in the identity development of adolescent males (Douvan & Adelson, 1966), that conformity was less among males than females (Thomas, Grecas, Weigert & Rooney, 1974), and that male adolescents are less inclined to accept the authority of either parent than females (Smith, 1977).

Females differentiated Intrusive power strategy use (negative affect and begging and pleading) on the basis of importance of issue, whereas males did not. Not only do females have less power than parents, but traditionally they have had less power relative to males. The attribution of power is determined not only by importance of issue, but by gender as well. For females, the style of influence employed has traditionally elicited different consequences than for males (Johnson, 1976). Traditionally, females have been encouraged to use weak, indirect means of influence and admonished for using direct and stronger forms of influence (Johnson, 1976). In contrast, males have been encouraged to become independent and typical male forms of influence (direct and strong) reflect this attitude (Johnson, 1976). As
females have stereotypically been encouraged to remain childlike and dependent, it is not surprising that they continue to use weak, negative strategies as they mature. Thus, the combined influence of importance of issue and gender appears to potentiate the powerless status of females. These findings also suggest that females are more sensitive to situational variables (importance) than their male counterparts. Miller (1976) indicates that it is more advantageous for females to assess accurately varying circumstances in their environment in order to influence outcomes from a position of subordinate status.

For an explanation of how these sex differences occur, Kipnis (1976) applies causal attribution theory to the use of power. Males try out strong strategies and learn that parental compliance is the outcome of their influence. As a result, males become more autonomous and independent in relation to parents. Females, on the other hand, continue to accept the legitimacy of the parent's right to control certain aspects of their behavior and are expected by tradition to remain dependent. Thus, females remain less powerful than male peers and use the weak strategies that correspond with subordinate status.

**Sequencing of Power Strategies.** One of the major goals of this study was to examine the effects of situational variables on children's use of power
strategies. It seemed reasonable, therefore, to examine the influence of sequential use of strategies as they relate to importance, target, age, and gender. Sequential use of power strategies is a situational variable inasmuch as it is temporal and dependent upon such factors as the preceding strategy used. The results demonstrated that the amount of variation in children's use of power strategies differs with each of the three steps of the sequence (first, next, last).

As an individual proceeds from step to step in the power-act sequence, the expectancies of success and the incentive value of influencing the target take on new values (Kipnis, 1976). As a result, age, sex, and sex by age differences emerged in the sequential analysis that were not found in previous analyses. In addition, several general trends demonstrate this process. Children overwhelmingly used asking as an initial strategy; overall, 64% reported the use of asking first. Asking can be viewed as a normative strategy employed when individuals, both adults and children, initiate a request for something they want. In the initial analysis, asking was the overall most frequently used strategy. As asking seems to be such a universal first step in initiating influence attempts, it is not surprising that it was relatively free from the influence of importance of issue,
target, age or sex.

During the second sequential step children employed the widest range of strategies (See Table 5). Almost one-third of the children reported doing what they wanted (laissez-faire) whereas the remaining two-thirds used a wide array of strategies ranging in frequency from bargaining to begging and pleading. They appeared to be trying out various strategies, attempting to match the strategy with the situation. As a last resort, children primarily employed three strategies: giving up, eliciting reciprocity, and negative affect. Kipnis, who assumes that individuals act rationally when choosing how best to influence a target person, hypothesized that there are at least two stages in the choice of a particular means of influence. First, individuals must diagnose the reason for the target's refusal to comply with the request. For most individuals, Kipnis indicated, diagnosing the cause of target's resistance remains a subtle art based upon past encounters with the target person as well as the individual's own perceptiveness. Once the diagnosis is reached, regardless of whether it is correct, the choice of strategy is made. As an individual's diagnosis of target's reason for lack of cooperation and degree of resistance varies, so too will the choice of tactics vary. In addition, an individual may not be able to select the
best means of influence for a target person if s/he lacks authority. The results indicated that two-thirds of the children vary widely in their choice of an alternative strategy. This variation may be the result of attempts to assess target's failure to comply with their requests, and it may also reflect children's subordinate status. From a developmental perspective, children are certainly at an age when experimentation with various tactics would seem appropriate. The remaining one-third, however, seemed to circumvent these limitations by excluding the target completely and doing what they wanted (laissez-faire). The second strategy may also depend to some extent on the first strategy used.

Kipnis indicated that powerholders have available a wide variety of means of influence whereas there are restraints on persons of lower status. Parents can legitimately reward and punish children; children may be reduced to begging, pleading, or whining to influence parents (Kipnis, 1976). Children seemed to substantiate this notion by the third step in the sequence. Giving-up was a last-step choice, (by definition) and as expected, children increased the use of this strategy as a last resort thereby automatically decreasing the frequency of alternative choices. Further, by the third step in the power-act, children resorted to negative affect and
eliciting reciprocity, both relatively weak strategies, suggesting that children became more aware of their powerlessness relative to parents.

**Effects of Importance.** The sole strategy found to vary with importance of issue was giving up, which children utilized as a final choice. Intuitively, one would expect motivation to obtain compliance from the target would increase with important issues. Power attribution theory (Kaplowitz, 1978), postulates that on important issues, the potential power of the influencer decreases, and on unimportant matters, the potential power of the individual increases. As such, giving up, the ultimate strategy of the powerless, would be predicted to increase with important issues, not unimportant ones. This apparent discrepancy requires further explanation. A basic tenet of power attribution holds that rational processes are involved in the selection of power strategies (Kaplowitz, 1978). Emotions, as well as rational thinking, can guide the choice of power strategies (Gamson, 1964) by narrowing or expanding the range of influence a person is likely to believe effective in a particular situation (Kipnis, 1976). It is possible, therefore, that children may use rational processes for the first couple of strategy selections, but when forced to make a last effort, are guided by the emotionality
accompanying important requests, and come to believe additional strategies may be successful. This may be particularly likely if children's past experiences with influencing parental targets have been such that perseverance has been reinforced by parents who "give in". Using this reasoning, important issues with their higher incentive value, should elicit further influence attempts, while unimportant issues should elicit giving up responses.

**Effects of Target.** The analysis of sequential data showed that children are more likely to use Unilateral strategies with mothers than with fathers. A significant target effect was found with telling, an initial strategy used by 9.5% of the children. Twice as many children used telling with mothers than fathers. Further, children seemed to be reluctant to pursue their requests with fathers by giving up more readily with fathers than mothers. These findings are not inconsistent with the previous analysis which found that mothers received not only more Unilateral strategies relative to fathers, but also more strategies in general. As discussed previously, the accessibility of mothers as the target of influence puts mothers in the position to receive more strategies overall and does not necessarily imply either more or less power relative to fathers.
Effects of Grade. It was also hypothesized that sequential ordering of power strategies would reflect developmental differences with older children increasing the use of complex cognitive strategies (e.g. reasoning) while younger children would use more simple means of influence (e.g. begging and pleading). No evidence was found to support this hypothesis, even though the preceding analysis of individual strategy use showed that adolescents used reasoning more often than younger children. A methodological explanation is possible. Asking was the initial strategy of choice for most children, and the third step in the sequence was designated as "last" strategy used. As subjects were exposed to a forced choice situation with the opportunity to select only one "intermediate" strategy from numerous alternative selections, choices were systematically limited. Given more "intermediate" steps in the selection process, children who frequently use reasoning would have ample opportunity to report it.

It is also more likely that age differences represent status and power differences. Age differences were found in the use of strong Unilateral strategies designated as alternative choices. Twelfth graders used laissez-faire and telling significantly more frequently as a second strategy than 6th graders. Sixth graders, in contrast,
tended to use weaker negative affect more frequently than 12th graders. As discussed previously, researchers have demonstrated that older children are more autonomous and independent from parents than younger ones (Bowerman & Kinch, 1960; Douvan & Adelson, 1966). It seems reasonable, then, to assume that adolescents would be more resistant to accepting the legitimacy of parental control than younger children, manifesting this exertion of independence with use of stronger forms of influence.

**Effects of Sex.** Sex differences in the sequencing of power strategies provides additional evidence that females are less powerful than males. Males initiate requests with telling, a powerful strategy. Females, on the other hand, appear to start off with "nice" strategies (e.g. asking and positive affect), but switch to stronger strategies (e.g. laissez-faire) when they don't get their way. Sex differences were also found in alternative strategy choices. Males significantly used telling more frequently than females. Females, however, did tend to use laissez-faire more often than males. The dramatic increase in use of laissez-faire with age by boys and the consistent use of this strategy by females regardless of age, appears to account for this sex difference. Further, laissez-faire can be considered a relatively strong power strategy, but it is less strong and less confrontive than
telling. Analysis also revealed a significant sex difference in the use of eliciting reciprocity. Females used eliciting reciprocity as a last choice significantly more frequently than males. This finding supports results in the previous analyses which indicated that older females used less eliciting reciprocity with their fathers than mothers and less than younger females with either parent. This strategy seems to be utilized by females, particularly younger ones. As discussed in the preceding analysis, eliciting reciprocity can be considered a relatively weak, though socially approved strategy requiring concessions from the actor. Females appear to be more comfortable using this tactic than males. The present time can be viewed as a transitional period for females. Society, on the one hand, expects females to be "nice", but on the other hand, has begun to allow females to become independent. This duality in role expectations may create sufficient ambivalence such that females tend to initiate influence attempts with "nice" strategies, but upon realizing such strategies are relatively powerless, are then able to exert stronger means of influence as well. In fact, they may well fluctuate between "nice" strategies and stronger ones during the course of influence attempts.
Effects of Sex X Grade. Most major findings in this analysis occurred when both sex and grade were considered. Females appeared to consistently retain certain strategies (e.g. laissez-faire, eliciting reciprocity, negative affect, bargaining, and persistence), as they become adolescents. Males, however, dramatically decreased persistence, bargaining, eliciting reciprocity and negative affect, yet seemed to incorporate stronger tactics (e.g. laissez-faire). Not only do males drop the use of weak Intrusive strategies (persistence and negative affect) from their strategy repertoire, but they also decrease the use of Mature strategies (bargaining and eliciting reciprocity) as well. Both bargaining and eliciting reciprocity, as discussed previously, require negotiation and concessions from the actor in order to obtain compliance from the target. Several findings of this study have suggested that males have more power than females, and males increase power with age. It follows, then, that the more powerful actor would be less inclined to resort to strategies requiring concessions in the exercise of influence.

This pattern of power strategy use seems to reflect differential socialization of males and females. As males traditionally have been pressured and reinforced
for becoming independent whereas females have been permitted to remain dependent (e.g. Johnson, 1976; Rohrbaugh, 1979; Lips, 1981), one would expect females to retain the immature, weak, "nice" strategies of childhood. Males, on the other hand, dramatically drop these strategies from their repertoire, substituting more powerful means of influence. Given the prerogatives of higher status and independence, males tend to become less willing to make concessions to obtain compliance from parental targets.

The sequence of strategy use does not appear to be tied to the factor structure of the strategies per se. Specifically, children did not systematically employ those strategies which load under Mature, Intrusive, or Unilateral categories. For example, two-thirds of the children initiated requests with a Mature strategy, asking. The proportion of Mature strategies reported in the second step dramatically decreased; instead the proportion of Unilateral strategies showed a marked increase. As this study did not take into account individual differences, it is possible that some children consistently use Mature, Intrusive, or Unilateral strategies throughout the influence sequence. For each step in the sequence, children reported Mature and Intrusive strategies with notable use of Unilateral
strategies as a second choice. It seems just as likely, however, that strategy sequencing denotes gender and age status/power differences. For example, older children may initiate requests with asking (Mature) and subsequently utilize laissez-faire (Unilateral); when faced with a forced third choice, negative strategies and those tactics requiring compromise and negotiation (Mature, bargaining and eliciting reciprocity) along with giving up emerge. As children proceed in a step-by-step fashion through the influence sequence, these age and sex related power differences seem to vary, not only with the sequence of the power act, but with the target of influence and importance of the issue as well.

In summary, this study has attempted to clarify children's use of power strategies. Much of the previous research has focused on adults and does not account for strategy use by children. Although their subordinate status restrains children in power interactions with more powerful parents, children are not limited to begging and pleading or whining to influence parents. Instead, age emerged as a salient variable in children's use of power strategies. More important, the power of importance of issue as a situational variable, accounting for more variance than age, target and sex, confirms the relevance of situational parameters of influence which are likely
to vary as a function of motivational and other temporary setting conditions.

The stereotypical notion that females use less mature forms of influence than males is not true. Although the gender differences in the use of weak and strong strategies were suggested to reflect power differentials between males and females, it is clear that sex differences were not as strong determinants of children's power strategy use as importance of issue, target, or age. Nevertheless, the finding of sex difference in power strategy use points to a possible direction for future research. Specifically, young females may benefit from assertive-type training that provides the opportunity for girls to substitute the less effective Intrusive strategies with more effective ones. More research is also needed to specify the extent to which sex and age differences influence the interpretation of power strategies.
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