

The Effects of Target, Age, and Gender On Use of Power Strategies

Gloria Cowan, Joan Drinkard, and Laurie MacGavin
California State University, San Bernardino

Falbo and Peplau (1980) found that females use unilateral and indirect power strategies in intimate relationships, whereas males use direct and bilateral power strategies. Differences in power strategies reported by 6th, 9th, and 12th graders in response to mother, father, and same-sex friend targets were examined by using the same two-dimensional model. Friends differed from both parental targets in receiving fewer unilateral and indirect strategies. Fathers, hypothesized to have the most power, received fewer direct and bilateral strategies than mothers and friends. Weaker strategies were used more with parents and stronger strategies were used more with friends. Gender effects, alone and in interaction with target and grade, did not support previous gender differences. Overall, the study supports the usefulness of the Falbo and Peplau model in examining the effects of targets on the use of power strategies and a power interpretation of gender differences in intimate relationships.

The concept of interpersonal power can be defined as the ability to influence another person to do or to believe something she or he would not have necessarily done or believed spontaneously (Johnson, 1978). Women have long been seen as using more indirect, that is devious, strategies to get their way than have men. It is said that men debate and women manipulate. Support for this observation, however, cannot be based solely on a demonstrated sex difference because the issue of gender differences in power strategies is confounded with power inequality between the sexes (Miller, 1976). Differences in the strategies women and men use to exert interpersonal influence, particularly with each other, may be more a function of power or status inequality than gender per se.

Research on power strategies was accelerated with the introduction by Goodchilds, Quadrado, and Raven (1975) of a procedure that directly asked subjects how they get their way. Since then, several studies have employed this procedure to assess power strategies (Falbo, 1977a, 1977b, 1982; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; McCormick, 1979). Although not all

the studies using the self-report procedure have found gender differences (e.g., McCormick, 1979), a primary finding of the Falbo and Peplau (1980) study on intimate relationships was that heterosexual men and women differed in the power strategies they use. Men reported using bilateral and direct strategies, the strategies rated good by the experts providing the multidimensional scaling of the responses, whereas women used more unilateral and indirect strategies. Although other writers (Miller, 1976) have suggested that women use more indirect strategies, the use of unilateral strategies by women had not been previously reported. Bilateral strategies require the cooperation and responsiveness of the target person (e.g., bargaining) and unilateral strategies do not (e.g., negative affect). Falbo and Peplau suggested that because women do not expect compliance, they use unilateral strategies, which do not anticipate or require cooperation. Not surprisingly, men in the Falbo and Peplau study (1980) also reported that they had more power in their relationships than that reported by women. Thus, it is possible to interpret the gender differences as reflecting a power difference.

Evidence supportive of a power interpretation of gender differences is also found in studies by Kipnis (1976) and Falbo (1982). In contrast to the Falbo and Peplau findings,

The first author would like to thank Toni Falbo and Lynda Warren for their comments on earlier drafts.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Gloria Cowan, Department of Psychology, California State University, San Bernardino, California 92407.

no gender differences in marital decision-making power were found in the Kipnis (1976) survey of married men and women. Significant correlations, however, between both authoritative and accommodative means of influence and decision-making power were found ($r = .45$) with the more powerful person using more authoritative and less accommodative strategies. Additionally, Falbo (1982) found that androgynous people reported using primarily bilateral strategies and undifferentiated people reported unilateral strategies. Indirect and unilateral strategies were used by feminine people and women, and direct and bilateral strategies were reported more frequently by masculine people and men. Although gender differences were found, equally strong differentiations using gender-typing suggest other bases for strategy use than sex. A high masculinity score incorporates explicit acknowledgement of power.

If, as Falbo and Peplau (1980) suggest, differences are not inherent in gender but are based on power inequality in intimate relationships, men use more direct and bilateral strategies because they are strategies associated with power and status, and not because they are men. Put simply, men may have more power in intimate cross-sex relationships. Consequently, more direct and bilateral strategies should be used when a target is in a lower or equal power or status position relative to the actor and more unilateral and indirect strategies should emerge when the target has more power and status than the actor. Accordingly, relationships between same-sex pairs of equal status should be characterized by more direct strategies.

The present investigation, directly modeled on the Falbo and Peplau (1980) study, attempted to test the power interpretation with a sample of children, who have less power than parents but equal power with same-sex best friends. The power of the target was varied by asking 6th, 9th, and 12th graders how they get their way with their mother, father, and same-sex best friend. The use of specific power strategies by children would be expected to depend on differences in power of the child and his or her target. For example, Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1970) found that first-borns use more powerful techniques than later-borns, a finding that is consistent

with age, size, and ability (power) differences. Kipnis (1976) suggested that "children can only beg, ask, plead, or whine in order to influence their parents" (p. 46). It is assumed here that parents not only have more power than children but that fathers also have more power than mothers. On the basis of this assumption, we hypothesized that children use more bilateral, direct, and stronger strategies with friends than with parents and more of these strategies with mothers than fathers. The reverse ordering is hypothesized for unilateral, indirect, and weak strategies. When trying to get their way with parents, particularly fathers, children are expected to use strategies reported by females in intimate relationships and strategies reported by males when trying to get their way with best friends.

Age differences are also expected. Developmental differences should occur, reflecting the increasing cognitive maturity of the subjects, their ability to reason and bargain and to use more complex and interactive strategies. Because power may also increase with age, older children should use more direct, bilateral and stronger strategies than younger children, and younger children should use more indirect, unilateral, and weaker strategies than older children.

An alternative hypothesis is an interaction between gender and age. If power strategies are "person" rather than "situation" effects, and females generally learn to use more indirect, unilateral, and weaker strategies independent of the target of influence, then gender differences should override target differences and increase from preadolescence to adolescence. The adolescent period can be viewed as a time during which individuals are most susceptible to gender-role differentiation because of the increasing pressures toward heterosexual relationships and identity formation, of which gender-typing is a large component (Erikson, 1968). Thus, an interaction of age and gender effects would support an alternative hypothesis that females and males increasingly diverge in types of power strategies as a function of socialization into gender roles. This alternative expectation is inconsistent with the previously described interpretation that gender differences are more interpretable in terms of power differences.

Overall, the primary hypothesis predicts

significant target effects. Age differences are also expected. Gender differences or interactions of gender and age are not expected to occur.

Method

Subjects

The sample consisted of 198 volunteer adolescents from the 6th, 9th, and 12th grades in a Southern California suburban community. Twelve subjects were dropped from the original 210 because in some instances they did not respond or their responses were uncodable. Subjects were retained if any of their responses were codable. The sample was drawn from three schools: an elementary, junior high, and high school. Feeder schools were selected in order to minimize heterogeneity of the groups. Students from the elementary school sample subsequently attend the particular junior high school sampled, and all junior high school students feed into one high school. The particular grade levels were chosen to ensure a uniformity of relative position within the schools. Subjects were drawn from two classes at each grade level. The sample included 26 sixth grade males, 44 sixth grade females, 22 ninth grade males, 40 ninth grade females, and 33 male and 33 female twelfth graders.

Procedure

Four undergraduate female experimenters conducted the 20-min group-administered sessions with each experimenter co-running three sessions. Subjects were told that the study was an investigation of how people get their way. The written instructions, also read aloud by an experimenter, asked subjects to imagine that they very much wanted to do something, such as to go to a party, buy a particular item, or borrow something. They were asked to suppose that the other person does not want to do what they would like them to do. They were then asked how they would go about getting their way in such a situation. Three sheets of paper, arranged in a block randomized fashion, were entitled "How I get my way with my mother. . . . father. . . . best friend." Subjects wrote essays for all three targets.

Coding Procedures

The free responses were transcribed to omit any sex and age identification of the subject and friend. Target was not blind coded. Coding strategies were established on the basis of the previous, and to a great extent overlapping, work by Falbo and Peplau (1980) and Falbo (1977a), with at least five instances of the responses required for coding. Of the 13 power strategies established by Falbo and Peplau, 9 were retained: asking, bargaining, laissez-faire, persistence, negative affect, positive affect, reasoning, stating importance, and telling. Evasion and verbal manipulation (called deceit) were included in the Falbo (1977a) categories. Falbo (1977a) also used a separate category of threat, which is included with "demanding" in the present study.

Adolescents, especially at the earlier grades, rarely used conceptual labels such as reasoning to describe how they get their way. Instead, they offered examples, such as "I told her that if she let my sister do it, I should be able to do it too." Because these general labels for strategies were rare, persuasion and reasoning could not be distinguished. New categories that emerged included begging and pleading, demanding, enlisting the aid of an advocate (such as getting mother to help obtain father's permission), and eliciting reciprocity. The eliciting of reciprocity is similar to bargaining but involves a more unilateral action such as doing the dishes to elicit subsequent reciprocity from the target. Although all indirect strategies theoretically can be viewed as manipulation, a direct statement of awareness of manipulation was separately coded. Indications of direct manipulation were terms such as flattery, lying, conning, bribery, and snow job. Table 1 presents the categories with definitions and examples.

Training of 3 student coders, excluding the one coder who helped develop the coding scheme, was continued until at least a .80 reliability for each category was attained, using a percentage agreement method used by McCormick (1979).

Essays that completely focused on the target without specifying a strategy, such as "If my mother thinks it is safe, she will let me go," were coded as "no strategy," as distinguished from "no response." No differences in target, gender, or grade levels were found for the presence of no strategy; however, more friend and father targets resulted in no response (no essay) than did mother targets (8.5% for friend, 7.5% for father, and 2% for mother), $F(2, 384) = 5.75, p = .004$.

Measures

Responses were scored in terms of percentage use of a given strategy by each subject. Percentage use of the category was used rather than presence-absence because both target and gender effects were found for number of different types of strategies: for gender, $F(1, 192) = 5.88, p = .02$, for target, $F(2, 284) = 9.38, p = .0001$. Females used more strategies than males ($M_s = 1.78$ vs. 1.50). More strategies were used with mothers ($M = 1.94$) than with either fathers ($M = 1.49, t = 4.55, p = .001$, or friends ($M = 1.56$), $t = 3.55, p = .001$. No main effect of grade was found. The interaction of grade and gender on number of strategies, $F(2, 192) = 3.18, p = .04$, showed that for both 6th and 9th graders, females reported more strategies than males ($M_s = 1.70$ vs. 1.33 and 1.99 vs. 1.36, respectively), and no difference was found for the 12th grade sample (M for males = 1.73, M for females = 1.62). Without correcting for number of different reported strategies, target and gender effects would be confounded by the greater frequency of strategies used by females in response to mothers and would artificially inflate effects attributable to both gender and target; therefore, the percentage score is a more appropriate measure as it corrects for number of strategies. The percentage score is that of the target category relative to all categories contained in the essay. For example, if bargaining was one of four strategies mentioned by a subject, the score for bargaining would be 25 percent.

The dimensional model presented by Falbo and Peplau

(1980) guided the grouping of individual categories.¹ In the case of categories similar to those found in the Falbo (1977a) study and categories unique to the present study, their inclusion in combined categories was based on judgment of similarity to the other categories and to the conceptualization of the combined category itself. Although a new scaling of the strategies might have been preferable, the generality of the model is assumed for the purposes of the present study.

The primary combined categories (or dimensions) were bilateral, unilateral, direct, and indirect. Direct strategies included bargaining, reasoning, asking, stating importance, persistence, and telling as well as begging and pleading, and demanding. Indirect strategies included positive affect, negative affect, evasion, laissez-faire, manipulation, eliciting reciprocity, and use of an advocate. Bilateral strategies, those strategies that require interaction, included bargaining, reasoning, positive affect, and persistence. Unilateral strategies, those strategies in which the agent's actions are more independent of the target, included laissez-faire, evasion, telling, negative affect, enlisting the aid of an advocate, stating importance, asking, and begging and pleading.

A third dimension of strong-weak was created on the basis of judgment of which categories seemed particularly strongest or weakest. Kipnis's (1976) factor analytic study of power strategies supports use of this dimension. The categories considered strong were telling, laissez-faire, and demanding and the weak ones were asking, begging and pleading, stating importance, and use of an advocate.

Individual categories were analyzed separately if sufficient numbers of responses were found in the total sample (over 30) and included asking, reasoning, bargaining, persistence, negative affect, positive affect, manipulation, and eliciting reciprocity. Finally, a combined category of negative strategies consisting of demanding, negative affect, and manipulation was analyzed.

Results and Discussion

A $2 \times 3 \times 3$ factorial mixed design multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the six major dependent variables: direct, indirect, bilateral, unilateral, strong, and weak strategies. The between independent variables were gender (male, female) and grade (6th, 9th, and 12th graders), and target was a within (repeated) variable (mother, father, friend). BMDP4V MANOVA was used for the analysis.

With the use of Wilks's lambda criterion, the combined dependent variables were significantly affected only by target, $F(12, 758) = 5.12, p = .0001$. No other main effects or interactions in the multivariate analysis approached significance, F gender = .85, F grade = .96, F Target \times Grade = .56, F Gender \times Grade = .48, F Target \times Gender = 1.26, F Target \times Gender \times Grade = 1.23.

The primary hypothesis of strong target effects was clearly supported. The analyses of the univariate target effects, using the Greenhouse-Geisser adjusted d_f s, showed all six dimensions significantly affected by target (see Table 2 for means and F values). Friends differed from both parental targets in receiving proportionately fewer unilateral and indirect strategies. Fathers, hypothesized to have the most power vis-a-vis subjects, received proportionately fewer direct and bilateral strategies than mothers and friends.

Strong and weak categories also showed parental versus friend differences. Strong strategies were used more frequently with friends than with parents and weak strategies used less with friends than with parents.

As predicted, the results indicate that the target of influence overrides both developmental and gender effects in the use of type of power strategy. All six of the dimensions showed target effects. Parents, relative to friends, are targeted with the strategies of the less powerful—unilateral, indirect, and weak strategies. The father, hypothesized to have more power than either mother or friends in relationship to their children, elicited fewer direct and bilateral strategies than either mothers or friends. Thus, support is given for Falbo and Peplau's (1980) suggestion that gender differences in power strategies in intimate cross-sex relationships reflect power differences between men and women, corroborating the same interpretation Henley (1977) provides for gender differences in non-verbal communication. According to Miller (1976), gender differences in power strategies may be more broadly understood as reflecting a state of permanent inequality between men and women.

Although specific hypotheses were not generated for individual categories, analysis of individual and relatively frequently used categories may contribute to an understanding

¹ The model of power strategies in the Falbo and Peplau (1980) study is similar to that previously found by Falbo (1977a) when the target of influence was unspecified. If an argument is to be made for considering the relationships of children to more or equally powerful others as analogous to intimate cross-sex relationships, however, it is important to use the dimensions that emerged from the study of adult intimate relationships.

of the effects previously described. Further, significant effects of an individual category can be masked by inclusion in a priori di-

mensions. Thus, individual category analyses are presented to elaborate the findings on the six dimensions.

Table 1
Definitions and Examples of the Codes Used to Classify the Power Strategies Found in the Power Essays

Label	Definition	Example
Direct strategies		
Asking	Agent makes a simple request.	I just ask. "Please"
Begging and pleading	Simple statement about begging or pleading.	I beg to go. I plead to get my way.
Telling or assertion	A matter-of-fact statement of one's desires.	I tell him/her what I want.
Reasoning (includes persuading, convincing, talking or discussing)	Verbal rationale provided for getting one's way.	I give my reasons. I use logic. I talk him or her into it.
Demanding or arguing	Simple statement using these terms. Includes verbal fighting, threat.	We end up arguing. I demand my way.
State importance	Agent tells target how important the request is.	I say this is very important to me.
Bargaining	Agent and target arrive at a mutually agreeable solution. Statement must imply bilaterality.	We usually negotiate something agreeable We work things out.
Persistence	Denotes pure frequency; continuing in one's influence attempts or repeating same strategy.	I keep on trying. I keep bugging her.
Indirect strategies		
Negative affect	Agent shows strong negative affect, such as crying, anger, sadness. Negative feelings are created in the target, especially guilt.	I get mad and start to cry. I won't speak to her I act mean. I try to make her feel bad or guilty.
Positive affect	The agent manipulates self in a positive manner. Looks appealing, winsome, sweet, or innocent. The agent manipulates target to put target in a good mood.	I put on my happy, happy face. When I ask, I do it very, very nicely or respectfully. I give my mom a hug to get her in a good mood
Verbal manipulation	Direct statement of manipulation, lying, flattery, bribery.	I flatter him. I use psychology. I con her. I bribe her by paying her way.
Eliciting reciprocity	Unilateral activity in hopes of influencing target.	I clean my room and do my homework first. Then I ask ...
Using an advocate	Getting someone else to intercede on agent's behalf.	I ask my sister to ask for me.
Evasion	Agent evades authority and goes to someone else, or goes to someone else first.	I don't ask my dad if I think he will say no. I ask my mom instead.
Laissez-faire	Agent takes independent action; does what she or he wants, regardless.	I do what I want to do, no matter what.

Table 2
Means of Percentage Use of Strategies: Targets

Strategies	Targets			F	p
	Friend	Mother	Father		
Dimensional categories					
Direct	58.53 ^a	56.78 ^b	47.51 ^{ab}	4.08	.018
Indirect	22.18 ^{ab}	32.79 ^a	29.25 ^b	4.92	.008
Bilateral	38.07 ^a	39.59 ^b	30.65 ^{ab}	3.35	.039
Unilateral	26.66 ^{ab}	39.15 ^a	38.27 ^b	8.55	.0002
Strong	30.34 ^{ab}	20.09 ^a	20.98 ^b	9.14	.0001
Weak	13.91 ^{ab}	22.70 ^a	20.12 ^b	7.15	.001
Individual categories					
Positive affect	4.75 ^{ab}	9.64 ^a	8.59 ^b	4.60	.011
Negative affect	6.81	9.28 ^a	4.18 ^a	3.20	.042
Bargaining	15.99 ^{ab}	4.78 ^a	3.15 ^b	24.95	.0000
Asking	9.34 ^{ab}	18.04 ^a	16.85 ^b	8.62	.0002
Eliciting reciprocity	.27 ^{ab}	4.89 ^a	5.27 ^b	7.51	.0006
Negative strategy	18.16 ^a	16.97 ^b	8.28 ^{ab}	8.56	.0002

Note. Common subscripts indicate significant differences. ($p < .05$, $df = 1, 197$).

As might be expected by the strong target effects in the dimensional analyses, a number of individual strategies showed target effects, with all but one in the expected direction. Positive affect, bargaining, asking, and eliciting reciprocity showed parental versus friend differences, with positive affect, asking, and eliciting reciprocity used more with parents than with friends and bargaining used more with friends than with parents (see Table 2). Negative affect, a unilateral and indirect strategy, is not consistent with the hypothetical ordering of power of targets. Mothers were the targets of more negative affect than fathers, and friends did not differ significantly from either mothers or fathers. Additionally, negative strategies in general (negative affect, manipulation, and demanding) were used less frequently with fathers than with friends or mothers. That adolescents use positive affective strategies equally with both parents but less negative affect with fathers, in spite of the placement of negative affect on the two-dimensional model as indirect and unilateral, is not intuitively surprising. Although negative affect would be expected to appear from the lowest power position, mothers, as the primary socialization agents and targeted with more strategies in general, may be more tolerant of negative behavior. Perhaps, as they are

responsible for more of the decisions about childrearing than fathers, they are subject to a fuller range of strategies, including negative strategies. Obvious negative tactics may be avoided with the most powerful targets or may be used as a last resort when other strategies fail. In any case, the finding that fathers receive less negative affect is the only effect that is not consistent with the hypothesized ordering of target power.

Partial support is found for the hypothesis of differences in strategies with increasing grade level. Although an overall multivariate effect of grade was not found on the six dimensions, subsequent univariate analyses showed a significant main effect for grade on use of bilateral strategies, $F(2, 192) = 3.10$, $p = .047$. Both 9th and 12th graders used significantly more bilateral strategies than 6th graders (for 12th graders, $M = 40.64$, for 9th graders, $M = 38.56$, and for 6th graders, $M = 29.65$). In addition to dimensional analysis showing grade effects for bilateral strategies, separate analysis of individual categories shows that the effect is primarily attributable to reasoning differences, for grade level, $F(2, 192) = 4.46$, $p = .013$. Sixth graders used less reasoning ($M = 9.80$) than either 9th graders ($M = 16.45$) or 12th graders ($M = 18.89$), t for 6th versus 9th graders = 1.99, $p =$

.05, for 6th versus 12th graders, $t = 2.72$, $p = .007$.

A trend was found for increasing use of unilateral strategies with grade level (for 12th graders, $M = 38.40$, for 9th graders, $M = 33.35$, and for 6th graders, $M = 29.93$); however, this trend was not significant. Sixth graders also reported more persistence, $t = 2.55$, $p = .01$, and greater use of asking, $t = 2.29$, $p = .05$, than 12th graders (for persistence, $M_s = 8.40$ for 6th graders, 4.96 for 9th graders, and 3.59 for 12th graders; for asking, $M_s = 18.83$ for 6th graders, 14.63 for 9th graders, and 10.25 for 12th graders).

The developmental findings support the hypothesis of increasing complexity of strategies with increases in bilateral strategies, most specifically in reasoning, and decreases in persistence and asking. No grade trends in the use of direct or indirect strategies are found. Thus, for the developmental findings, the two-dimensional model suggested by Falbo and Peplau (1980) is only partially supported. The increase in bilateral strategies with grade level may reflect greater anticipation of cooperation with age or, more simply, the greater cognitive abilities of the formal operational period.

As predicted, multivariate analyses of the six dimensions revealed no significant gender effects. The only main effect of gender for an individual category occurred for the use of positive affective strategies, $F(1, 192) = 3.78$, $p = .05$, with females using more positive affective strategies than males (for females $M = 9.98$, for males $M = 5.47$). Interactions between gender and grade were found for bargaining, $F(2, 192) = 3.66$, $p = .03$, and persistence, $F(2, 192) = 4.87$, $p = .009$. Twelfth grade females bargained more than 12th grade males: for females, $M = 14.10$, for males, $M = 5.47$, $t = 2.83$, $p = .005$. The Grade \times Gender interaction for bargaining is modified by a significant three-way interaction among gender, grade, and target, $F(4, 384) = 6.27$, $p = .001$. Subsequent comparisons between means showed that 12th grade females bargained more with friends ($M = 34.24$) than did 12th grade males ($M = 7.15$), $t = 5.25$, $p = .001$; however, 9th grade males bargained more with friends ($M = 23.86$) than did 9th grade females ($M = 13.38$), $t = 2.02$, $p = .05$. Sixth grade males reported more

persistence than 6th grade females, (for males $M = 11.64$, for females $M = 6.49$), $t = 1.94$, $p = .06$, and 9th grade females reported more persistence than 9th grade males, (for females $M = 7.28$, for males $M = .76$), $t = 2.46$, $p = .01$.

The bargaining findings suggest that females, particularly 12 graders, report use of more egalitarian strategies with their friends than do males. Two significant interactions of gender and target support this interpretation. Males were more likely to directly report manipulation of friends than were females, (for males, $M = 8.83$, for females $M = 1.92$), $F(2, 384) = 5.08$, $p = .007$, $t = 2.43$, $p = .01$. Negative strategies were also used more with friends by males than females, (for males $M = 25.58$, for females $M = 13.03$), $F(2, 384) = 5.67$, $p = .004$, $t = 2.30$, $p = .01$. From these few significant gender effects and interactions, it might be concluded that, if anything, females are using strategies that are more mature and rational with their same-sex friends than are males. There is little evidence from the main effects of gender or interactions of gender and target that females use more unilateral, indirect, and weaker strategies.

Conclusion

The multivariate and univariate analyses of the six dimensions suggest an overriding effect of target on use of power strategies, minimal support for a grade or age effect, and no support for gender or gender by age effects. These findings lend support, albeit indirectly, to the suggestion that gender differences may reflect more a state of inequality than gender itself.

Concerning the gender and target differences in the number of different strategies, it is interesting to note that females use more strategies and mothers receive more strategies, particularly in view of other findings (Macoby & Jacklin, 1974) that boys in the family are more the targets of parental socialization efforts than are girls. Thus, there appears to be a possible nonreciprocity in influence attempts, with parents attempting to influence their sons more than their daughters and daughters, more than sons, attempting to influence their parents. This might suggest a relative powerlessness of daughters and moth-

ers in the family structure. Both boys and girls, however, operate from a position of powerlessness relative to parents in their choice of power strategies. Similarly, women may experience the same sense of powerlessness in their intimate relationships.

The present study does reinforce the usefulness of the Falbo and Peplau model in looking at target, or power, differences in strategies. Given the strong target effects, one might speculate that there are changes, particularly on the bilateral dimension, as females move from egalitarian peer relationships to intimate cross-sex relationships in adulthood. Perhaps, in intimate relationships, females learn, as Falbo and Peplau's (1980) data suggest, that the bilateral strategies, which depend on cooperation and the more direct and stronger strategies, are less effective. Interactions with parents and more powerful others may provide a model for how to get one's way in intimate relationships in which one is less powerful than one's partner. By the time both females and males are old enough for intimate relationships, they have learned to vary their strategies according to the power and status of their targets. They have a repertoire of strategies and which ones will be used may depend largely on the structure of the current relationship.

References

- Erikson, E. H. (1968) *Identity Youth and crisis* New York: Norton.
- Falbo, T. (1977a). Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 537-547.
- Falbo, T. (1977b). Relationship between sex, sex-role, and social influence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 2, 41-52.
- Falbo, T. (1982). PAQ styles and power strategies used in intimate relationships. *Psychology and Women Quarterly*, 6, 399-405.
- Falbo, T., & Peplau, L. A. (1980). Power strategies in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 618-628.
- Goodchilds, J. D., Quadrado, C., & Raven, B. H. (1975, April) *Getting one's way Self-reported influence strategies* Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Sacramento, California.
- Henley, N. M. (1977) *Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication* Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Johnson, P. B. (1978). Women and interpersonal power. In I. H. Frieze, J. E. Parsons, P. B. Johnson, D. N. Ruble, & G. L. Zellman (Eds.), *Women and sex roles A social psychological perspective* (pp. 301-320). New York: Norton.
- Kipnis, D. (1976) *The powerholders* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *The psychology of sex differences* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- McCormick, N. B. (1979). Come-ons and put-offs: Unmarried students' strategies for having and avoiding sexual intercourse. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 4, 194-211.
- Miller, J. B. (1976) *Toward a new psychology of women* Boston: Beacon Press.
- Sutton-Smith, B., & Rosenberg, B. (1970). *The sibling* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Received November 29, 1982

Revision received August 5, 1983 ■