

Manipulation in Close Relationships: Five Personality Factors in Interactional Context

David M. Buss

University of Michigan

ABSTRACT This research had three basic goals: (a) to identify manipulation tactics used in close relationships; (b) to document empirically the degree of generality and specificity of tactical deployment across relationship types (mates, friends, parents); and (c) to identify links between five major personality dimensions and the usage of manipulation tactics. Twelve manipulation tactics were identified through separate factor analyses of two instruments based on different data sources: Charm, Reason, Coercion, Silent Treatment, Debasement, and Regression (replicating Buss et al., 1987), and Responsibility Invocation, Reciprocity, Monetary Reward, Pleasure Induction, Social Comparison, and Hardball (an amalgam of threats, lies, and violence). The Big Five personality factors were assessed through three separate data sources: self-report, spouse report, and two independent interviewers. Personality factors showed coherent links with tactics, including Surgency (Coercion, Responsibility, Invocation), Desurgency (Debasement), Agreeableness (Pleasure Induction), Disagreeableness (Coercion), Conscientiousness (Reason), Emotional Instability (Regression), and Intellect-Openness (Reason). Discussion focuses on the consequences of the five personality factors for social interaction in close relationships.

In the past two decades, much work in personality psychology has focused on defense of the basic personality research paradigm. From

This report was completed while the author was a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. I am grateful for financial support provided by National Institute of Mental Health Grant MH-44206-01, National Science Foundation Grant BNS87-00864, and the Gordon P. Getty Trust. Correspondence should be addressed to David M. Buss, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, 580 Union Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1346.

Journal of Personality 60:2, June 1992. Copyright © 1992 by Duke University Press.
CCC 0022-3506/92/\$1.50

this protracted period of self-scrutiny, three major conclusions have emerged. First, there is considerable evidence that personality traits show moderate to strong stability over time (e.g., Buss, 1985; Conley, 1984; Costa & McCrae, 1980). Second, behavior does show a great deal of context-specificity and discriminativeness (Cantor & Zirkel, 1990; Wright & Mischel, 1987). Third, at least five major dimensions appear to be necessary to describe the major ways in which individuals differ within the personality sphere (e.g., Digman & Inouye, 1986; Goldberg, 1981; Hogan, 1983; John, Goldberg, & Angleitner, 1984; McCrae & Costa, 1985; Norman, 1963; Zuckerman, Kuhlman, & Camac, 1988).

The five-factor model of personality (Surgency, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Intellect-Openness) has gained support from diverse investigators using different instruments, different data sources, and different populations (Digman & Inouye, 1986; Digman & Takemoto-Chock, 1981; Goldberg, 1981; Hogan, 1983; McCrae & Costa, 1985, 1987; Norman, 1963). One need not accept the view that this model is either comprehensive or adequate to recognize that these five dimensions have accrued enough independent replications to qualify as major dimensions of personality.

The basic findings of temporal stability and the existence of at least five major personality factors suggest two important research agendas for the field of personality psychology. The first involves identifying the *causal origins* of these individual differences. This task lies within the province of developmental personality psychologists (e.g., Daniels, 1986), behavioral geneticists who study genetic and environmental sources of individual differences (e.g., Plomin, DeFries, & McClearn, 1980), psychologists focusing on the psychophysiology of personality (e.g., Eysenck, 1981; Humphreys & Revelle, 1984; Zuckerman, 1990), and evolutionary psychologists who focus on the adaptive origins of individual differences (e.g., Buss, 1991a). A second important task is to identify the *consequences* of major personality factors: What are the implications of personality for the ways in which individuals interact with their worlds? The present study represents a contribution to this second goal and deals with the consequences of five major dimensions of personality for the ways in which individuals manipulate or influence persons inhabiting their social environment.

Manipulation represents one of three major components of a proposed interactional framework of personality (Buss, 1984, 1985, 1987). This framework has as its focus the interactional processes by which individuals are nonrandomly exposed to different environments. Selec-

tion, the first mechanism, deals with nonrandom entry into, or avoidance of, certain environments. Evocation, the second mechanism, is defined by the actions, strategies, upsets, conflicts, coercions, and reputations that are unintentionally elicited by individuals displaying certain characteristics. Manipulation, the third proposed class of mechanisms, is defined as the means by which individuals intentionally (although not necessarily consciously) influence, alter, or shape those selected environments (Buss, 1987).

A first step in understanding manipulation is the *taxonomic task*—identifying, naming, and ordering the diverse tactics by which individuals influence and exploit the psychological mechanisms and behavioral machinery of others. A step toward this goal has been made by Buss, Gomes, Higgins, and Lauterbach (1987). They identified six tactics of manipulation in the context of dating relationships: Charm, Silent Treatment, Coercion, Reason, Regression, and Debasement. These tactics showed individual difference consistency across the contexts of behavioral instigation (getting another to do something) and behavioral termination (getting another to stop doing something). The Charm tactic, however, was used more frequently for behavioral elicitation, whereas the Coercion and Silent Treatment tactics were used more frequently for behavioral termination.

A major limitation of that study is apparent for achieving the taxonomic goal. Only a single relationship was used to identify and assess tactics of manipulation—that of intimate dating partners. The diversity of tactics used with others may be much greater than the six identified. Given the multiplicity of goals toward which tactics of manipulation are directed, as well as the diverse relationships within which they occur, six tactics may drastically underrepresent the major manifestations of manipulation.

A second step toward understanding manipulation, therefore, is to identify the *generality* or *specificity* of tactical deployment across contexts. Although consistency of manipulation tactics was demonstrated across the contexts of instigation and termination, another major contextual variable would be type of relationship. Are tactics of manipulation displayed consistently across relationships with spouses, mothers, fathers, and close friends? Or are different tactics targeted for these different relationships? Thus, one goal in this research program is to contribute to identifying systematic sources of context specificity of tactical deployment.

A third step in this research program is to identify the tactics of

manipulation used by individuals who differ on each of five major dimensions of personality. The demonstration of coherent links between personality variables, traditionally assessed, and specific manipulation tactics would place personality in functional context. It would demonstrate that personality characteristics do not reside as static attributes of persons, but instead carry consequences for the ways in which individuals interact with their social worlds.

Several diverse strands of research suggest promise for this direction. Thorne (1987), for example, found that extraverts adopt different strategies than introverts when interacting with others. Extraverts strive to establish common ground, while introverts adopt an interviewer's stance, presumably to avoid too much talking or self-disclosure. Buss et al. (1987) found that those high on EPQ Neuroticism (Eysenck, 1981) tended to use Coercion and Silent Treatment tactics to influence their intimate dating partners. Persons scoring high on the IAS Ambitious scale (Wiggins, 1979) tended to use the Reason tactic. Those scoring relatively high on IAS Lazy tended to use Debasement. Those high on IAS Calculating tended to deploy a wide variety of tactics, most notably Charm, Silent Treatment, Reason, and Debasement.

In sum, this research had three major goals: (a) to develop a more comprehensive taxonomy of manipulation tactics by uncovering tactics used within several close social relationships; (b) to document empirically the generality or specificity of tactical deployment across these different relationships; and (c) to place the five-factor model of personality in functional context by identifying links between each of the major dimensions and usage of manipulation tactics within and across relationships.

Preliminary Study: Nominations of Acts of Influence

Subjects

One-hundred and thirty-two undergraduates participated in this phase of the study. Subjects received experimental credit for a psychology class in return for their participation.

Procedure

Subjects were requested to nominate acts of influence within different types of close relationships: acts directed at close friends, mothers,

and fathers, as well as acts performed by close friends, mothers, and fathers. The basic instructional set was as follows:

We are interested in the things that people do to influence others in order to get others to do what they want. Please think of your MOTHER [closest friend, father, etc.]. How do you get this person to do something? What do you do? Please write down specific behaviors or acts that you perform in order to get your mother [closest friend, etc.] to do things. List as many different sorts of acts as you can.

Each nomination was examined for its redundancy with the original set of 35 acts of influence (Buss et al., 1987) that were nominated within the context of close intimate relationships. Redundant acts were eliminated. All distinct acts were retained for the subsequent studies. These procedures resulted in the addition of 47 new and distinct acts of influence. These were added to the original set of 35 to generate an 82-act instrument.

Main Study METHOD

Subjects

Subjects for the main study were 214 individuals composing 107 married couples. Couples were used in order to obtain two separate data sources for assessing each act of influence. Names of couples were obtained through the public court records of marriage licenses issued within a 6-month period. Couples were first contacted by letter. The ages of the husbands ranged from 17 to 41, with a mean of 26.68 ($SD = 3.71$). The wives ranged in age from 18 to 36, with a mean of 25.54 ($SD = 4.05$). Further details of the sample may be obtained from Buss (1989).

Materials

Among a larger battery of assessment instruments, the following measures were used for this study.

Self-reported tactics of manipulation. Four different instruments were administered in self-report form to assess manipulation tactics in four separate relationships—with the spouse, close friend, mother, and father. The general instructional set for each instrument was as follows:

When you want to get your wife [husband, close friend, mother, father] to do something for you, what do you do? Look at each of the items listed

below and rate how likely you are to do each when you are trying to get your wife [husband, etc.] to do something. None of them will apply to all situations in which you want your wife [husband, etc.] to do something; simply rate how likely you are *in general* to do what is described. If you are extremely likely to do it, then circle a "7." If you are not at all likely to do it, then circle a "1." If you are somewhat likely to do it, then circle a "4." Give intermediate ratings for intermediate likelihoods of performing the behaviors.

Observer-reported tactics of manipulation. In a separate testing session, three different instruments were administered (influence tactics used by one's spouse, one's mother, and one's father). The instructional set paralleled that of the self-reported tactics, with appropriate alterations with respect to nature of relationship and observer-based format. In this article, I am concerned with the observer-reported tactics of the spouse, which can be used as an alternative to self-reports. Thus, for each subject, we know not only how he or she claims to manipulate the other, but also how the other perceives she or he is being manipulated.

Self-reported personality characteristics. A 40-item personality instrument was administered along with the other self-report instruments. This consisted of bipolar adjective scales, eight each for Surgency (e.g., bold-timid), Agreeableness (selfless-selfish), Conscientiousness (reliable-undependable), Emotional Stability (secure-insecure), and Intellectance-Openness (intelligent-stupid). The instrument is based on factor analyses reported by Goldberg (1983).

Spouse-observer reporting of personality characteristics. A parallel version of the Goldberg (1983) instrument described above was administered in a separate testing session to the spouses of each subject.

Interviewer-based observer reporting of personality characteristics. Each couple was interviewed by a pair of trained interviewers drawn from a 10-member team. Each interview lasted approximately 40 minutes. A set of standard questions were posed to each couple, including: How did you meet? What are the similarities and differences between you? What are the sources of conflict in your marriage? Were your parents for or against the marriage? How do you make joint decisions? In addition to these standard questions, interviewers were trained to probe further into issues raised during the course of the interview.

Directly following each interview, the two interviewers independently rated each subject on a parallel version of the Goldberg (1983) 40-item instrument. Subsequently, the interviewer ratings were standardized and composited with unit weighting to form five scores for each subject for Surgency, Agree-

ableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Intellectance-Openness. Thus, personality characteristics were assessed through three separate data sources—self-report, spouse report, and interviewer report.

Procedure

Subjects participated in three separate episodes of assessment. First, they received through the mail a battery of instruments to be completed in their home during their spare time. This battery contained most of the self-report instruments. Second, subjects came to a laboratory testing session to complete a battery of procedures, most of which pertained to reports about their spouse (e.g., spouse's tactics of manipulation). Spouses were separated for the duration of the testing session to preserve independence of responses. Third, couples were interviewed as a couple to provide information about the relationship and exposure to the interviewers, who in turn provided personality descriptions. Total confidentiality of all responses was assured for subjects. Not even the subject's spouse could see the responses without written permission.

RESULTS

Factor Analyses of Manipulation Tactics

Because previous studies have revealed a "general" factor in act report data that may be partially due to a response set (Botwin & Buss, 1989), the data were ipsatized prior to factor analyses. Two sets of factor analyses were conducted on the ipsatized scores, using varimax rotation, to identify the major dimensions along which tactics of manipulation vary. One set was conducted on the self-reported tactics used to influence one's spouse, and a second set on spouse-observer-reported tactics. These two data sources were used as primary because they contain the best ratios of subjects to reported acts (approximately 3 to 1), whereas data on the other instruments had ratios of only half that size.

Twelve clear factors emerged across these two data sources. These are shown in Table 1, along with the factor loadings of those items that consistently loaded on the same factor across the two data sources. Six factors replicate those found by Buss et al. (1987): Coercion, Regression, Debasement, Charm, Reason, and Silent Treatment.

Six new factors emerged across data sources that were not discovered by the earlier study. Responsibility Invocation contains acts that involve invoking commitment, responsibility, and disappointment upon failure to perform the act. The Reciprocity-Reward tactic contains acts that

Table 1
Factor Loadings for Manipulation Tactics

Factors/ acts	Self- reported data	Observer- reported data
<i>Coercion</i>		
Demand that she do it	.58	.75
Criticize her for not doing it	.75	.58
Yell at her so she'll do it	.43	.74
<i>Responsibility Invocation</i>		
Get her to make a commitment to doing it	.76	.77
Give her a deadline to do it	.70	.64
<i>Regression</i>		
Pout until she does it	.77	.68
Sulk until she does it	.79	.50
Whine until she does it	.55	.76
<i>Reciprocity-Reward</i>		
Tell her I'll do her a favor if she'll do it	.77	.78
Do something in exchange so that she will do it	.77	.78
Promise her that next time I will do what she wants	.43	.35
Give up something so she'll do it	.33	.38
<i>Debasement</i>		
Lower myself so she'll do it	.74	.71
Allow myself to be debased so she'll do it	.80	.68
Look sickly so she'll do it	.38	.31
<i>Hardball</i>		
Hit her so she will do it	.72	.80
Tell her you'll leave her if she doesn't do it	.80	.57
Imply the possibility of physical harm if she doesn't do it	.73	.79
Lie so that she will do it	.59	.87
Degrade her into doing it	.64	.70
Use deception to get her to do it	.54	.51
Do something violent so she will do it	.79	.87
Ask her to do it	.74	.65
Withhold money until she does it	.68	.84
Threaten to cut off her money if she doesn't do it	.65	.81

Table 1
Continued

Factors/ acts	Self- reported data	Observer- reported data
<i>Charm</i>		
Compliment her so she'll do it	.65	.73
Act charming so she'll do it	.76	.66
<i>Reason</i>		
Explain why you want her to do it	.70	.71
Give her reasons for doing it	.39	.73
Point out all the good things that will come from doing it	.56	.33
<i>Silent Treatment</i>		
Ignore her until she agrees to do it	.66	.70
Be silent until she agrees to do it	.76	.74
Don't respond to her until she does it	.76	.76
<i>Pleasure Induction</i>		
Tell her that she will enjoy it	.83	.82
Show her how much fun it is	.87	.82
<i>Social Comparison</i>		
Compare her to someone who would do it	.37	.36
Tell her that other partners would do it	.76	.49
Tell her that everyone is doing it	.79	.76
Tell her that she will look stupid if she doesn't do it	.29	.70
<i>Monetary Reward</i>		
Promise to buy her something if she does it	.69	.72
Give her a small gift or card before asking her to do it	.22	.77
Offer her money so she will do it	.67	.28

involve exchange, favors, and promises of future return. The Hardball tactic contains threats of withholding money, physical violence, and deception.

Pleasure Induction involves convincing the other that the act will be fun or enjoyable, as well as in their best interest to perform. Social Comparison contains acts that involve comparing the spouse to others

who would perform the act, mentioning that everyone else is doing it, and appealing to social opprobrium that would ensue if the act is not performed. Monetary Reward involves payment of money or gifts contingent on the act being performed. These 12 factors represent a major expansion of the taxonomic work started by Buss et al. (1987) that uncovered six tactics of manipulation. These factors were carried forward in subsequent analyses.

Reliabilities of Tactic Composites

Alpha reliability coefficients were computed for each of the composites for each of the seven conditions and data sources. These ranged from .49 to .85, with a mean of .66 for the self-report data on influence tactics; and from .60 to .86, with a mean of .68 for the spouse-reported influence tactics. The reliabilities for the other contexts were generally slightly lower, with means of .57 for friends, .62 for mothers, and .63 for fathers.

Sex Differences in Deployment of Manipulation Tactics

Buss et al. (1987) reported few sex differences in tactics of manipulation, and no sex differences appeared to exist across data sources and conditions of instigation and termination. To examine sex differences in this study, *t* tests were conducted for each tactic for each of the seven conditions and data sources. Within marital relationships, only two tactics showed significant sex differences across data sources. Females showed higher frequencies of the Regression tactic for both self-reported and spouse-reported data sources, replicating the sex differences found in dating couples (Buss et al., 1987). In contrast, there were no tactics that showed significantly greater male performance across data sources.

Females reported using more Regression with both spouses and with fathers. No other sex differences showed any degree of generality across relationships or data sources. In sum, the greater use of Regression by females is the only sex difference that shows generality across relationships as well as data sources.

Cross-Relationship Consistency of Manipulation Tactics

Table 2 shows the cross-relationship correlations for manipulation tactics for each data source that is available, as well as the cross-data source correlations for spousal manipulation tactics. Manipulation tactics represent one domain where it would be surprising if there existed uniformly high agreement between self-reports and reports by the target of the tactics. Indeed, some might argue that the most effective tactics are those about which the target is unaware.

The left column of Table 2 shows these correlations for spousal manipulation. Agreement is significant for all but the Charm tactic, most strongly so for Coercion, Reason, and Responsibility Invocation. These results partially replicate those of Buss et al., 1987, who also found Coercion to show the highest cross-data source agreement.

The next six columns of Table 2 show the correlations between tactics used with the spouse, as reported by the self and spouse-observer, with those used with friends, mothers, and fathers, as reported by the self. It is apparent that the correlations using the same data source are generally higher than those across data sources. The self-reported tactics used on spouses and friends may be inflated due to shared method variance. On the other hand, cross-data source correlations between observer-reported tactics used on the spouse and self-reported tactics used on the friend may be attenuated due to limitations on the spouses' knowledge of the tactics used by their marital partner. Thus, the within-data source correlations may be regarded as upper-bound estimates of true cross-relationship consistency, while the cross-data source correlations may be regarded as lower-bound estimates. Correlations significant across both data sources may be interpreted substantively with confidence.

Only three tactics show significant *spouse-friend* consistency across data sources—Coercion, Responsibility Invocation, and Hardball. Four tactics show significant *spouse-mother* consistency across data sources—Regression, Pleasure Induction, Reason, and Hardball. Five tactics show significant *spouse-father* consistency across data sources—Hardball, Responsibility Invocation, Social Comparison, Pleasure Induction, and Reason.

In sum, these data suggest that some modest degree of cross-relationship consistency exists in the use of some manipulation tactics. In most cases, however, the magnitude of the correlations is not high, especially

Table 2
Manipulation Tactics across Data Sources and Relationships

	Spouse × Friend		Spouse × Father		Spouse × Mother	
	S	O	S	O	S	O
	S × O ^a					
Coercion	.51***	.05**	.10	-.05	.12	-.02
Responsibility	.36***	.24**	.37***	.23*	.41***	.18
Hardball	.28***	.19**	.59***	.26*	.66***	.24*
Charm	.10	.04	.26*	-.12	.29**	.17
Silent Treatment	.20**	.07	.35***	.10	.34***	.18
Regression	.22**	.12	.29**	.20	.40***	.31**
Reciprocity	.20**	.12	.27**	-.09	.30**	-.04
Pleasure Induction	.21**	.09	.39***	.33***	.34***	.21*
Debasement	.23***	.06	.21*	.10	.41***	.07
Reason	.38***	.47***	.49***	.23*	.55***	.36***
Social Comparison	.15*	.13	.51***	.22*	.50***	-.04
Monetary Reward	.20**	-.05	.35***	.14	.23*	.10

a. S = self-reported data; O = Observer-reported data.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$.

when cross-data source correlations are examined. Thus, there appears to be considerable room for tactical specificity depending on the nature of the relationship.

Differences in Tactic Use across Relationships

To examine differences between relationships in the nature of tactics that are deployed, *t* tests were conducted on each of the tactics prior to ipsatization. The results indicated that across all tactics, greater frequencies were reported within the spousal relationship than in any other relationship.

To correct for this difference in overall elevation, *t* tests were performed on corrected ipsatized scores, as shown in Table 3. The first entry in this table shows that individuals report that they use more Coercion in dealing with spouses than with friends; this finding is replicated when spouse-observer ratings of Coercion use on spouses is compared with self-reported use of Coercion on friends. Several major results may be noted about the relative use of different tactics in different relationships. First, Coercion, Responsibility Invocation, Charm, and Regression are used relatively more frequently within spouse relationships than with friends, mothers, or fathers. In contrast, Hardball, Reciprocity, Debasement, Social Comparison, and Monetary Reward are used relatively more frequently with friends. Hardball, Debasement, and Reason are used relatively more often with the father than with the spouse. And Hardball, Monetary Reward, Debasement, and Reason are used relatively more often with the mother than with the spouse.

When contrasting the tactics used with friends with those used with parents, Reciprocity was found to be used more often with friends, whereas Regression was used more often with parents. In sum, although an overall elevation on tactic usage exists within spouse relationships compared with other relationships, tactics do show considerable relationship specificity when this overall elevation is controlled for in the individual tactic scores.

Links between the Big Five Personality Factors and Tactics Used

To preserve the independence of the self-report and the non-self-report data sources, two sets of personality scores were computed, one using

Table 3
Differences between Relationship Contexts in Tactics Used

	Spouse/Friend	Spouse/Father	Spouse/Mother	Friend/ Father	Friend/ Mother	Mother/ Father
Coercion	Spouse***/Spouse****	Spouse****/Spouse****	Spouse****/Spouse****			
Responsibility	Spouse****/Spouse****	Spouse****/Spouse*	Spouse****/Spouse****	Friend*	Friend****	
Hardball	Friend****/Friend****	Father****/Father**	Mother****/Mother**			
Charm	Spouse****/Spouse****	Spouse****/Spouse**		Father*		Mother*
Silent Treatment	Spouse****/Spouse*					
Regression	Spouse****/Spouse****	Spouse**/Spouse**	Spouse**/Spouse**	Father****	Mother****	
Reciprocity	Friend****/Friend****		/Mother*	Friend****	Friend****	
Pleasure Induction	/Friend****					
Debasement	Friend**/Friend****	Father**/Father****	Mother****/Mother****	Father**	Mother****	
Reason	Friend****/Friend****	Father****/Father**	Mother**/Mother**			
Social Comparison	Friend**/Friend****	Father**/	Mother*/			
Monetary Reward	Friend****/Friend****		Mother****/Mother****	Friend****		Mother****

Note. Table entries show the significant differences between relationships in tactic deployment. Entries represent the relationship in which the tactic is used more frequently. First entry represents self-report; second entry represents observer report.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$.

the self-report and one using composites, with unit weighting, of the spouse and interviewer reports. These personality variables were then correlated with each of the ipsatized manipulation tactic scores separately for each relationship and data source. For reportorial efficiency and generalizability, only those tactic-personality links that were significant across at least three conditions are reported (see Table 4). These links are shown for each personality variable, ordered by the degree to which it shows generality across sexes, data sources, and relationships. The first row in Table 4 shows that men who report that they are high in Surgency say they use Coercion in dealing with friends. The second row shows that men who are rated by others as being surgent say they use Coercion in dealing with their wives.

Surgency shows links with Responsibility Invocation in friend and father relationships, but not in the spousal relationship. Men high on Surgency also tend to be high on Coercion with their friends. Men and women who score low on Surgency tend to use Debasing tactics, especially with mothers and spouses, suggesting submissiveness and self-abnegation often associated with low scores on this factor (Buss, 1991b; Wiggins, 1979). Those low on Surgency also tend to use the Hardball tactic (threats, lies, violence), but only with their mothers and fathers.

Those scoring high on Agreeableness tend to use Pleasure Induction as a tactic of influence across all four types of close relationships. Agreeableness is also linked with the use of Reason, but only in the context of spouse relationships. Those scoring low on Agreeableness tend to use Coercion and the Silent Treatment to influence their spouses.

Conscientiousness shows only one link with manipulative tactics of any degree of generality; high scorers tend to use Reason with spouses and friends more than low scorers.

The most powerful tactical links with Emotional Stability are with Regression. Low scorers on this factor tend to use Regression to influence their spouses. Low scorers also tend to use Coercion and Monetary Reward. In contrast, those high on Emotional Stability tend to use Hardball tactics and Reason, although these links are few and small in magnitude.

Intellect-Openness shows the most pervasive links with the use of Reason—hardly surprising given the meaning of this construct. High scorers also tend to use Pleasure Induction. A less obvious linkage is between low scores on Intellect-Openness and the use of Social Comparison.

Table 4
Personality Correlates of Manipulation Tactics

Tactic	<i>r</i>	Sex	Relationship	Data source	
				Personality	Tactic
<i>Surgency</i>					
Coercion	.22*	Male	Friend	Self	Self
	.23*	Male	Spouse	Other	Self
	.30**	Male	Friend	Other	Self
Responsibility	.34**	Male	Father	Self	Self
Invocation	.23*	Male	Friend	Other	Self
	.27*	Female	Friend	Other	Self
Debasement	-.21*	Male	Spouse	Self	Spouse
	-.45***	Female	Mother	Self	Self
	-.23*	Male	Spouse	Other	Self
	-.30*	Female	Spouse	Other	Spouse
	-.34*	Female	Mother	Other	Self
Hardball	-.39**	Male	Father	Self	Self
	-.30*	Male	Mother	Self	Self
	-.33*	Female	Father	Self	Self
	-.33*	Female	Mother	Self	Self
	-.32*	Female	Father	Other	Self
	-.31*	Female	Mother	Other	Self
Monetary	-.45***	Male	Father	Self	Self
	-.22*	Male	Spouse	Self	Self
	-.24*	Male	Spouse	Other	Self
<i>Agreeableness</i>					
Pleasure	.22*	Female	Spouse	Self	Self
Induction	.23*	Female	Spouse	Self	Spouse
	.32*	Female	Father	Self	Self
	.39***	Male	Spouse	Other	Spouse
	.23*	Male	Friend	Other	Self
	.35*	Male	Mother	Other	Self
Reason	.30**	Female	Spouse	Self	Self
	.33***	Male	Spouse	Other	Spouse
	.23*	Female	Spouse	Other	Self
	.25**	Female	Spouse	Other	Spouse
Coercion	-.27**	Female	Spouse	Self	Self
	-.32***	Male	Spouse	Other	Self
	-.50***	Male	Spouse	Other	Spouse

Table 4
Continued

Tactic	<i>r</i>	Sex	Relationship	Data source	
				Personality	Tactic
	-.38***	Female	Spouse	Other	Self
	-.45***	Female	Spouse	Other	Spouse
Silent Treatment	-.21*	Female	Spouse	Self	Self
	-.31*	Female	Mother	Self	Self
	-.22*	Male	Spouse	Other	Self
	-.26**	Female	Spouse	Other	Self
	-.23*	Female	Spouse	Other	Spouse
<i>Conscientiousness</i>					
Reason	.29**	Female	Spouse	Self	Self
	.22*	Female	Friend	Self	Self
	.31**	Male	Spouse	Other	Self
	.26**	Male	Spouse	Other	Spouse
	.20*	Male	Friend	Other	Self
	.23*	Female	Spouse	Other	Self
<i>Emotional Stability</i>					
Hardball	.29**	Male	Spouse	Self	Self
	.26**	Male	Friend	Self	Self
	.23*	Female	Spouse	Other	Spouse
Reason	.24*	Male	Spouse	Other	Spouse
	.25*	Male	Friend	Other	Self
	.24*	Female	Spouse	Other	Spouse
Regression	-.20*	Male	Spouse	Self	Self
	-.29**	Female	Spouse	Self	Self
	-.22*	Female	Spouse	Self	Spouse
	-.29*	Female	Mother	Self	Self
	-.24*	Male	Spouse	Other	Self
	-.19*	Female	Spouse	Other	Spouse
Coercion	-.24*	Male	Friend	Self	Self
	-.24*	Female	Spouse	Self	Self
	-.31***	Male	Spouse	Other	Spouse
	-.26**	Female	Spouse	Other	Spouse
Monetary Reward	-.21*	Female	Friend	Self	Self
	-.21*	Female	Friend	Other	Self
	-.34*	Female	Mother	Other	Self

Table 4
Continued

Tactic	<i>r</i>	Sex	Relationship	Data source	
				Personality	Tactic
<i>Intellect-Openness</i>					
Reason	.20*	Male	Spouse	Self	Self
	.25*	Female	Spouse	Self	Self
	.22*	Male	Spouse	Other	Self
	.30**	Male	Spouse	Other	Spouse
	.29**	Female	Spouse	Other	Self
	.23*	Female	Spouse	Other	Other
Pleasure Induction	.26**	Male	Spouse	Self	Self
	.21*	Male	Spouse	Other	Self
	.32*	Male	Mother	Other	Self
	.24*	Female	Spouse	Other	Spouse
	.25**	Female	Friend	Other	Self
Responsibility Invocation	.32***	Male	Spouse	Self	Self
	.25**	Male	Friend	Self	Self
	.20*	Female	Spouse	Other	Self
	.33***	Female	Friend	Other	Self
Social Comparison	-.22*	Male	Spouse	Self	Self
	-.30**	Female	Spouse	Self	Self
	-.20*	Male	Spouse	Other	Spouse
	-.27**	Female	Spouse	Other	Self
	-.22*	Female	Friend	Other	Self

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$.

In summary, each of the five personality dimensions shows coherent links of some generality across relationships and data sources with the tactics of manipulation used in close personal relationships.¹ These

1. Correlations between the personality characteristics of one spouse and the manipulation tactics of the other showed fewer significant associations, suggesting that an *actor's* personality is a more powerful predictor of the tactics used than the personality of the *recipient* of the influence tactic. However, some links were seen. For example, low Agreeableness of one spouse is significantly correlated with the use of Regression, Coercion, and Silent Treatment by the other spouse. Low Agreeable spouses appear to elicit a lot of yelling, pouting, and whining, as well as stony silence.

Table 5
Couple Correlations on Manipulation Tactics Used on Each Other

Tactic	Self-reported data	Observer-reported data
Coercion	.28**	.33***
Responsibility	.21*	.15**
Hardball	.34***	.23*
Charm	.07	.21*
Silent Treatment	.02	.08
Regression	.01	.16
Reciprocity	.04	.19
Pleasure Induction	.13	.24*
Debasement	.13	.11
Reason	.23*	.40***
Social Comparison	.06	.18
Monetary Reward	.18	.30**

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$.

links help to illuminate the important social consequences of the major dimensions of personality, a topic I will take up in the Discussion section.

Couple Correlations on Manipulation Tactics

Table 5 shows the correlations between husbands and wives in their use of manipulation tactics toward each other. Four show significant positive couple correlations across data sources—Coercion, Responsibility Invocation, Hardball, and Reason. No tactics show negative correlations between husbands and wives, adding one more piece to the growing body of literature that documents ubiquitous similarity between mates in the interpersonal realm (Buss, 1984).

DISCUSSION

This research makes three basic empirical contributions: (a) a taxonomic contribution to the discovery, naming, and ordering of the major ways in which persons influence significant others inhabiting their social environment; (b) documentation of the degree of generality and nature of specificity of manipulation tactics across relationship contexts; and

(c) placement of the five factors of personality in interactional context by identifying the manipulation tactics deployed by persons differing on each. These issues will be discussed in turn.

Previous research has identified six major tactics of manipulation—Charm, Reason, Coercion, Silent Treatment, Debasement, and Regression (Buss et al., 1987). The current research replicated those factors, and discovered six additional tactics through factor analyses of two parallel instruments differing in data source—Responsibility Invocation, Reciprocity, Monetary Reward, Pleasure Induction, Social Comparison, and Hardball.

This taxonomic advance was achieved by examining different sorts of close relationships (friend, mother, father), and obtaining act nominations for each of them. The current taxonomy of tactics provides a much richer depiction of the ways in which individuals influence each other, although it cannot be considered comprehensive. Other relationships (e.g., siblings, work colleagues) and different age groups such as older persons (e.g., “I threatened to cut her out of my will”) represent important domains for further advances toward this taxonomic goal.

The second contribution of this research is the documentation of the degree of generality and nature of specificity of manipulation tactics across different types of close relationships. The use of two separate data sources permits a reasonable assessment of generality. A few tactics showed individual difference consistency across relationships. The use of Responsibility Invocation, Hardball, Pleasure Induction, and Reason, for example, showed moderate generality across spouses, friends, mothers, and fathers. Coercion showed consistency across spouses and friends. For the other six tactics, however, the degree of consistency across relationships ranged from quite modest to essentially zero.

Are tactics deployed differentially depending on relationship? Overall, the data showed elevation in the use of *all* manipulation tactics toward the spouse when contrasted with other relationships. This result may not be surprising in that spouses generally spend more time with each other than with friends or parents. Correcting for overall differences in elevation, however, yielded a coherent portrait of the relative relationship specificity of tactical usage. This sample used Coercion, Responsibility Invocation, and Regression differentially more toward their spouses than toward their friends, mothers, or fathers. They used Hardball, Reciprocity, Debasement, Social Comparison, and Monetary Reward relatively more often with friends than with spouses. These findings contribute to knowledge about systematic sources of behav-

ioral specificity: Relationship type moderates which tactics of influence will be deployed.

Implications of Five Factors of Personality for Social Relationships

The third set of findings represents a step toward placing personality in interactional context by identifying the manipulation tactics deployed by persons differing on the five major dimensions of personality. Among the major findings were that persons high on Surgency tended to use Responsibility Invocation and Coercion; persons low on Surgency used Debasement; Disagreeable persons tended to use Coercion and Silent Treatment; Conscientious persons tended to use Reason; Emotionally Unstable persons tended to use Regression; persons high on Intellect-Openness tended to use Reason; and those low on Intellect-Openness tended to use Social Comparison. These links all showed some degree of generality across sexes, relationships, and data sources, and provide evidence of the interactive implications of the five basic dimensions of personality.

The results linking personality characteristics with manipulation tactics used contribute to the development of an interactional framework for linking personality and social psychology (Buss, 1987). Although calls for interactionism have been sounded frequently in the past decade, no compelling framework has emerged within which person-environment links, their causal origins, and their consequences can be studied. The present results contribute to the selection-evocation-manipulation framework of person-environment interactionism (Buss, 1987). While previous results have documented the importance of selection as a mechanism that creates person-environment links (Buss, 1984), these results document the importance of manipulation in creating person-environment links.

Documenting these links illuminates the importance and implicativeness of the five major personality dimensions for social relationships. The finding that those low on Surgency tend to use Debasement (e.g., lowering self to get others to do something), for example, supports Wiggins's conceptual proposition that submissiveness involves denying status to the self. Combined with the finding that those high on Surgency tend to be somewhat condescending (e.g., treating self as superior and others as inferior) (Buss, 1991b), these results yield compelling support for the notion that *status allocation* is a central psychological ingredient in this major personality factor.

Another implication involves the consequences of personality for interactions between husbands and wives. Although it would be premature to draw conclusions about whom one should or should not marry, it does seem clear that those married to spouses low on Agreeableness are more likely to be subjected to yelling, demanding, and criticizing (i.e., Coercion) from their spouses; and those married to spouses low on Emotional Stability are more likely to be subjected to pouting, sulking, and whining (Regression) as well as demands, criticizing, and yelling (Coercion) from their spouses. Those seeking spouses who use Reason might do well to select mates who are high on Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Intellect-Openness. These results point to the centrality of five personality factors in understanding how individuals interact in close social relationships.

REFERENCES

- Buss, D. M. (1984). Toward a psychology of person-environment correspondence: The role of spouse selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **47**, 361–377.
- Buss, D. M. (1985). The temporal stability of acts, trends, and patterns. In C. Spielberger & J. N. Butcher (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (Vol. 5, pp. 165–196). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Buss, D. M. (1987). Selection, evocation, and manipulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **53**, 1214–1221.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Conflict between the sexes: Strategic interference and the evocation of anger and upset. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **56**, 735–747.
- Buss, D. M. (1991a). Evolutionary personality psychology. In M. Rosensweig & L. Porter (Eds.), *Annual review of psychology* (pp. 459–491). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Buss, D. M. (1991b). Conflict in married couples: Personality predictors of anger and upset. *Journal of Personality*, **59**, 663–688.
- Buss, D. M., Gomes, M., Higgins, D. S., & Lauterbach, K. (1987). Tactics of manipulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **52**, 1219–1229.
- Cantor, N., & Zirkel, S. (1990). Personality, cognition, and purposive behavior. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality theory and research* (pp. 135–164). New York: Guilford.
- Conley, J. (1984). The hierarchy of consistency: A review and model of longitudinal findings on adult individual differences in intelligence, personality and self-opinion. *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences*, **5**, 11–25.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Still stable after all these years: Personality as the key to some issues in adulthood and old age. In P. Baltes & O. G. Brim, Jr. (Eds.), *Life span development and behavior* (Vol. 3, pp. 65–102). New York: Academic Press.
- Daniels, D. (1986). Sibling personality differences and differential experience of siblings in the same family. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **51**, 339–346.
- Digman, J. M., & Inouye, J. (1986). Further specification of the five robust factors of

- personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **50**, 116–123.
- Digman, J. M., & Takemoto-Chock, N. K. (1981). Factors in the natural language of personality: Reanalysis, comparison, and interpretation of six major studies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, **16**, 149–170.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1981). *A model for personality*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (pp. 141–165). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1983, June). *The magical number five, plus or minus two: Some conjectures on the dimensionality of personality descriptions*. Paper presented at the Gerontology Research Center, National Institute on Aging, Baltimore.
- Hogan, R. (1983). Socioanalytic theory of personality. In M. M. Page (Ed.), *1982 Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Personality—current theory and research* (pp. 55–89). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Humphreys, M. S., & Revelle, W. (1984). Personality, motivation, and performance: A theory of the relationship between individual differences and information processing. *Psychological Review*, **91**, 153–185.
- John, O. P., Goldberg, L. R., & Angleitner, A. (1984). Better than the alphabet: Taxonomies of personality-descriptive terms in English, Dutch, and German. In H. J. C. Bonarius, G. L. M. van Heck, & N. E. Smid (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe: Theoretical and empirical developments* (pp. 83–100). Lisse, Switzerland: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1985). Updating Norman's "adequate taxonomy" of intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and in questionnaires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **49**, 710–721.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **52**, 81–90.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, **66**, 574–583.
- Plomin, R., DeFries, J. C., & McClearn, G. E. (1980). *Behavioral genetics: A primer*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Thorne, A. (1987). The press of personality: A study of conversations between introverts and extraverts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **53**, 718–726.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1979). A psychological taxonomy of interpersonal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **37**, 395–412.
- Wright, J. C., & Mischel, W. (1987). A conditional approach to dispositional constructs: The local predictability of social behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **53**, 1159–1177.
- Zuckerman, M. (1990). The psychophysiology of sensation seeking. *Journal of Personality*, **58**, 313–345.
- Zuckerman, M., Kuhlman, D. M., & Camac, C. (1988). What lies beyond E and N? Factor analyses of scales believed to measure basic dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **54**, 96–107.

This document is a scanned copy of a printed document. No warranty is given about the accuracy of the copy. Users should refer to the original published version of the material.