

# A review on how men and women play games in their communication and make decisions based on game theory approach

Maryam fouladi<sup>1</sup> and Mahdie Fouladi<sup>2</sup>

1. Linguistics Islamic Azad University of Sari, Iranmaryam.fouladi.1983@gmail.com

2. Department of Psychology, University of Mysore, mahdie.fouladi@gmail.com

## Introduction

Individuals play games with each other. Not simply Scrabble, but rather real life correspondence games, with unwritten guidelines and rules. Both sides of each game make sure to make exact moves keeping in mind the final goal to evoke certain moves from others, winning and achieving what they desire. Be that as it may, what do they need? How would they approach getting what they need? What's more, what are the tenets of the diversion? These are issues that are partitioned along gender orientation lines, and are additionally associated with game theory. The following paper discusses typical games, and additionally objectives of them (Eijck & Verbrugge, 2012). It explains procedures for "winning" these games among couples in their communications mostly in their married life, and in addition tenets of the games. The emphasis will be on how these issues contrast between couples, and additionally on probable solutions for a number of the conflicts that have emerged thus of these distinctions. Everything related to people communication starts with a scientific term known as "game theory" (Siegfried, 2006).

## Game theory

Game theory is "the investigation of numerical models of conflict and participation between smart decision makers." Game theory is usually considered as a part of economics, political science, and brain science, and also logic, software engineering and biology (Fotiadis,

2016). Originally, it addressed zero-sum games, in which one person's winning results in failure for other participants. Nowadays, game theory applies to a vast number of behavioral issues, and is considered an umbrella term for the science of logical decision making in humans, animals, and computers (Hermann, 2017).

Present day game theory started with the assumption regarding the existence of blended equilibrium in two-person zero-sum games and its confirmation by John von Neumann (Strickland, 2011). Neumann's original verification used Brouwer fixed-point hypothesis on persisting mappings into smaller sets, which became a standard style in game theory and economics. His work was followed by the 1944 book *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, co-written with Oskar Morgenstern, which considered cooperative games of several players. The second version of this book gave an aphoristic hypothesis of expected utility, which permitted mathematical statisticians and economists to treat decision-making under uncertainty (Neumann & Morgenstern, 2007). This theory was developed widely in the 1950s by many researchers. Game theory was later clearly applied to biology in the 1970s, although similar developments go back at least as far as the 1930s. Game theory has been widely recognized as an important tool in many fields (Ramachandran & Tsokos, 2012). With the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences going to game theorist Jean Tirole in 2014, eleven game theorists have now won the economics Nobel

Prize. John Maynard Smith was awarded the Crafoord Prize for his application of game theory to biology (Wang, 2014).

### **What does the game theory apply to?**

Game theory is a branch of applied mathematics designed to analyze specific circumstances in which there is interplay between sides that may have comparable, restricted, or blend interests. In a basic game, decision-making “players,” who each have their own targets, attempt to outsmart each other by anticipating each other’s choices; the game is finally resolved as a result of the players’ choices (Maartens, 2006). An answer to a game prescribes the decisions the players ought to make and describes the game’s appropriate result. Game theory serves as a guide for players and as a tool for predicting the outcome of a game. Although game theory may be used to analyze ordinary parlor games, its range of application is much wider (Easley & Kleinberg, 2016).

For instance, at the point when a wife advises the husband to “take an appointment from the doctor,” and the husband is forced to do so, the wife has played (and won) a game. The reason this is a game is that the wife has a desirable result and has settled on a specific vital choice, anticipating a choice by the husband which will achieve that result (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 2012). Everything backpedals to game theory, and it works a similar route with roles switched. At the point when a husband makes trouble, and the wife pays attention to it, the husband has played (and won) a game. This is in reality significantly even more a game, since it requires more than one move keeping in mind the end goal to win what the husband needs. The man has a desirable result, consideration, and has made a move with the information that it will evoke a reactionary move that will achieve that sought result (Case-Smith & O’Brien, 2014). This game playing is all over: in the media, in a business, in a marriage.

Dr. David Berne’s “*Games People Play*” really expounds about what precisely forms a game in communication (Berne, 2016). First come rituals,

which are programmed, prepared reactions. For instance, when one individual says “Hello,” the other will state “Greetings” back, and it is less a game, but rather more a custom. Pastimes are “semi ritualistic topical discussion, for example, discussing the climate. Past these two sorts of “social programming,” be that as it may, “individual programming” takes control, and all interaction might be analyzed in terms of game theory (Pereira, 2016).

When it comes to gender-based games among men and women especially in married life games are challenges in which players, couples, go up against each other, and each side wishes an alternate result (Gobet, Voogt, & Retschitzki, Hove). These are the circumstances that prompt to battling issues among wedded couples. According to Sue(2016) , MFCC (Marriage, Family, and Child Counselor) couples constantly experience circumstances where each side needs something, and they feel that just one of them can have what they need (Sue & Sue, 2016).

### **Research on couples’ communication**

More than two decades ago, researchers attempted to figure out exactly what couples who succeed in marriages do better than people who fail in their marital life (Atkinson, 2005). In the first year of these researches, scholars accurately observed and assessed everything that might be related to if their marriages succeeded or not (attitudes, communication styles, amount of anger, amount of tenderness, etc).

In some research done several times in various situations on a number of couples they placed participants, couples, in flats outfitted with camcorders in each room in the condo (aside from the restroom!) and recorded everything each of them did. They likewise got some information about particular themes while the analysts checked their heart rates and measured their physical developments, as well as taking blood tests at different parts of communication. At the point when the specialists were fulfilled that they had measured everything that may be

identified with the couples' eventual achievement, they just turned them free and afterward followed them down up years after the fact to perceive how they were doing. Which couples were separated? Which ones were miserably hitched? What's more, which ones had flourishing relational unions? Not exclusively did the analysts prevail with regards to pinpointing the interpersonal habits that distinguish individuals who prevail from individuals who flop, yet they observed that some interpersonal habits are crucial to the point that the absence of them results in marital disappointment and failure. By measuring the relative existence or absence of particular interpersonal habit, specialists found that they could anticipate the probability of a marriage's prosperity or disappointment with 91% exactness. Individuals who have these important propensities quite end up in satisfactory relational unions and marital life, while individuals who don't, quite often wind up separated or miserably wedded (Gottlieb, 2010).

Males and females as couples have an alternate comprehension of what constitutes winning, because in terms of game theory, to win is to accomplish the desirable result, to achieve what one is interested in (Levin & Palahniuk, 2011). And couples often want different things. We have two discrete threads here, concerning GENERAL gender-based differences in game playing objectives. The primary contrast is that males are more competitive, and women are more collaborative (Barnes, 2016).

From what scholars have observed, males do quantify their success on how close they are to getting their way, and women for the most part do quantify theirs on how successfully they reach a commonly gainful solution. Barbara Tannen's position bolsters this view. It is her opinion that men "attempt to accomplish and keep up the high ground in the event that they can, and shield themselves from others' attempts to put them down." (25, *Different Worlds, Different Words*) Females, on the other hand, trust that "discussions are negotiations for closeness in which individuals attempt to look

for and give affirmation and support, and to achieve agreement (Tannen, 2013)."

On less important and smaller scale, the opposition in these kinds of circumstances among couples can vary from who gets the opportunity to go to bathroom first or who is supposed to stay home to take care of the kid, to watch the series or football on TV, over whose idea is chosen by the company to be put into practice. Dr. Steve Weiner, the second MFCC, has researched and faced similar contests among the couples particularly over who gets to be in control of money, and also over who will be responsible to make up the guidelines and rules for the kids. On the more important and greater scale, this sort of rivalry is over power (Kuratko, Goldsby, & Hornsby, 2013).

Two well-recognized experts who have done great deal of research on couples' communication styles based on game theory, Dr. Weiner and Ms. Walker, both discussed and researched on details regarding a game named as the great "power struggle" in couples (Mendler & Mendler, 2012). Women tend to gain more power than they have now, and males are competing **a)** not to lose that power and **b)** to gain more power as much possible. This characterization of game is known in Dr. Berne words as "crossed transaction... the one which resulted, and has always resulted in majority of the social troubles in the world, in marital life, love, friendship, or workplace ... ." Dr. Berne somehow names the female the less mature one and the male the slightly less immature one in his cases of studies, but it is still acceptable to get past the sexism of several years ago to some profitable information. For instance, by perusing about a game called "cold lady," we may better comprehend the expression "existential preferred standpoint," the one picked up when one's unique thoughts are approved (Greene & Elffers, 2010). The lady starts with the assumption that either all men are beasts; her souse just cherishes her for sex and not for herself. The objective of this game is substantiating herself right and the gain of this existential benefit is her win.

However, there is a second distinction. Even when males and females are playing a communitarian game, when the grand scale objectives are more comparable, there is still a basic difference in understanding of what constitutes accomplishment of that objective (Tischler, 2014). Consequently, problems can emerge here as well. Ms. Walker discussed that "Men talk to solve problems, and women want to resolve issues." John Gray, he of the Mr. Fix-It theory, agrees with her completely. "She wants empathy, he thinks she wants solutions," is a view similar to the point Ms. Walker has conveyed. (15, *Men Are From Mars, Women are from Venus*) Dr. Weiner has a similar idea as well: "Men are looking for information, and women are looking for feelings (Gray, 2000)." Whether the desired result of the collaborative games soon to be discussed has more to do with either successful communication of ideas or solutions to problems will depend on the gender of the participant.

Even though both experts were somehow exaggerative, generalizations mostly don't take into account. In any case, when various published experts and two authorities of opposite sexes have mentioned comparable objective facts from their work, a specific measure of validity is included. Their cases will describe the accompanying difference in strategy that backings their hypothesis (United States. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1998). We can merely hope that the observations of the experts are what have led to their beliefs, and that it is not vice versa.

### **Techniques**

Assuming that perception of gender contrasts in strategy and technique are what the MFCCs have used as the reason for their beliefs about the distinctions in objectives, it is consequently natural for one to mirror the other. These techniques are detailed instances of some of the types of games, with the emphasis on the differences in how the sexual orientations play a similar game (Shoemaker, 2013).

To expand on her perception with respect to the contrast amongst male and female objectives, Ms. Walker set forth a theoretical situation in which a wife gets back home furious, and she begins to complain about her supervisor. She then discusses the situation first with another female, and after that with the spouse. Her female friend reacts to this declaration of misery by saying something like, "That is ghastly. You shouldn't need to be dealt with like that." The female has made this move expecting that these words will improve the other lady feel, which is her desired result (Sandberg & Murai, 2013). The spouse on the other hand reacted to her dissatisfaction by saying "so, why don't you quit?" The male has made this move expecting that these words will solve his wife's problem. The male and the female each think they are making the best decision for the spouse. In both cases, the objective is empathy; there is no power battle in progress here. Be that as it may, there is a distinction in these empathetic objectives. This distinction is reflected by the distinction in strategy. The female's strategy was to attempt to permit the spouse to get the problem off her chest, and the male's technique was to attempt to solve the issue. The issue with utilizing the male's procedure to accomplish the female's sought result, or the other way around, is that it doesn't work (Ward & Gundlach, 2016).

Dr. Weiner explains on his facts versus emotions perception with the case of buying a new automobile. If someone gets a new car, a female will need to speak more about whether the buyer likes it or not, on the grounds that she will likely let the buyer discuss what she supposes he might want to talk about. A male will attempt to discover the price he paid for it, what number of CDs the changer in the trunk holds, and what its engine type is, on the grounds that this is the thing that he supposes the buyer wishes to talk about (Stallman, 2015).

Another example is that a number of techniques are used in driving. Dr. James did a review on male driving matters. The doctor's conclusions depend on a yellow light running test, a street crossing test, and a survey on driving

habits. What he concluded was that “the (hazardous) driver sees risky vehicle use as a way to show their power, a method of indicating prevalence over “slower” drivers, and so the action of driving turns to a subtle but more risky form of competition.” Dr. James observed that men did more continuous “dangerous vehicle use.”

Dr. James is stating that guys regard driving as, in addition to simply a type of transportation, a method for playing “power competition.” The result they look for is to win other drivers, and the consequent establishment of higher status. Hazardous vehicle use is a way to this result.

There is another strategy that males use in order to win this game, and it can be observed both in competitive or collaborative terms. Put in Barbara Tannen’s terms, “The chivalrous man who ... signals a woman to go ahead of him when he’s driving is negotiating both status and connection.” (34, *You Just Don’t Understand*) Thus in permitting a female driver to go ahead of him, a man is making a strategic decision which will at the same time win himself favor with the lady and build up his own higher status, both of which are pleasant consequences (Gamble & Gamble, 2015). The lady will react, as the male behavior, by accepting the offer, and very likely, also as he suspects, with a gesture of appreciation. Nonetheless, he will simultaneously know that “the lady gets the opportunity to proceed not because it is her privilege but rather because he has conceded her authorization.” Therefore, he will have achieved power and control over her. Furthermore, his preconceived notion that he is the more powerful one will be reinforced, and so the male will feel he has accomplished an existential advantage as well.

Several games in a family gathering or workplace make for fine representations of competition over power. Studies claim that women are frequently “ignored at a gathering, family party or meeting... frequently interrupted during a presentation or an explanation of a point of view... left out of conversations...” It is obvious that the result of such behaviors is that women

will be heard or noticed less. These issues lead to females having less power and control over communications. Happily, this game does not end here. Females will make a countermove, and this current female’s exposition is about direction as to exactly what that move ought to be. “One, you can feel totally overpowered... two, you can start another theme and trust it gets their advantage. On the other hand three, you can find out about some fundamental interests of your male partners... “These are strategies! These are methods for accomplishing a coveted objective. Ms. Compagno favors the third choice. if guys play it like that, then females will play it back (Fuchs, Fizek, Ruffino, & Schrape, 2014). “There are times when you will need to get your expert perspective over and they are your gathering of people.” Even if ladies decide to cooperate, and would prefer not to contend with their colleagues or partners, they need to. In the event that they need respect, they need to make a couple moves with specific moves to get it, if just to counter the status bringing down impacts of moves made by the men.

In a comparable state, the Associated Press’ “Who’s Rude at Work?” concentrate found that 70% communication that concluded in lower work effort, loss of work time due to worrying, or quitting was started by men . This is a similar method at work. Plainly these activities will bring about the females’ working less adequately, along these lines dropping them down further in the power-battle situating, and that is the desired result. Have the females arranged a countermove? Completely. “Our goal is to make organizations more aware of this,’ said study coauthor Christine Pearson .The system of spreading mindfulness would come about, apparently, in a decrease in male rudeness, which would permit the females to achieve the power that was being taken from them, and as we already established, that is the wanted result.

A female lawyer, for example, can have a unique strategy to be used just in situations where she is managing a male legal advisor on the opposite side, especially the kind whose technique is to refuse to yield or admit that any

idea is better than his own. With a specific final goal to go around this system, the female gets the terms she needs by keenly driving the male to feel that he is the person who considered them. That way, the male will in any case think he has the high ground... despite the fact that he doesn't. In fact she will have won the game of "negotiate." Her desired result is clear to her, she settles on certain strategic choices reckoning the reactionary choices of the other, and she achieves the authoritative terms she fancies.

The general pattern, up until now, is that the male system to competitive game playing appears to include making moves all the more direct at females, and the female procedure appears to include more indirect methods. Dr. Weiner's improvement (and he emphasizes on that it is a simplification) is that where strategy is concerned, "the male is more overt. The female is more covert." Hence, he says, if a male spends a lot of cash one day, and his coveted objective is to have this not be an issue for his significant other, he starts by saying "I burned through \$500 today." If a female spends a lot of cash, and her fancied objective is to have this not be an issue for her better half, she says, "... (Nothing)." This case of contrasting procedures is reliable with the others. In most cases, the guys go right to females; they intrude on them, they reject them, they overlook them, and at their most megalomaniacal, they may even disturb them. The females go around the males; they don't react by yelling louder. Or maybe, they counter stealthily, either by receiving a coverage, in which they discuss points they are not keen on, or by detailing their issues to outside associations. Each of these strategies is bound and molded by the guidelines, a hazy area which, when crossed, will bring about the opposite side challenge.

### Principles

The principles are widely based upon David Berne's "established rituals." The central condition is what Dr. Berne calls "local acceptability," meaning that quite a bit of this ritual communication is a piece of politeness. Games are bound by rules of politeness.

The distinctions in rules are the essential driver of both the distinctions in correspondence objectives and correspondence procedures are mindful of as well as adapted by these standards. In this manner, the ways they play and the prizes they play for are bound and guided. At the point when the old tenets are broken as often as possible, bringing on a move in a critical position of force, the previously mentioned protestations start. The final desperate attempt made by the opposite side to stop this win/lose in influence is to make a negative stereotype. The distinctions in standards are the essential driver of both the distinctions in correspondence objectives and correspondence procedures. For the sexual orientations are mindful of as well as adapted by these standards.

For instance, females have figured out how to "cajole and please." (Sarah Cook. Ladies in Higher Education, "Pilot Course Teaches the Gender Difference in Communication") this is a principle they have been instructed, and it has impacted them (Muhs, 2012). It is likewise an important blockage to their competitive game playing. Persuading and satisfying is the inverse of contending. Because of the way that this run has been broken habitually and is being changed, a stereotype has framed in which competitive ladies are seen as unwomanly (despite the fact that they aren't). Since they would prefer not to be seen along these lines, numerous competitive ladies do different things in order to compensate.

One such pay is stripping. As *The Times Picayune's* Mark O'Keefe points out in "Skin Games (Rhoden)," a plenty of well known female competitors and athletes have showed up openly in different conditions of disrobe. Swimmer Jenny Thompson seemed topless however covering herself with her arms, Canadian water polo player Waneek Horn-Miller postured almost bare, the Australian soccer group has a bare calendar out, and there are some more. These choices come significantly more often from female competitors than they do from male competitors. From a game theory point of view, the technique is to make a double attempt

to cajole and please, and the pleasant result is that the female athletes will be viewed as being more womanly. The reason female contenders use this strategy significantly more as often as possible than male contenders do is that men almost often don't have this generalization stereotype attached to competitiveness. "Young men are prepared to contend and win," says Sara Cook. If anything, society sees their competitiveness as making them significantly manlier. This is a great example of what is called "differential treatment." Differential treatment means that the stereotype is different for each gender, and so even if the rules seem to be the same, they aren't. Differential treatment is the basic reason males and females desire different things and employ different techniques to fulfill their desires.

Females also as housewives, business women, employees and artists play games confront similar forces and troubles, since they too are competitive females. They too would prefer not to be seen as unwomanly, and they are impacted by the principles that have shaped them and the stereotype they wish to destroy, choosing to apply a more relieving technique as compensation. However, then females face troubles from the other side of the spectrum. Firstly, they will, as Ms. Cook puts it, "make unwise promises or fail to take a hard line when necessary." Second, they will run right into a second stereotype! Females who appease too much fall victim to just as undesirable a stereotype. "Women favor their nurturing side, they feel perceived as weak." This is what is called the "double standard," the one in which females are bound by rules on either side into a tight little spot (Rancer & Avtgis, 2014). It is very difficult to develop a technique that is both effective in achieving desired outcomes and within these extremely limit boundaries.

The recent unfavorable distribution of power clarifies a considerable amount of why the methods and needs are distinctive. For if men are winning "power battle (Heller & Rao, 2015)," they can push whatever stereotype they desire and these will be the stereotypes that go

into effect. That clarifies why females obey the guidelines and principles, and why the standards appears to be so weighted for the male. Women would not make up principles that put them at such a drawback.

### **Managing the Problems**

How do experts try to work out such issues? By attempting to change couple's style of correspondence. They'll attempt to limit the opposition, to have individuals cooperate, not against each other. Dr. Weiner says that couples use either "symmetrical communication" or "complimentary communication" (Servellen, 2011). The good part about symmetrical communication is that both sides are equal, and they "can stimulate each other mentally." The bad part is that each side feels rightful to everything, and this increases competition. Complimentary communication has its eligibility as well, because at least "each side accepts their role," but on the negative end one person, usually the male, dominates the other. In the case of the husband who openly declares having spent \$500, and the woman whose strategy is to say nothing when she does the same thing, "the reason is because she doesn't have as much power." It is the specialist's goal to develop a sort of communication between couples which has neither drawback.

Ms. Walker too this result for her patients. The strategy she suggests is "undivided attention." While in her office, one individual may never intrude on the other (Keller, 2016). Each is encouraged to request explanation at the suitable time, if vital. That way, each side will start to comprehend the point of view of the other, and through this expansion in cooperating, the coveted result will move closer. Dr. Berne's "I'm fine, you're fine" theory is the idea Ms. Walker uses to give this comprehension a name. Dr. Weiner communicates something comparative. "Regardless of what the issue is, there's constantly shared duty. Inspire them to recognize it. That is progress."

Viewing the advancements in this game playing from one point of view, Ms. Pac Man makes a metaphor for the power battle among

males and females. Pac Man is an electronic game in which a small yellow creature, the player, is pursued by ghosts with harmful intentions, and if the ghosts catch Ms. Pac Man, then Ms. Pac Man is taken out of commission. Now for the metaphor: the ghost is the male counterpart. Ms. Pac Man is the female counterpart. For proof that the party with the pursuit technique is most often the male, see University of Pennsylvania Professor Franklin South worth's recent survey on the "dating" game. 0% of respondents of either gender prefers that the female call first, 0% prefer that the female ask for the first date, and 0% prefer that the female pay for dates. Though admittedly a large number also had no preference, NONE of the respondents felt that the female should do the pursuing (Waldman, 2011).

Although, there is a second stage, both in the session of Ms. Pac Man and in the session of life. Whenever Ms. Pac Man eats a special circle, the balance of power shifts. Roles are reversed. The hunter becomes the hunted. The point is, the great female revolution, the one taking place now, is, like this aspect of Ms. Pac Man, a shift in the balance of power. Women are gaining power, and men are losing it. "Recall that in the case of a predator/prey relationship, one population enjoys an increased growth rate at the *expense* of another population." From the kill or be killed perspective, if there is to be a winner, then there must also be a loser (Husbands & Harvey, 1997).

On the other hand, if we view this power struggle from another viewpoint, a new metaphor is required. From this viewpoint, the aspect of communication which is mostly emphasized is collaboration. In field of marriage counseling, all practitioners interviewed favor emphasis on collaboration (Rollnick & Miller, 1995). Dr. Weiner likens the difference in approaches to communication to the difference between singles tennis, where one participant tries to outperform the other, and doubles tennis, where the participants are on the same side (Fiske, Gilbert, Lindzey, & Jongsma, 2010). It isn't that the male way is bad and the female

way is good, only that the "I'm trying to be better than you" way is bad. If we stop seeing these two approaches as typically male or female, we will cease to understand changes as one gender's gain and the other's loss. This brings us to the final solution.

#### **Mr. Wright Says: Non-Zero-Sumness**

Non-zero-sumness is the game theory equivalent of what the specialists have been saying. Robert Wright wrote in *Time*, "In zero-sum games, the fortunes of the players are inversely related...in highly non-zero-sum games the players interests overlap entirely (Wright, *Nonzero: the logic of human destiny*, New York)." (1, "Games Species Play) His example is the game played by the three astronauts aboard Apollo 13, where "the outcome would be either equally good for all of them or equally bad." What this means is, this type of game is perfect for male female relationships. From the game theory perspective, ie logic, the reason this is the best course of action is that it satisfies the most wants simultaneously. It has competition of the doubles tennis nature and collaboration of the problem solving nature AT THE SAME TIME. None of the outcomes are undesirable, as they would be in the case of the children who choose to misbehave because they want attention, even though they do not enjoy getting in trouble. Non-zero-sumness represents a marriage of desired outcomes, a marriage of techniques, and a marriage of understandings of what constitutes winning (Wright, *Nonzero: the logic of human destiny*, New York) (Wright, *The moral animal: why we are the way we are: the new science of evolutionary psychology*, 1996).

Mr. Wright goes on to sing the praises of non-zero-sumness by highlighting the many arenas in our world where it is already proving effective, on the small scale. "The very existence of communication—among cells via hormones, among ants via pheromones, among people via words – is owing to the non-zero-sumness that pervades life (Hadden & Luce, 2000)." It pervades on the grand scale too, of course; the World Trade organization and the United Nations make economies and governments more and more

interdependent, where the fate of one greatly affects the others. It is disadvantageous for the advancement of our species and for the advancement of male female communications to pit men and women against one another. I think all sides can agree on that.

### Bibliography

Atkinson, B. J. (2005). *Emotional intelligence in couples therapy: advances from neurobiology and the science of intimate relationships*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Barnes, T. (2016). *Gendering legislative behavior: institutional constraints and collaboration*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Berne, E. (2016). *Games people play: the psychology of human relationships*. London: Penguin Life.

Case-Smith, J., & O'Brien, J. C. (2014). *Occupational therapy for children*. St. Louis: Mosby.

Easley, D., & Kleinberg, J. (2016). *Networks, crowds, and markets reasoning about a highly connected world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eijck, J., & Verbrugge, R. (2012). *Games, Actions and Social Software Multidisciplinary Aspects*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2012). *Getting to yes: negotiating an agreement without giving in*. London: Random House Business.

Fiske, S. T., Gilbert, D. T., Lindzey, G., & Jongsma, A. E. (2010). *Handbook of social psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Fotiadis, D. I. (2016). *Handbook of research on trends in the diagnosis and treatment of chronic conditions*. Hershey, PA: Medical Information Science Reference, an imprint of IGI Global.

Fuchs, M., Fizek, S., Ruffino, P., & Schrape, N. (2014). *Rethinking Gamification*. Luneburg: Meson Press by Hybrid Publishing Lab.

Gamble, T. K., & Gamble, M. W. (2015). *The Gender communication connection*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Gobet, F., Voogt, A. J., & Retschitzki, J. (Hove). *Moves in mind: the psychology of board games*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Gottlieb, L. (2010). *Mr Good Enough: the case for choosing a real man over holding out for Mr Perfect*. London: Collins.

Gray, J. (2000). *Men Are From Mars, Women Are From Venus Book Of Days*. New York, NY: Masterpeak.

Greene, R., & Elffers, J. (2010). *The 48 laws of power*. London: Profile.

Hadden, B., & Luce, H. R. (2000). *Time Magazine*, 155.

Heller, P., & Rao, V. (2015). *Deliberation and development: rethinking the role of voice and collective action in unequal societies*. Washington (DC): World Bank.

Hermann, H. R. (2017). *Dominance and aggression in humans and other animals: the great game of life*. Boston: Elsevier.

Husbands, P., & Harvey, I. (1997). *Fourth European Conference on Artificial Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Keller, H. (2016). *The Story of My Life*. publisher not identified.

Kuratko, D. F., Goldsby, M. G., & Hornsby, J. S. (2013). *Innovation Acceleration: Transforming Organizational Thinking*. Upper Saddle River (N.J.): Prentice Hall.

Levin, I., & Palahniuk, C. (2011). *The Stepford wives*. London: Constable & Robinson.

Maartens, W. (2006). *Mapping reality: a critical perspective on science and religion*. Lincoln, NE: iUniverse, Inc.

Mendler, A. N., & Mendler, B. D. (2012). *Power struggles: successful techniques for educators*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Muhs, G. G. (2012). *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Boulder, CO: Univ. Press.

Neumann, J. V., & Morgenstern, O. (2007). *Theory of games and economic behavior*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

- Pereira, L. M. (2016). *Programming machine ethics*. Switzerland: Springer.
- Ramachandran, K. M., & Tsokos, C. P. (2012). *Stochastic differential games: theory and applications*. Paris: Atlantis Press.
- Rancer, A. S., & Avtgis, T. A. (2014). *Argumentative and Aggressive Communication: Theory, Research, and Application*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Rhoden, W. C. *\$40 million slaves: the rise, fall, and redemption of the Black athlete*. New York 2006: Crown Publishers.
- Rollnick, S., & Miller, W. R. (1995). *Motivational interviewing: preparing people to change addictive behavior*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Sandberg, S., & Murai, A. (2013). *Lean in: women, work, and the will to lead*. Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Shinbun Shuppansha.
- Servellen, G. V. (2011). *Communication skills for the health care professional: Concepts, practice and evidence*. New Delhi: Jones and Bartlett.
- Shoemaker, P. J. (2013). *Mediating the message in the 21st century: a media Sociology perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Siegfried, T. (2006). *A beautiful math: John Nash, game theory, and the modern quest for a code of nature*. Washington, D.C.: Joseph Henry Press.
- Stallman, R. (2015). *Free software free society: selected essays of Richard M. Stallman*. Boston, MA: Free Software Foundation.
- Strickland, P. J. (2011). *Men of manhattan: creators of the nuclear era*. Lulu Com.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2016). *Counseling the culturally diverse: theory and practice*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Tannen, D. (2013). *You just don't understand: women and men in conversation*. London: Virago.
- Tischler, H. L. (2014). *An Introduction to Sociology*. Andover, GB: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- United States. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, N. I. (Ed.). (1998). Resources in Education. *Resources in Education* , 33 (9), 108-123-134.
- Waldman, S. (2011). *The information needs of communities: the changing media landscape in a broadband age*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Wang, J. (2014). *Encyclopedia of business analytics and optimization*. Hershey, PA: Business Science Reference.
- Ward, M. D., & Gundlach, E. (2016). *Introduction to Probability*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman & Company.
- Wright, R. (New York). *Nonzero: the logic of human destiny*. 2001 , Vintage.
- Wright, R. (1996). *The moral animal: why we are the way we are: the new science of evolutionary psychology*. London: Abacus.