DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 312   PS 017 567

AUTHOR   Leonard, Rosemary
TITLE   Exploring the Roles of Requests, Refusals and Reasons
              in Preschoolers' Negotiations.
PUB DATE   Aug 88
NOTE   19p.; Paper presented at the Australian Developmental
              Conference (5th, Sydney, Australia, August 26-28,
              1988).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
              Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Age Differences; *Communication Skills; Foreign
              Countries; *Performance Factors; *Preschool Children;
              Prosocial Behavior; Puppetry; *Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS   Australia; Negotiation Processes; *Refusals;
              *Requests

ABSTRACT
        Preschoolers' negotiations were studied for the
purposes of linking two lines of research previously treated
separately and extending the analysis of children's negotiations
beyond the first move. A total of 24 boys and girls between 3.5 and
5.5 years of age were individually required to provide both requests
and refusals in a controlled context. The context provided was a
negotiation session in which an aunt puppet and a child puppet (same
sex as the subject) were having a disagreement and the child puppet
would ask for the subject's help. Involved were four episodes that
varied in two dimensions: (1) the Aunt Jenny puppet, who gave
reasons, versus the Aunt Margaret puppet, who did not; and (2)
suggestions for requests of the aunts versus suggestions for refusing
the aunts. Children were given the opportunity to provide second and
subsequent suggestions when their first request or refusal was not
successful. Main questions of interest were: (1) Do differences exist
between requests and refusals? (2) What are the effects of the use of
reasons by the adult party? (3) Are changes made from subject's first
to subsequent responses? (4) Are there sex differences in negotiating
behaviour? (5) Are there age progressions? Findings suggested an
overall picture in which younger subjects did not differentiate
greatly between requests and refusals whether or not the adult party
provided a reason. Older children tended to use two types of requests
and could increase politeness. (RH)

Exploring the Roles of Requests Refusals and Reasons in Preschoolers' Negotiations

Rosemary Leonard

Paper presented at the 5th Australian Developmental Conference,
August 1988

The present study has two immediate aims. One is to bring together two lines of interest in negotiation between preschoolers and adults that have so far been treated separately. One line of interest has to do with children's requests. The other has to do with their refusals: their ways of saying 'no' to an adult's request. How far these two types of situation tap into a common skill or show similar lines of development is to date far from clear. The second aim is to extend the analysis of children's negotiations beyond the first move (that is beyond the first request or the first refusal), on the grounds that the essence of negotiation may lie in the second move and its improvement on the first.

Studies of children's requests: Most studies of preschooler's requests have to do with politeness. There has been a study of requests in terms of persuasive strategies (Clark and Delia, 76) but it was with children aged 7-10 years. In that study the strategies were coded into two heirarchies; the form of the request and support for the request.

Studies of the first request suggest that children can adjust the politeness of their requests depending on whether the other party is older or younger and whether the child is asking a favour or demanding a right (James 78). Preschoolers can also distinguish nice from bossy requests and indicate which one of a pair is the nicer or bossier (Becker 86).

Becker (86) pointed out the need to examine children's responses to the failure of their first request. It is known from Bates (76) and Becker (82) that preschoolers can improve the politeness of a request when specifically asked to, it is not known however, if and when they will do so without specific prompting. Axia and Baroni (85) studied 5, 7 and 9 year old Italian children whose spontaneous requests were either ignored , or replied to with a trivial excuse. They found that five year olds almost never increased the politeness of their second request but most nine year olds did. Nine year olds used expressions of deference if no answer was given and negotiations when the trivial excuse was given. Five year olds tended to repeat their initial request if it was ignored and alter it if a trivial excuse was given, but they did not increase the politeness.

Stalder (unpub) also examined the change from first to subsequent requests. He found that five year olds would continue to use formal request forms if the (unfamiliar) adult always complied. In the other condition the adult said 'no' sometimes and gave partial compliance at other times. Both these negative responses were accompanied by a reason eg 'I need to use it'. In this condition some children adjusted their request form. The ones who changed were those who could correctly answer questions about the adult eg. 'what is she expecting when you go in?'. Children only became aware of the adult's position when she was being difficult but that awareness was linked to a change in request form.

Studies of children's refusals. These studies stem primarly from

1

an interest in compliance and socialialization rather than an interest in children's pragmatic use of language. The narrow study of compliance has been widened by researchers such as Kuczynski (84) to include negotiated refusals. Kuczynski argued that there was evidence that parents did not expect instantaneous obedience from their children and that the normal course of development is for children to move from defiant NOs to negotiated refusals.

Two studies of refusals that are particularly relevant to young children's negotiation are by Kuczynski (84) and Parpal(87). Kuczynski (84) observed mothers getting their children to work on a boring sorting task. In the 'long term 'condition mothers were told that this task was important for the next stage of the experiment. Mothers were nurturant and used reasoning and character attributions The children responses were assertive and they used bargaining, explanations and suggestions. In the 'short term' condition mothers were not given a goal for the task. They used power assertion and the children responded with whingeing, refusing or telling the mother to do it herself.

Parpal (87) observed 6 year olds working on a boring task with an adult who was either a stranger or their mother Children were more sociable and cooperative with the stranger whereas with their mothers they used more bargaining ,excuses, persuasion and negative resistance.

Linking requests and refusals. The separation of research on requests from that on refusals may well be artificial. They are both essential parts of negotiation. It is fairly commonplace to refuse using a request eg.'Why can't you do it' or to use a refusal as a way of requesting eg'I'm not going to do it alone'. Munn and Dunn (87) used requests and refusals without differentiation to study justifications in 18 month to three year old children.

The interplay of requests and refusals in young children has been studied by Garvey (75) in dyads of 4 and 5 year olds. Simple 'no's led to the reiteration of the request; with temporizing responses eg. 'I'll do it later' the request was not repeated; querying the request led to either a justification of the request or the dropping of the request.

In the present study children were required to provide both requests and refusals in a controlled context so that their repertoire could be compared in terms of types of strategies and degree of politeness. Another dimension was the effect of reasons being provided (or not provided) by the other party. Children were given the opportunity to provide second and subsequent suggestions when the first request or refusal was not successful. The context chosen was a negotiation between an adult and a child puppet and subjects were asked to help the child puppet with his/her side of the negotiation.

The main questions are as follows:

2

- Are request and refusal situations responded to in the same way? Requests and refusals are both important parts of negotiation . There are however, intuitive reasons for believing that their developmental paths may be different. Mothers may intensively train requests by withholding rewards until children ask nicely and giving children scripts for good requesting. There are rarely encouragements or scripts provided for refusing.

-Are both affected by the person refusing or requesting supplying a reason as against presenting an unexplained request or refusal? From studies by Stalder (unpub) of requests and Kuczynski (84) of refusals noted above, the provision of reasons wr·ld be expected to facilitate negotiation.

-Are there changes from the first to the second response? Results from Axia and Baroni (1985) suggest that the second response may vary from the first when reasons are given. In the no reasons condition children may not make a second response.

-Are there sex differences in negotiating behaviour? Becker (1986) review of the request literature revealed virtually no sex differences in politeness. In the compliance literature Wenar (82) suggests that boys take longer than girls to grow out of the 'open defiance' stage so that defiance is common amongst three year old boys but not amongst girls.

-Are there links between age and various aspects of children's negotiatiating behaviour? Age changes in the preschool years might be expected because it is a time when many children start to move outside their immediate family; their language skills are improving; their motners are training them in basic social skills.

Method

The 24 subjects (12 girls and 12 boys) ranging in age from 3 years 6 months to 5 years 5 months (mean age 4 years 7 months) all attended a sessional preschool in a middle class area. They were interviewed individually by a female experimenter in the preschool office (a moderately familiar environment) and audio recordings were made of the interviews. The chidren were presented with 4 different puppet episodes. In each episode an aunt puppet and a child puppet (same sex as the subject)were having a disagreement and the child puppet would ask for the subjects help. After the subject's suggestion proved unsuccessful the child puppet would ask for another: 'that didn't work. What will I say now ?' Each episode continued until the subject had no more suggestions. The 4 episodes varied along 2 dimensions Aunt Jenny who gave reasons vs. Aunt Margaret who did not, and suggestions for requests of the aunts vs. suggestions for refusing the aunts.

3

The four episodes were:

A. Refusing Aunt Margaret's request that the child puppet put the dirty clothes in the laundry (Aunt Margaret provides no reason)

B. Refusing Aunt Jenny's request that the child puppet take the things off the table (Aunt Jenny provides reasons for the request 'for dinner.' 'I need to set the table' I'm busy doing the vegetables').

C. Requesting Aunt Margaret to take the things off the table (Aunt Margaret says no without giving a reason).

D. Requesting Aunt Jenny to put the clothes in the laundry (Aunt Jenny provides reasons for refusing 'not my clothes', 'I'm busy')

They were presented in the order A,D,B,C (For protocol see appendix A).

Coding

A response was deemed to be all that the subject said after the child puppet's prompt 'What will I say?' and the next prompt. Responses were coded in terms of the number and length of responses, and approach to the task; On Task verses Off Task. On task responses were coded in terms of type of response, politeness, and changes from the first to the second suggestion.

Coding of politeness. Brown and Levinson's (1978) system was used to order requests in terms of politeness. In order to include refusals in the politeness hierarchy information was used from the preschooler's mothers about the relative annoyance caused by different types of refusals. Each response was coded 1-9 to indicate its level of politeness. (appendix B)

Types of responses. The responses, requests and refusals, could be categorized into 7 main groups (See Appendix B). The least sophisticated category was stopping the interaction eg. 'Go away' and the highest category was compromise and cooperation eg. 'Maybe you could do some and I could help you'. Interrater reliability on the ordering of these categories was .84.

RESULTS

1. Comparisons between the four episodes.

i. On Task and Off Task responses.

Every child gave a response to at least one of the episodes and 20 of the 24 children gave responses to all four episodes. Responses ranged from one to 23 words in length with one story of 34 words. The preschoolers' responses suggested that there were three ways in which children approached the task. One was to interact with the child puppet arguing that the puppet should

4

obey the aunt or go and get a third party. Another approach was to interpret the task as pure fantasy with themes such as buried treasure, rainbows, policemen and flying. A third approach was to make suggestions to the child puppet of what to say to the aunt puppet. Since the first two approaches did not constitute a negotiation with the aunt they were labelled 'Off Task'. (Off task does not mean that the responses were necessarily illogical. It only means that the children's task definition was different from that of the experimenter's.) The third approach was 'On Task'. Some children changed from one approach to another within the one episode. Thirteen children used the child puppet orientation at least once and eleven children used the fantasy approach. All the children used On Task responses at least once.

Table 1.1 shows the number of 'On Task' and 'Off Task' responses, average number of responses per child, the average number of words per response and the number of children who gave a response in each of the 4 episodes.

TABLE 1.1   Number and Length of Responses in Each of the Four Episodes.

	Episode A Refusal/ no reason in aunts request	Episode B Refusal/ +reason in aunts request	Episode C Request/ no reason in aunts refusal	Episode D Request/ reason in aunts refusal
Total	124	94	72	83
On Task	48	52	47	52
Off Task				
Fantasy	71	22	13	23
Child Puppet Oriented	5	20	12	8
Av. word length	4.1	5.0	6.1	7.0
No. of Ss	21	22	22	23
No. of Ss for On task responses	18	19	21	22

The four episodes have similar numbers of On Task responses. Amongest the Off Task responses the most marked difference is the large number of fantasy responses in Episode 1. Since this was the first episode, it is possible that some children needed to exhaust their fantasy responses before they produced On Task responses.

A within subjects analysis showed that requests were longer than refusals (F = 13.3, p = .002) and that responses to Aunt Jenny who

5

7

gave reasons were longer than those to Aunt Margaret who did not
(F = 4.78,p = .043).

There was no evidence of a practice effect since children gave more responses in Episode D which was presented second than in Episode C which was presented last.

ii Types of on task responses

Table 1.2 shows the 7 main types of responses and their use in the 4 episodes.

Table 1.2 Types of responses used in the four episodes.

	Episode A Refusal/ no reason in aunts request	Episode B Refusal/ +reason in aunts request	Episode C Request/ no reason in aunts refusal	Episode D Request/ reason in aunts refusal	Total
Stopping the interaction	15	13	-	-	28
Assertion	7	4	2	-	13
Directive	11	7	21	31	70
Alternative	3	8	1	1	13
Gives reason	3	4	3	-	10
Uses Aunt's reason	NA	2	NA	14	16
Help/coop.	_	6	15	6	27
Misc.	3	1	1	1	6

Table 1.2 shows that directives were the most commonly used response. They were very frequently used in the request episodes and were not uncommon amongst refusals. An examination of the types of response categories used for requests as opposed to refusals showed that 'reference to helping' and 'compromise/cooperation' were used almost exclusively for requests. Whereas 'contradicting Aunt Jenny's reasons' was used mostly in request episodes, children announced alternative activities and made assertions mainly in the refusal episodes.

In the refusal episode in which Aunt did not give reasons there were 33 responses (assertion, stopping the interaction, directing the Aunt to do it herself) which were fairly negative and 6 (giving reasons, suggesting alternatives) which implied negotiation. In the refusal episode in which the Aunt gave reasons 24 responses were negative and 20 implied negotiation.

6

iii Politeness of on task responses.

Politeness was defined as being from the aunts' point of view. Fantasy responses were excluded as not being relevant to the dimension of politeness and interactions between the subject and the child puppet were excluded since they could not be judged from the aunts' point of view. Table 1.3. shows the mean politeness in the 4 episodes.

Table 1.3   Mean politness of On Task Responses in the Four Episodes

	Episode A Refusal/ no reason in aunts request	Episode B Refusal/ +reason in aunts request	Episode C Request/ no reason in aunts refusal	Episode D Request/ reason in aunts refusal
Politeness	3.0	4.2	4.8	4.7

A within subjects analysis showed that requests were more polite than refusals (F=13.2,p=.002); however there was no significant trend for subjects to be more polite in episodes when reasons were given (F=1.7, p=.2); nor was there a significant interaction (F=3.8,p=.07).Politeness was significantly related to the length of responses to the number of On task responses (r=.46,p=.013).

2. Change from first to subsequent responses.

i On Task and Off Task Responses. Table 2.1 shows the numbers of subjects who had a second request and whether they changed from first to second request.

7

TABLE 2.1   Changes from first to second response.

	Episode A Refusal/ no reason in aunts request	Episode B Refusal/ +reason in aunts request	Episode C Request/ no reason in aunts refusal	Episode D Request/ reason in aunts refusal
No. Subjects				
No 1st response	3	2	2	1
1st but no 2nd response	3	2	5	3
1st Off task/ 2nd off task	4	4	1	1
1st on task/ 2nd off task	1	5	4	–
1st off task/ 2nd on task	1	2	–	2
1st on task/ 2nd on task	12	9	12	17
Total	24	24	24	24

The request episode in which the aunt gave reasons is the one in which most children could give two on-task responses as their first and second suggestions. In all episodes there were relatively few children who changed from on-task to off-task or vice versa, in their first two suggestions.

ii Changes in the types of on-task responses and iii changes in politeness. Children could improve apon their first request either, by changing to a more sophisticated type of response eg. from a directive to a suggestion for cooperation, or by improving politeness within the one category eg. adding the word 'please'. Table 2.2 shows how many children improved their response in each of the episodes.

8

Table 2.2 Change from first to second on-task responses.

	Episode 1 Refusal/ no reason in aunts request	Episode 3 Refusal/ +reason in aunts request	Episode 4 Request/ no reason in aunts refusal	Episode 2 Request/ reason in aunts refusal
No 2nd on-task response	12	9	9	5
No improvement	7	11	10	5
Improved type of response	2	3	2*	6
Same type/more polite	3	1	3	5
Total	24	24	24	24

* In 1 case the first and second on-task responses were separated by 1 fantasy response.

In the request episode in which the Aunt gave reasons, 11 of the children were able to improve on their first request. In the other episodes only four or five improved.

3. Sex Effects

i. On and Off task responses. Table 3.1 shows the total number of On Task and Off Task responses given by boys and girls.

TABLE 3.1 Number of responses from boys and girls in the four episodes.

	Episode 1 Refusal/ no reason in aunts request		Episode 3 Refusal/ +reason in aunts request		Episode 4 Request/ no reason in aunts refusal		Episode 2 Request/ reason in aunts refusal	
	girl	boy	girl	boy	girl	boy	girl	boy
none	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
1	3	0	2	0	3	1	3	0
2	1	0	1	0	2	3	0	2
3+	5	12	8	12	6	8	8	10
total	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12

In each of the four episodes girls gave fewer responses than did boys. This was most marked in the refusal/no reasons episode in which 6 of the girls could not give a second suggestion. While boys gave more responses than girls, they were more likely to use the child puppet oriented approach (9 boys, 4 girls) or the fantasy approach (3 boys, 3 girls) so that the difference between

9

11

boys and girls in the number of On Task responses was not great (av. for 4 episodes boys 10.8, girls 8.6;T=1.6, p=.13).

While boys had slightly longer responses (av. 4 episodes boys 5.8,girls 5.0) the difference was not significant (T=1.2,p=.29).

ii Types of On Task responses. There were no differences in the numbers of different types of responses across all episodes(girls mean = 3.3;boys mean = 3.3). In the refusal episodes the percentage of on task responses which suggested negative resistance was 62% for boys and 75% for girls.

iii. Politeness. There were no sex differences on the politeness measures (p=.4).

5. Age

i. On Task and Off Task responses. Age in months was positively related to the length of the children's responses (averaged over all episodes) the relationship was weak (r = .18,p = .19). Both younger and older children used off task responses.

ii Types of responses.

Even the youngest group occasionally used some sophisticated negotiating strategies; softeners such as 'for me' and 'excuse me'; interrogatives for requests; reason for a request eg 'so you can have tea'; legitimizing a request eg 'Aunt Jenny says to'; asking for an alternative activity eg. 'can I have a little sleep'; demands for help. The references to help implied that the child wanted the adult to actually carry out the task for the child rather than implying that they work on the task together.

The oldest group used some different devices; justifications for refusals eg. 'I done it all week' or 'I'm too little'; requests rather than demands for help; suggestions for cooperation eg 'you do it and I'll help you'; frequent use of 'please'; compromises based on Aunt Jenny's reasons eg 'when you've finished the whole book you can do it'.

Considering the number of different types of responses given across all episodes, it appears that the older children had a larger repetoire than the younger children. For the 12 older children number of different types of responses ranged from 2 to 5 with a mean of 3.9 responses for the younger 12 children the range was 1 to 4 with a mean of 2.7 responses.

iii Relationship between age and politeness (averaged over all On Task responses).

Age correlated significanty with politeness averaged over all responses in all episodes (r=.45,p=.014). This effect was apparent in the episodes in which the aunt gave reasons (r=.46,p=.015) but not in the episodes without reasons (r=.23,p=.142)

10

There was a trend for politeness to be more strongly related to age in request episodes (r = .39,p =.034) than in refusal episodes (r = .35,p = .059).

DISCUSSION

Using puppets with the preschoolers proved to be a useful technique in that the children were highly involved and most did not feel obliged to give the 'right' response. The main disadvantage with the puppets was that sometimes children were absorbed in the fantasy aspect of the task.

The main questions of interest, as listed in the Introduction, were: 1) are there any differences between requests and refusals, 2) what are the effects of the use of reasons by the other party, 3) are there any changes from first to subsequent responses; 4) are there sex differences or 5) age progressions ?

(1) Differences between requests and refusals occurred in the length of reponse, types of responses and the politeness of responses.

Responses in the request episodes were longer than refusal episodes as might be expected because requests generally require more information to be included. In this study however, many of the requests were not complete in the sense that they did not provide enough information for the requestee to be able to carry out the request. It appears that the differences between requests and refusals in response length was related to the types of strategies. Two examples of strategies which were more common in request episodes than refusal episodes are the use of extra words or phrases such as 'please' or 'help me to', and the use of compromises which need to be wordy.

There were two main approaches to the request episodes; the use of a directive e.g. "take the things off the table" and suggestions for help or cooperation e.g. "you do some and I'll do the rest". A wider variety of approaches were used for refusals. In addition to directives or suggestions for Help- cooperation, the children used reasons, announced alternative activities, tried stopping the interaction or simply said "No".

From the types of reponses , it appears that children are more likely to stay within limited scripts for requests and from the politeness measure it was found that requests are more polite for requests than refusals.

(2) The provision of reasons by the aunt puppet could affect the children's responses directly by giving them more material with which to negotiate, or indirectly by giving the mpression that Aunt Jenny who gives reasons, is a more amenable person to deal with than Aunt Margaret who does not. The direct effects of the

11

reasons can be seen when the children refer to t'.e reason in their responses eg. 'You can't read a book.'. Almost all these references occurred in the request episode. Some indirect effects of the reasons may account for the increase in negotiation and reduction in negativity in refusal episodes when the aunt gave reasons as compared to the refusal episodes when the aunt did not.

The result that reasons are associated with increased negotiation and reduced negativity was found also by Kuczynski (84) in his study of mothers' strategies for persuading children to work on a boring task.

(3) Children appeared to recognise that the task demanded that they should provide a second response that was different from the first. There were a negligible number of second responses that were identical to the first. Slight variations in wording however, were not coded as changes. Changes from first to subsequent responses could occur in the use of on and off task reponses, the type of reponse and the politeness of the reponse. In each episode there were at least 6 children whose second response differed from their first response in one of these ways.

While Axia and Baroni (85) found that five year olds gave up after the first request and did not increase the politeness of their request when requesting an unfamiliar adult, in this study in the request with reasons condition only five children gave up and 11 increased the politeness of their request. The differences may be cultural ones between Australian and Italian children or they may be due to the fact that children were less inhibited with the puppets than in a real negotiation.

(4) Sex differences occurred only in the approach to the task. More boys than girls used fantasy and child puppet oriented responses. It is possiible that the boys' way of coping with the difficulty of the task was to try anything whereas the girls' approach was to give up.

Results from this study are consistant with the request literature in that there were no sex differences in the use of politeness. There are however, differences between these results and the compliance literature in that boys did not show more negative resistance than girls in their on task responses. It can be noted that in the fantasy responses the boys were often quite violent suggesting for example that the aunt should be thrown on the road and run over.

(5) Age correlated with politeness in the episodes in which the aunt provided reasons but not in episodes in which the aunt did not give reasons. It appears that older children were able to respond to Aunt Jenny's reasonableness by increasing politeness. Younger children did not distinguish greatly between the two aunts.

There was a trend also for older children to show more politeness

12

in requests than refusals but for younger children not to be polite for either requests or refusals.

The data suggests an overall picture in which the younger subjects did not differentiate greatly between requests and refusals and whether or not the other party provided a reason. They tended to have 1 or 2 types of refusals and 1 or 2 types of requests, none of which were very polite. The older children still tended to use requests of 2 types but they could increase the politeness by, for example, using "please". In the episode in which a child was giving a refusal to an aunt who gave a reason, a wider range of responses was found amongst the older children than amongst the younger children, or in the other episodes.

Training and modelling are two obvious explanations for politeness and limited scripts found in the request episodes. Of these training might be expected to be the most influential since carers tell their children to 'say please' and may withhold their compliance until the child has asked nicely. In contrast it would not be expected that training would be so influential when children are making refusals. ('No Thank-you'is only appropriate when the child has a real choice.) Modelling or trial and error may be important. The result there was a wider range of responses when the other party provided a reason suggests that trial and error may be the more relevant.

13

REFERENCES

Axia, G. & Baroni, M. R. (1985). Linguistic politeness at different age levels. Child Development, 56, 918-927.

Bates, E. (1976). Pragmatics and socio-linguistics in child language. In Morehead, D. & Morehead, A. (Eds.), Normal and deficient child language. Baltimore University, Park Press.

Becker, J. A. (1982). Children's strategic use of requests to mark and manipulate social status. In Kuczaj, S. (Ed.), Language development: Language, thought and culture. Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.

Becker, J. A. (1986). Bossy and nice requests: Children's production and interpretation. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 32, No.4.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language use: Politeness phenomena. In Goody, E. (Ed.), Questions of politeness: Strategies in social interaction (pp56-289). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 56-289.

Clark, R. A. & Delia, J. G. (1976). The development of functional persuasive skills in childhood and early adolescence. Child Development, 47, 1008-1014.

Garvey, C. (1975). Requests and responses in children's speech. Journal of Child Language, 2, 41-63.

James, S. L. (1978). Effect of listener age and situation on the politeness of children's directives. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 7, 307-317.

Kuczynski, L. (1984). Socialization goals and mother-child interaction: Strategies for long term and short term compliance. Developmental Psychology, 20, 1061-1073.

Munn, J. & Dunn, P. (1987). Development of justifications in disputes with mother and sibling. Developmental Psychology, 23, 791-798.

Parpal, M. (1987). Socialization within the family: Mutual influence and negotiation. Paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the Society for Research into Child Development, Balt. Maryland, April.

Stalder, J. (unpub.) Knowledge about addressee and the request behaviour of children.

Wenar, C. (1982). On negativism. Human Development, 15, 1-23.

1

Lisa: Hello I'm Lisa (Mark, boy puppet).
   What's your name? (Child ....)
   Hey, do you have any aunts? (Child ....)
   What are their names? (Child ....)
   I have two aunts, Aunt Margaret and Aunt Jenny. They're
   staying at our house. Do your aunts come to stay?
   (Child ....)

   I was hoping you could help me. My Aunt Margaret keeps on
   asking me to do this, do that, tidy up this and tidy up that.
   I just want her to stop asking me, but I don't know what to
   say. O-Oh, here she comes again.

Aunt Margaret: Lisa, take the dirty clothes to the laundry.

Lisa (Mark) : I don't want to do that. What can I say to stop
   her asking me? (Child ....) You think that'll stop
   her, O.K. I'll try. .... (Lisa repeats child's
   suggestion)

Aunt Margaret: Lisa, you still have to take those dirty clothes
   to the laundry.

Lisa (Mark) : Oh, it didn't work, she's still asking. What
   will I say now? (Child ....)

Again the child's suggestion does not work and Lisa (Mark) ask
the child for another suggestion. This procedure continues until
the child cannot make any more suggestions.

Lisa (Mark): 1 know what I'll do I'll get Aunt Jenny to help
   me. What will I say to Aunt Jenny to get her to help me take
   these dirty clothes to the laundry? (Child ....) Lisa
   (Mark) repeats child's suggestion.

Aunt Jenny : No, they're not my clothes.

Lisa (Mark) : I'd better ask again. What will I say this time?
   (Child ....) I'll try that...

Aunt Jenny : No, I'm busy.

This procedure also continues until the child has run out of
suggestions. Each time Aunt Jenny uses a reason for her refusal.
A third type of refusal used by Aunt Jenny was " No, I want to
read my book." Most children did not go past four suggestions but
when they did variations of these reasons were given. In order
that the protocol should end on a positive note, Aunt Jenny
agreed to help in the end.

Aunt Jenny: Well, O.K. I'll help you.

Lisa (Mark) : Thank you Aunt Jenny, off we go. See you later.

Appendix B Categories of responses ordered from 1-least
                sophisticated to 7-most sophisticated.

1 Stopping the interaction a) getting the aunt to go away
                eg 'go away'
                                b) getting the aunt to stop asking
                eg 'Don't say it again.'

2 Assertion   'I'm still not going to help you do it'
                Simple no 'No.', 'No Jenny'

3 Directives Inadequate information eg 'You do it'
                Adequate eg 'Take the dirty clothes to the
                    laundry.'
            Directive + please 'Please take the things to the laundry.'
            Interrogative 'Can you please take the washing?'
            Requester should do it herself (or get someone else)
                a) using 'you' eg 'You go and do it'
                b) phrased as a directive eg 'rush the things off'
                c) directive + 'for me' eg 'You clear it for me.'
                d) requester should get someone else eg 'Get Aunt
                    Jenny to pull them off.'

4 Alternative activity
                Asserts eg 'I'm going to ride my bike.'
                Requests eg 'Can I have a little sleep?'

5 Reasons 'There's too much to do there.'

6 Using the aunt's reason
                Contradicting the aunt eg 'They are your clothes'
                Cooperating eg. I'll do the vegetables and you do
                        the things.

7 Help/ Compromise and cooperation
                Directive eg 'I'll do some and you help me.'
                Request eg 'Can you please help me do them and
                    I'll help you?'

Miscellaneous Threats eg.If you don't, I'll smack you.
                Asking the aunt to say please
                'Try and catch me'

     Levels of politeness from 1-least polite to 9-most polite.

1 Use of an aggravator eg. 'Stupid' or 'You!'.

2 Abrupt command eg.'Get out'

3 General imperative eg. 'Do the washing'   **BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

4 More specific imperative eg.'Take the things to the laundry'

5 Use of a softener eg. 'Aunt Jenny' or 'for me'

6 Use of please

7 Interrogative form 'Will you take the things off the table?'

8 Interrogative + please

9 Interrogative + please + softener

BEST COPY AVAILABLE