International Journal of Economics, Management and Tourism

GOCE DELCEV UNIVERSITY OF STIP
FACULTY OF TOURISM AND BUSINESS LOGISTICS

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS, MANAGEMENT AND TOURISM

VOL. 2 NO. 1

2022

ISSN 2671-3810 online version

Publisher:
Faculty of Tourism and Business Logistics
Goce Delchev University of Shtip
“Krste Misirkov” no.10-A P.O. Box 201 Shtip 2000, North Macedonia
Tel: +389 32 550 350
www.ftbl.ugd.edu.mk
www.ugd.edu.mk

The International Journal of Economics, Management and Tourism (IJEMT) is peer-reviewed and issued two times per year, in online version at the following website of the web portal of Goce Delcev University in Stip: https://js.ugd.edu.mk/index.php/ijemt/index. The official language for papers is English language.

IJEMT DOI: https://doi.org/10.46763/IJEMT

IJEMT Vol.2 No.1 DOI: https://doi.org/10.46763/IJEMT2111

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Manuscript received: 19.04.2022
Accepted:

International Journal of Economics, Management and Tourism
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 63-69
Online: ISSN **2671-3810**
UDC: 316.47:159.923.2
DOI https://doi.org/10.46763/IJEMT2221063z
Original scientific paper

IMPACT OF PERSONALITY ON INTERPESONAL RELATIONSHIPS AND SUPPORT

Aleksandar Zezova

PhD, University "Goce Delchev" - Stip, Faculty of Tourism and Business Logistics,
aleksandra.zezova@ugd.edu.mk

Abstract
Personality can influence to whom individuals are attracted and how often they interact in social situations. Personality even influences how successful people are at getting along with other people. Indeed, social behaviour is often shaped by the dispositions of the individuals involved in the interactions (Ozer and Benet-Martínez 2006). Conversely, social relationships can also have a profound effect on personality. First, we will begin by examining the direct effect of personality on social relations across a range of interpersonal relationships that occur during the lifespan. Secondly, we will focus on how personality not only influences social relations, but how social relations also can shape personality. We will conclude by discussing newer methodologies that allow researchers to study both personality and social relationship effects simultaneously. The personality dimensions presented are not meant to be exhaustive but instead are offered as examples when considering the association between personality and social relations across the lifetime. We should also note that we will use the terms temperament and personality somewhat interchangeably. Personality, on the other hand, has been defined as 'an individual's characteristic pattern of thought, emotion, and behaviour'. Given that both definitions focus on characteristic patterns of responding, there is considerable overlap in these two constructs when attempting to understand how these differences influence social relations across the lifespan.

Key words: *personality, social relationships, social support*

Introduction

Establishing and maintaining social relationships with others are some of the most important tasks an individual faces (Baumeister and Leary 1995). Although the interpersonal dynamics of a relationship are important in understanding how it is formed and maintained, the characteristics an individual brings to that relationship may be equally as important (Robins, Caspi and Moffitt 2002). For example, personality characteristics associated with socio-emotional competence (e.g., Extraversion, effortful control, empathic accuracy, Neuroticism) have been found to predict both the duration and quality of relationships across the lifespan. The role of personality on social relations can be seen as early as infancy in the relationship between an infant and care-giver. For example, attachment researchers believe that a warm, receptive parenting style is crucial for developing secure attachments with an infant. The personality of the parent, however, appears to play a critical role in his/her ability to provide this warm, nurturing care-giving. Recent models of socialization posit that the personality of both the child and parent can influence the socialization process (Belsky and Barends 2002; Lytton 1990; Putnam, Sanson and Rothbart 2002). Having a responsive mother is particularly important for anger-prone infants; when a mother is highly responsive, an anger-prone infant is likely to become highly cooperative over time. As children grow older, peers and friends become increasingly important. Peers provide contexts for learning social skills, are resources of emotional and cognitive support, and can be used as practice for later relationships (Asher and Parker 1989; Hartup 1992). Extraversion has been linked to social competence in children. Extraversion involves a person's general level of sociability. Extraverted individuals are more likely to experience positive affect, which may in turn lead to smoother interpersonal

Manuscript received: 19.04.2022
Accepted:
International Journal of Economics, Management and Tourism
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 63-69
Online: ISSN **2671-3810**
UDC: 316.47:159.923.2
DOI https://doi.org/10.46763/IJEMT2221063z
Original scientific paper

relationships. Indeed, Extraversion has been associated with general peer acceptance. Conscientiousness has also been found to be important for childhood peer relationships. Conscientious children are less likely to be victimized and rejected than children lower in Conscientiousness. Moreover, Conscientiousness is positively related to friendship quality. Conscientiousness reflects a person's self- control processes and enables them to maintain appropriate social behaviour that, in turn, allows for higher quality peer relationships (Jensen-Campbell and Malcolm 2007). A large body of work has also established the link between personality and social relationships in adulthood, especially through the exploration of romantic relationships.

Transactional models of personality development

To date, personality research has focused primarily on how personality influences relationship experiences. An equally important issue involves whether relationship experiences can cause changes in personality. Undeniably, personality development is a complex process integrating the individual and the social environment; we cannot ignore how social relations may influence an individual's personality. The notion that there is a co-development of personality and relationships was perpetuated by the dynamic interactionist paradigm (Caspi 1998; Magnusson 1990). It is suggested that personality and the environment are relatively stable over short periods of time, such as a few weeks. However, both personality and the environment are subject to change over longer periods, such as months or years (Asendorpf and Wilpers 1998). With this in mind we can assume that these changes are influenced by both the individual's own personality and the social relations in which they are involved. For example, a dyadic relationship between spouses can be seen as a transactional or dynamic interactional relationship. The personality of the wife may influence and be influenced by the personality of the husband over time. In addition, the quality of the marital relationship can influence and be influenced by the personalities of both spouses. Recent empirical consideration has been given to transactional models of personality and social relations (Asendorpf and Van Aken 2003;). For example, Robins, Caspi and Moffitt (2002) found that not only did antecedent personality characteristics predict social relations, but social relations also predicted changes in personality over time. When individuals were involved in romantic relationships that were maladaptive, their negative emotionality increased over time. As late as the 1990s, it was assumed that personality was essentially fixed and unchanging by age thirty. Recent empirical evidence suggests that personality does reliably change in middle adulthood; moreover, midlife concerns associated with social relations (e.g., work stress, social support) influence personality change (Van Aken, Denissen, Branje et al. 2006). For example, marital tensions and divorce predict changes in dominance and masculinity/femininity in women during early and middle adulthood (Roberts, Helson and Klohnen 2002). Another approach to understanding how social relations may influence personality change in adulthood is the Social Investment Theory, which attempts to understand why there are not only individual-level changes in personality (via interpersonal transactions), but also consistent mean-level changes in personality during adulthood. For example, adults as a group (i.e., mean level changes) become more agreeable, emotionally stable and conscientious over time. Experiences that are linked to social roles are believed to influence these mean-level changes in personality (Wood and Roberts 2006). For example, although there are increases in Conscientiousness and Emotional Stability in adulthood, only persons experiencing satisfying relationships show these predicted increases. The most important individual differences in interpersonal relationships become encoded into language across many cultures (Hogan 1983; Wiggins 1991). Different cultures may value different personality qualities in social relationships. The function and significance of certain personality traits may differ by culture, which may have serious implications for how personality is associated with social relations (Chen, French and Schneider 2006). Shyness-inhibition is also

Manuscript received: 19.04.2022
Accepted:
International Journal of Economics, Management and Tourism
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 63-69
Online: ISSN **2671-3810**
UDC: 316.47:159.923.2
DOI https://doi.org/10.46763/IJEMT2221063z
Original scientific paper

more a social liability in individualistic cultures that promote social initiative and independence. Behaviours associated with shyness- inhibition (e.g., being reserved), on the other hand, are more valued in collectiv- istic cultures that emphasize interpersonal harmony and interdependence among individuals (Chen, Wang and DeSouza 2006). Indeed, shy American children are more likely to be neglected by the peer group; shy American men are less likely to initiate relationships. In China, a more collectivistic culture, shyness is associated with being more socially mature in children. Most researchers would agree that individuals do not live in a vacuum. Not only does one's personality influence social relations, but the vast array of interaction partners (e.g., romantic partners, friends, strangers, co-workers) a person comes into contact with influence the way a person thinks, feels and acts. This reciprocal or mutual influence is often termed interdependence.

Social relations model

The social relations model (SRM)[1] is a two-way random effects statistical model which examines the interaction between personality characteristics and social relations (Kenny, Kashy and Cook 2006; Lashley and Kenny 1998). SRM treats each individual in an interaction as both a subject and an object (Malloy and Kenny 1986) with each dyadic score a function of four components: constant, actor, partner and the relationship (Kenny, Kashy and Cook 2006; Kenny 1988). The constant represents the group mean (i.e., the average group level of an outcome score) and accounts for the variation of an outcome measure as it differs between interactions. To help illustrate, imagine a study in which the outcome measure is Agree/ableness. The constant component accounts for differing levels of Agree/ableness across dyadic interactions. The actor and partner components account for the individual responses of the dyadic members. For example, individuals may consistently rate people high or low on Agreeableness. The actor component accounts for the target member's outcome scores (i.e., how agreeable the target member consistently views his/her partners). Instead, this effect estimates the amount of variability in how consistently the target member rates various interaction partners on a particular outcome (i.e., in this case, Agreeableness). The partner component, on the other hand, accounts for whether the interaction partner is consistently rated on the outcome behaviour regardless of the dyadic partner. For example, the partner component would account for the degree that all interaction members view the partner as agreeable. The relationship effect reflects the variance in the outcome score above and beyond the individual contributions of each dyadic member (i.e., accounting for the variability in Agreeableness after parsing out the effects of the actor and the partner). In sum, variability is accounted for at multiple levels including the group level (i.e., the constant components), the individual level (i.e., the actor and partner components), and the dyadic level (i.e., the relationship component). This ability to partial out actor effects has the potential to enhance the field's understanding of personality's role in social behaviour and relationships. SRM provides the unique ability to tease apart the variance of the effects and thus account for the unique influence of personality in social environments.

Actor-partner interdependence model

The actor-partner interdependence model (APIM) is an interactional model which assumes a causal direction in that the actor and partner components cause the outcome measure (Kenny, Kashy and Cook 2006; Cook and Kenny 2005). APIM treats the individual predictor scores as being nested within the dyadic unit (Cook and Kenny 2005). As such, both individual scores and dyadic level scores are estimated. Similar to SRM, APIM makes use of actor, partner and interaction components. However, these effects have a very different meaning in an APIM than in the SRM. Again consider the above example with Agreeableness (Kenny, Kashy and

[1] SRM- Social relations model

Manuscript received: 19.04.2022
Accepted:
International Journal of Economics, Management and Tourism
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 63-69
Online: ISSN **2671-3810**
UDC: 316.47:159.923.2
DOI https://doi.org/10.46763/IJEMT2221063z
Original scientific paper

Cook 2006). In APIM, the actor effect assesses the degree to which a target dyadic member's agreeableness influences his/her own outcome score. The partner effect assesses the degree to which the partner's agreeableness influences the target dyadic member's outcome score. The actor effect is computed while holding any partner influence constant; the partner effect is computed while controlling for any actor effects. The ability to estimate the partner effect is a key strength of APIM (Cook and Kenny 2005). Estimating the partner effect allows researchers to truly examine interpersonal effects by accounting for the variance of the partner's influence. Most social and personality theories acknowledge effects of interaction partners. APIM presents a statistical method to account for such interdependence. APIM can be used with both categorical and continuous data and can examine both the individual effects of each dyadic partner as well as the joint influence of the dyadic partners.

Relationship between personality and social support

Much of the early work investigating the construct of social support was based on epidemiological studies which showed that having supportive contacts with others was beneficial to health and wellbeing (Caplan 1974; Cobb 1976). Findings from this work led to the implicit assumption that the agent of influence regarding levels of social support was the social environment of the individual (i.e., the individual's social network size), rather than dispositional factors of the person. However, by the mid-1980s, researchers were beginning to recognize the importance of personality in predicting coping responses in general (Parkes 1986), and the use of social support, in particular (Sarason and Sarason 1982). Much work has been done in the area since this time and hundreds of studies have documented the association between social support and various personality traits. Drawing from Scarr and McCartney's (1983) model of person-environment interaction, Pierce and his colleagues suggested that, first, personality might influence how supportive behaviour is perceived and responded to (reactive interaction). Essentially, individuals who experience similar levels of support may perceive this support quite differently. Individuals differ in the manner in which they evoke supportive responses from others (Pierce, Lakey, Sarason et al. 1997). While one individual's behaviour might signal a preference for support, another person's manner might convey the need for interpersonal distance. Individuals are active participants in selecting and creating their social world and, as such, play an important role in influencing the level of social support available to them. For instance, individuals who are more outgoing and social (extraverted) tend to report greater numbers of people in their social network (Swickert, Rosentreter, Hittner and Mushrush 2002), probably because they are more inclined to seek out interactions with others, as compared to more introverted individuals.

Social support

The construct of social support generally refers to the perception by the individual that he or she is cared for, loved and valued by others. It is believed that this sense of support and community helps the individual to manage the uncertainty of life events by enhancing feelings of personal control. Functional support is defined as an individual's perception of support available from others, as well as the support that is actually received from others. Within this general social support category a variety of supportive functions have been identified by researchers, including enhancement of self-esteem, feelings of belonging, guidance from others, and provision of tangible assistance. Regarding the assessment of functional support, various questionnaires have been developed to measure the different forms of functional support that have been identified in the literature. The other major form of social support, structural support, refers to the degree of embeddedness of the individual within a social network of significant others (Lin and Peek 1999). This type of support is often reflected by the number of people in the individual's social network (termed network size) and is assessed by asking the individual to record the names of all people they could turn to if support were

Manuscript received: 19.04.2022
Accepted:
International Journal of Economics, Management and Tourism
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 63-69
Online: ISSN **2671-3810**
UDC: 316.47:159.923.2
DOI https://doi.org/10.46763/IJEMT2221063z
Original scientific paper

needed. Based on this listing of individuals, the respondent is then typically asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the support provided by each network member, the level of contact they have with network members, and the density of their social support network. This last characteristic refers to the extent to which members of an individual's social network know one another. Functional support, in particular, perceived availability of support, is not only weighted heavily when individuals consider their level of social support, it has been found to play an important stress-buffering role when people are under a high degree of stress (Cohen 2003; Thoits 1985). In particular, it is believed to provide a protective role as individuals experience stress, in that it might foster a less negative interpretation of the stressor which then, in turn, can help to reduce the individual's experience of stress and anxiety (Cohen 2003). Perceived availability of social support is most effective when there is a match between what is required to successfully cope with the situation and the type of social support the individual perceives to be available. However, individuals who perceive having others they can talk to and share experiences with (belonging support), as well as individuals who make them feel good about themselves (self-esteem support), may benefit despite the coping requirements of a situation as these types of support are deemed to be helpful regardless of the nature of the stressor (Cohen 2003). Social support can have a beneficial effect regardless of whether the individual is under stress. The main-effect model of social support has been associated most frequently with structural social support as this type of social support seems to be helpful regardless of the level of stress that the individual experiences. Research has shown that social network size is associated with reduced mortality rates (Berkman and Syme 1979; House, Robbins and Metzner 1982), and greater resistance to particular disease processes (Cohen, Doyle, Skoner et al. 1997). It also has been associated with reduced levels of anxiety, depression and psychological distress (Cohen and Wills 1985). Indeed, theorists have suggested that structural support may exert its positive effects on health indirectly, by reducing the individual's general experience of anxiety and stress. Social interactions with others are not always supportive in nature. Interacting with others who are interfering, manipulative or even hostile has been shown to have a negative impact on psychological wellbeing. Furthermore, the impact of negative interactions on the individual is often greater, compared with positive interactions (Rook 1984; Schuster, Kessler and Aseltine 1990). Fortunately, most people tend to report substantially more positive social connections than negative (Schuster et al. 1990), and positive social interactions have been shown to attenuate the negative effects of problematic social ties.

Conclusion

The links between personality and social relations support several general conclusions. Personality influences interpersonal relationships across the lifespan. The influence of personality and social relations is bidirectional; that is, not only does personality influence social relations, but social relations also influence personality development. The larger cultural context can influence the association between personality and social relations. Certain personality traits may be more valued in some cultures. Thus, culture may influence the display of certain personality traits and how they contribute to social relationships. Both the Social Relations Model and the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model are steps in this direction. Future research is still needed that assesses changes in personality as well as changes in social relations to better understand the causal relationships between the constructs and to better understand their stability versus mutability. In addition, research that better considers how culture and sub-cultural contexts influence the personality-social relations link is necessary. Nonetheless, the findings, provide a strong case that personality and social relationships share a symbiotic, dynamic relationship.

Manuscript received: 19.04.2022
Accepted:
International Journal of Economics, Management and Tourism
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 63-69
Online: ISSN **2671-3810**
UDC: 316.47:159.923.2
DOI https://doi.org/10.46763/IJEMT2221063z
Original scientific paper

Reference:

Asendorpf, J. B. and Wilpers, S. 1998. Personality effects on social relationships, Journal of Personality and Social Relationships 74: 1531–44

Asher, S. R. and Parker, J. G. 1989. The significance of peer relationship problems in childhood, in B. H. Schneider, G. Attili, J. Nadel and R. P. Weissberg (eds.), Social competence in developmental perspective, pp. 5–23. Amsterdam: Kluwer

Baumeister, R. F. and Leary, M. R. 1995. The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation, Psychological Bulletin 117: 497–529

Belsky, J. and Barends, N. 2002. Personality and parenting, in M. H. Bornstein (ed.), Handbook of parenting, vol. III, Being and becoming a parent, 2nd edn, pp. 415– 38. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Caplan, G. 1974. Support systems and community mental health: lectures on concept development, Behavioural Publications 17: 267

Caspi, A. 1998. Personality development across the life course, in W. Damon (Series ed.) and N. Eisenberg (Vol. ed.), Handbook of child psychology, vol. III, Social, emotional, and personality development, 5th edn, pp. 311–88. New York: Wiley

Chen, X., French, D. C. and Schneider, B. H. 2006. Peer relationships in cultural context. New York: Cambridge University Press

Cobb, S. 1976. Social support as a moderator of life stress, Psychosomatic Medicine 38: 300–14

Cohen, S. 2003. Psychosocial models of the role of social support in the etiology of physical disease, in P. Salovey and A. J. Rothman (eds.), Social psychology of health, pp. 227–44. New York: Psychology Press

Cook, W. L. and Kenny, D. A. 2005. The actor-partner interdependence model: a model of bidirectional effects in development studies, International Journal of Behavioural Development 29: 101–9

Hogan, R. T. 1983. A socioanalytic theory of personality, in M. Page (ed.), Nebraska symposium on Motivation: personality – current theory and research, pp. 58–89. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press

Jensen-Campbell, L. A. and Malcolm, K. T. 2007. The importance of Conscientiousness in adolescent interpersonal relationships, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 33: 368–83

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A. and Cook, W. L. 2006. Dyadic data analysis. New York: Guilford Press

Magnusson, D. 1990. Personality development from an interactional perspective, in L. A Pervin (ed). Handbook of personality: theory and measurements, pp. 193– 222. New York, Guilford Press

Ozer, D. J. and Benet-Martínez, V. 2006. Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes, Annual Review of Psychology 57: 401–21

Parkes, K. 1986. Coping in stressful episodes: the role of individual differences, environmental factors, and situational characteristics, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 6: 1277–92

Rothbart, M. K. and Bates, J. E. 2006. Temperament, in W. Damon and R. M. Lerner (Series eds.) and N. Eisenberg (Vol. ed.), Handbook of child psychology, vol. III, Social, emotional and personality development, 6th edn, pp. 99–166. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley

Robins, R. W., Caspi, A. and Moffitt, T. E. 2000. Two personalities, one relationship: both partners' personality traits shape the quality of their relationships, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 79: 251–9

Roberts, B. W., Helson, R. and Klohnen, E. G. 2002. Personality development and growth in women across 30 years: three perspectives, Journal of Personality 70: 79–102

Manuscript received: 19.04.2022
Accepted:
International Journal of Economics, Management and Tourism
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 63-69
Online: ISSN **2671-3810**
UDC: 316.47:159.923.2
DOI https://doi.org/10.46763/IJEMT2221063z
Original scientific paper

Sarason, I. and Sarason, B. 1982. Concomitants of social support: attitudes, personality characteristics, and life experiences, Journal of Personality 50: 331–44

Van Aken, M. A. G., Denissen, J. J. A., Branje, S. J. T., Dubas, J. S. and Goossens, L. 2006. Midlife concerns and short-term personality change in middle adulthood, European Journal of Personality 20: 497–513

Wood, D. and Roberts, B. W. 2006. The effect of age and role information on expectations for Big Five personality traits, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 32: 1482–96