

DOBRIVOJE MIHAILOVIĆ, Ph.D., Associate Professor
RANKO LOJIĆ, M.Sc.

Faculty of organization sciences, Belgrade, University of Belgrade, Serbia and Monte Negro

INTERACTION OF PERSONALITY AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

UDC 159.922.2

Received: 19.10.2003

Preliminary communications

The nature of interaction between the personality phenomenon and the interpersonal relations phenomenon is a very complex and dynamic one. Which of these two phenomena, interwoven set of personality or interpersonal relations, will be more dynamic and deciding in shaping the other is difficult to estimate. Specificity of these interactions is not sufficiently researched.

Key words: interpersonal relations, personality, interaction.

INTRODUCTION

By means of his conscious activity the man has made not only the norms of behavior but the behavior itself, i.e. the relation towards other people. The basics of the interpersonal relations cannot be regarded as static mechanisms but as a dialectic development process of the humane bio-psychological and social development.

The main characteristic of interaction is mutual relations. Two persons have formed mutual relation when they are in frequent interaction? "By interaction it is understood that the people show certain activity in mutual presence, create product for each other or communicate among themselves. In any case with interaction there is at least a possibility that the activity of each person influence the activities of the other person."(Thibaut and Kelley, 1959).

A lot of factors influence interpersonal relations, but the personality is the key phenomenon for explanation of these relations. Since the features of the personality determine all man's activities in the greatest extent, they will have deciding role in its interpersonal relations. However, the link between the interpersonal relations and personality is not entirely scrutinized by determining only the influence of a personality on the interpersonal relations, because the interpersonal relations determine the personality. Therefore, we are going to look at the link between the interpersonal relations and personality in two ways:

- *influence of personality on interpersonal relations and*
- *influence of interpersonal relations on personality.*

1. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

Nowadays there are several theoretic concepts which interpret in different ways the notion of interpersonal relations. Depending on the theoretic course and the nature of the issue they explain, there are given different classification of the theories on interpersonal relations. We will not involve in deep tackling the issue of the classification of these theories, but will stay occupied with the theoretic concepts dealing with the traits of interaction of personality and interpersonal relations.

The first studies of interpersonal relations were directed towards examining *the group*. The unit of observation is the narrow social group. The subject of these analyses was focused on the *group atmosphere (climate)*. *Social atmosphere (climate)* can be simply defined as a state of psychosocial relations of the members of a social group and their relations towards the entire group (Zvonarević, M., 1985). These relations can be "good-bad", and they rest on two important traits of each social group: on its cohesion and its action efficiency. These analyses proved that the behavior of the members of the group should be explained by the atmosphere (climate) of their group. There were rather different on the point whether the approach advocating the study of groups should be predominantly theoretical or empirical. Nevertheless neither extreme theorists nor extreme empirics were not in the right (Rajkov, M., 1996). Theoretical as well as empirical studies are needed since it is still unknown to what extent the individual contributions depend on others from the group.

By research in the field of interpersonal relations we came to the conclusion that the forms of relations within small groups, as well as the behavior of these groups, depend on broad social units. Atmosphere in the group most frequently only reflects the atmosphere (climate) of the *organization* which part it represents. Researches in the psychology of the interpersonal relations are most frequently directed to researches at the level of organizations. The behavior of an individual in the working procedure, from the standpoint of the organizations they belong to and starting from the organization as the theoretic frame on analysis of interpersonal relations, analysis of the causes of behavior in the working process and out of it, is nowadays a dominant course (according to Bojanović) in the psychology of interpersonal relations. According to *Walter Nord* the different organization play most important part in the life of the majority of American population.

In contrast to *Freud's* personality theory, where the interest is focused on individual, the theory of interpersonal relations examines primarily interpersonal relations and social environment that is created by person. In order to explain the core of the interpersonal relations, *Suliven* starts from the dual human nature: a man is a human *animal* and *humane* animal. He can be regarded as a biological organism and as a creature that lives in groups and social groups. Interpersonal relations are aimed at having two or more individuals which form the field where interaction takes place (Pešić-Golubović, Z., 1966). The kinds and quality of that interaction depends on cultural, social and personal factors. When defining interpersonal relations, *Suliven* places great importance on the individual experience. On the other hand, *Dorothy Bildsten* thinks that *Saliven* has much in common with *Freud* than the rest of the representatives of the same opinion, since his theory much more underscores the biological aspect compared with other authors.

From, in contrast to Suliven, made a step forward explaining the social frame where the interpersonal relations take place. He makes the analysis of the characteristic interpersonal relations in the modern capitalistic society and he claims that the subject of study is neither the person nor interpersonal relation within the small group, but a society with its characteristic types of interpersonal relations and individual structures. According to him there is a method characteristic for manipulation by things and numbers introduced more often into interpersonal relations. This inevitably leads to loss of individuality. There is a growing alienation in interpersonal relations as a consequence of the technology penetration into this sphere.

In the papers of the western theorists the importance of organization for interpersonal relations is over-exaggerated, since the atmosphere (climate) of organization and the values it transfers onto its members, most often represent only a part of their wider scope and dominant social values (Bojanović, R., 1995). There is a mutual linkage of the characteristics of a society, an organization and a group. The important features of a group stem from the social climate and the values of a society, which does not mean that there is no return action. Studying of the interpersonal issues should not be limited to the level of a analysis of a group, organization or society on the whole, but to a comprehensive observation appreciating the interactive influence upon each other.

The issue of machines and production was long ago put on the bases of the expert assessments, analyses and experiments, in contrast from the issue of "*the man*" where we still make a lot of use of indefinite terms for describing its quality, serviceableness, character, intelligence, capabilities, and especially scarce work was done on the issue of interpersonal relations. There are various opinions on whether the interpersonal relations can be systematically and scientifically solved as all the other issues.

According to *Boris Petz* there are four main forms that become noticeable in interpersonal relations in an organization as follows (Bujas, Z., 1964):

- *cooperation and corroboration*
- *competition(competence, competitiveness)*
- *domination*
- *submission.*

Cooperation and competition represent the relations between the coordinated members while submission and domination represent the form of interpersonal relation which result from the real or formal hierarchy of the organization of a collective.

Complexity of interpersonal relations derives from the complexity of the humane nature either regarded as a bio-psychological structure or as a socio-historical reality. These relations cannot be derived isolated from any of these aspects of human nature but from the unity that exists among them. According to *Adijes*, the world is made in such a way so that everything exists in one functional totality, and that totality functions for the purpose of satisfying the needs of its components. Interpersonal relation depends equally from the position of a person in the humane community (and the personal experience of that position) and the psychological mechanisms that react to that position (Babić, B., 1983). There was an unparalleled predominance in research

work of the personality itself than of the interpersonal relations. *Levinson, Heller* and others tried to determine the connection between the culture and interpersonal relations. However, according to *Bojanović*, it is not even given which particular cultural characteristics influence the observed forms of interpersonal relations. *Cratch, Crachfield* and *Balaki* start from the basic statement that the behavior of an individual is determined by the features of his interpersonal reactions towards other persons. According to them manifestation of this characteristics important for interpersonal relations is most closely linked to the way of satisfying the needs. The particular satisfying of needs and the way the process is performed occupies the central point in expressing the features that become apparent in interpersonal relations.

Psychiatrist *Karen Hornay* focuses her scientific commitment on the socio-cultural factors that influence human mental health, behavior and interpersonal relations. Hornay regards bad interpersonal relations as a source of neurotic disorders. *Zvonarević M.* determines the characteristics of the psycho-social interactions that regulate the influence of an individual to another individual, of an individual to a group and that of the group to an individual. The basis of the interaction is: imitation, suggestion, simpathy and antipathy, identification, group pressure and facilitation with inhibition. In that way a social climate (atmosphere) is made "as a state of psycho-social relations of the members of the same social group and their relation towards the group as a whole".

In the book titled "*The Art of Management*" which is based on the American TV serial of the same name, *William Weber* says that the people are the main cause of success or failure of the company. It is necessary to understand people, as well as their mutual relations. In the same book, *John Bisley* points out that almost all the problems in business are linked to interpersonal relations in one or another way. The executives, except from the need to convey their message to others, should be able to listen to other people problems, get rid of their own prejudices and get to know themselves. According to *James Hall*, regulation of the human relations is the most important art that a manager (executive) should possess.

2. INFLUENCE OF A PERSONALITY ON INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

Personality represents a key phenomenon for explanation of interpersonal relations. Human's activities determine the features of the personality to the largest extent, and accordingly they have deciding role in its interpersonal relations. Depending on the way we understand personality we are going to regard the influence of the personality on the interpersonal relations in the same way. Perception of a personality as a collection of multitude of features requires that a research should be directed towards finding those characteristics of the personality that are important for the interpersonal relations.

If we start from the point that all the characteristics of a person can be categorized as one type, then from the definition of a type come the characteristics of the interpersonal behavior as well, i.e. the type of personality determines interpersonal relations.

Types of personality and their influence on the interpersonal relations

Psychoanalytical theory of the personality has made the greatest contribution to the research of the influence of the types of personality on the interpersonal relations. *Sigmund Freud* gave a definition of three types of personality which are believed not to depict just the pathological but also normal personalities.

The main characteristic of a *narcissus type* is the absence of tension between ego and superego, and erotic needs are not strongly expressed. This type is independent, hard to frighten, focus on self-defense. He accepts the leader role, and endeavors to be loved rather than love himself.

Obsessive type is characterized by supremacy of ego over superego and the presence of tension. These types feature greater inner than outer dependence. They developed high level of self-confidence.

The main characteristic of *erotic type* is its endeavor to be liked. For him the most important thing in the world is love, but primarily that he should be loved. He becomes dependent on those persons who can stop loving him and he is mainly influenced by fear of losing love.

According to *Erich Fromm* there are also three types of personality.

Tendency to withdrawal and destruction is characteristic of the first type of personality. Withdrawal is the basic form of relations with other people. This personality is featured by superficial interests and absence of a powerful social motive. He wants to be distanced in relation to other people. He strives to destroy others from fear of being destroyed by others.

The other type is characterized by *symbiotic form of relations* with other people. In this case the dependence on other people is underlined. This person avoids danger of loneliness, merging with another person, either to be "swallowed" from the other person or by means of "swallowing" the other person. The first is called masochism, which is the attempt to escape from freedom and to achieve the safety by merging with another individual. The other case is called a sadistic endeavor, which is the wish for a complete command over the other persons. In symbiotic relation, the approach to other persons is paid by loss of freedom and integrity (Bojanović, R., 1998.).

Love features people who successfully realized their relations with other people. Two persons with this form of relationship are close, minding the integrity of each of them.

Karen Hornay describes three characteristic modes of relations towards people. She made a classification of the ways of interpersonal reaction with the patients.

Yielding type manifests all the traits by means of which he *moves towards* people. This type shows expressed need for favor and approval and a special need for "partner"- friend, lover, husband or spouse", who are ready to fulfill everything he

expects of life, to take responsibility for good or evil, where the successful manipulation becomes his main task" (Hornay, K., 1976). All these needs are manifested in different ways, and all are concentrated round a desire to achieve human intimacy and a wish for "belonging to smb.". This type needs to be loved, wanted, favored, that he is welcome, being approved, appreciated by others, to be supported, to be protected, to be led. He becomes self-sacrificed, without demands, except for his enormous desire for love. He becomes yielding, exaggeratedly kind, grateful and noble. Besides idealization of the given qualities, this type has special stances towards him as well. He regards himself as a weak and helpless. He thinks that everybody else is supreme, more intelligent and more precious than him. Typical characteristic of this type is a general dependence on others. Every form of abandoning becomes a disaster. These types tend to develop affectionate relationship with other people and to rely on them. The basic question when they approach another person is: Will he like me?

Tendency of moving *against people* is the type with who predominates aggressive traits of personality. Aggressive type takes for granted that everybody is in adversary mood and refuses to accept the contrary. For him the life is a battle of everybody against everybody. According to him the world is a battlefield where mighty destroys weak, and only most capable can survive. The primary need of this type is the need to dominate over other person. This type very badly experiences failure and wants only a victory. According to him the power gives the right. Love has no importance for this personality, even if it has it is in service of achieving supremacy over people. He approaches another individual with a question: "What is the strength of the opponent?" and "Of what use can he be for me?"

The third neurotic tendency is moving *away from people*. Everyone sometimes wants to be alone. The wish to be alone is the indication of a neurotic retreat only when there is unbearable tension in socializing with people, and the loneliness is a means to avoid that strain. It is alienation from people, and here the human relations are distorted. The second characteristic is alienation from oneself.

The main need of such types is to place emotional distance between themselves and the rest of the world. They don't wish to be emotionally engaged neither in love, nor in battle, not in cooperation or in contest. Its strongest needs are self-sufficiency, loneliness and need for total independence. Intimately, they do not obey to the rules of behavior and don't accept traditional values. The question with which they approach people is: "Will he disturb me?" "Will he desire to make influence on me or let me be?"

By analysis of the opinion of *Freud, Fromm and Hornay* concerning the types of personality and link with interpersonal relations we come to the conclusion that there is significant accordance between these authors. All of them describe and explain familiar types of personalities. The main thing that makes the types similar are their common endeavors. Narcissus type, tendency to retreat and movement from people, common is the endeavor to avoid close emotional ties with other people. Effort to have close emotional ties with other people is present with erotic type, love and movement towards people. Negative emotional stance towards people is characterized by destructivity and movement against people. Tendency to dominate others to some extent has narcissus type, symbiotic orientation and movement against people. The core

of types of personalities does not make only one of the given tendencies, but also the form of relation with other people, and emotional side of these relations. Theories of these three authors do not represent comprehensive typology of interpersonal relations.

3. INFLUENCE OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS ON PERSONALITY

Interpersonal relations, except of being dependent on the personality characteristics, *interpersonal relations* significantly influence the process of personality formation and on the development of its important features. The way of interpersonal relations influence on the personality can be seen in the best way by scrutinizing the relation between the atmosphere in the family and the personality characteristics of the young members of the family. Many tests have shown that in the families where a high level of personal freedom of children was allowed, they often develop the independence and initiative. Rapid intellectual development was observed with these children, they are emotionally secure and less irritable. In the families where the parents take a stance of "active refusal" and where there are repressive relations of parents towards children, these children develop dependence and submissiveness. The intellectual development of these is more slowly, they are emotionally instable, aggressive and quarrelsome.

From, Hornay and Suliven study the individual in the social environment and they find in it the basic factors for the personality development. The unit of study, for Fromm, is neither a personality nor humane interrelation within a small group, but a society with its characteristic types of interpersonal relations and character structures of individuals (Pešić, Z., 1966). Leaving his narrow family frame and other small social groups, he exceeds Freud's theory, since their structures depend on the global society and its influence. He also studies the personality issues in the domain of interpersonal relations, because he is of the opinion that an individual cannot be observed in isolation, because the social interpersonal relations are the source of motivation of the individual as a social being. According to Fromm the relation between the individual and the environment is creative, dynamic relation, where both the environment and the individual are both giving and receiving.

Sullivan discusses the perception of personality on the group level and underscores the importance of the interpersonal relations in the group for the personality development. He thinks that study that psychiatry should not start from the individual, because there is no isolated individual and everything that happens to individual goes on in interpersonal relations, and they should be a unit of study. Interpersonal relations and the social circumstances create a personality. According to *Bojanović*, Sullivan defines personality as an "integrated type of interpersonal behaviour", since it is a product of interpersonal relations, either other individuals are present or illusory (Pešić, Z., 1966). It means that a human being has as many personalities as many interpersonal relations it has.

The importance of the social factors for the personality development was emphasized by Fromm and other authors, but they disagreed with Sullivan's opinion

which was extreme and it went in a single direction. The importance of Sullivan's theory is in the fact that he loudly emphasized influence of interpersonal relations on the development and study of personality.

4. FEATURES OF INTERPERSONAL REACTIONS

The second orientation of the influence of personality on the interpersonal relations starts from the fact that two individuals are not characterized by one homogenous style of relations with other persons, but by multitude of *features of interpersonal reaction* (Bojanović, 1988). Each individual, by chance and by crucial influence of heritage and personal experience, develops a characteristic set of lasting dispositions for relations with other individuals. There is a rather large number of consistent and lasting dispositions on which, of course, depends reaction towards other people. *Cratch and al.*, by examination of the *Karen Hornay's* theory assessed that her triple typology represents a "large simplification of variety of the characteristics of the interpersonal reactions that influence our behavior". Hornay has been, in the first place, dealing with the characteristic ways of reaction of individuals towards the other individuals, and the individual characteristics of the interpersonal reactions served just for her explanation of these ways of behavior. The features of interpersonal reactions that most commonly appeared in the course of research were the special subject of analysis of Cratch and associates. The authors classified these characteristics in three arbitrary categories: *dispositions for roles, sociometric dispositions, and expressive dispositions*. A certain number of indicators were given for each feature in order to define its nature (Cratch and al., 1972). The description of the first half is given in brackets.

Dispositions for roles represent the features that are linked to the way the individual realizes his role in relations with other people. These are the following:

- 1) *superiority- social shyness*(sure of oneself, does not keep his mouth shut, clears the way by force),
- 2) *dominance- submissiveness* (self-assured, persistent, gravitating towards power),
- 3) *social initiative/ social passivity*(organizes groups, gives proposals at gatherings, takes leadership) and
- 4) *independence -dependence* (likes to perform jobs in his way, does not look for advice, emotionally self-sufficient).

Socio-metric disposition comprise the features of interpersonal reactions that primarily speaks of its affection for others, his confidence in others, his interest for others etc. The persons of this kind come easily into close relations with other people and tend to be apt at managing the human relations.

The following can be classified into these dispositions:

- 1) *acceptance of others- refusal of others* (inclined to acquiescence, believes and confident, predicts weaknesses)
- 2) *socialbleness – unsociableness*(likes to be with people, helpful)
- 3) *kindness-unkindness*(open and accessible, good-natured, easily approaches others, makes many social connections) and
- 4) *sympathetic-unsympathetic* (of kind and warmhearted behavior)

Expressive dispositions include the features of interpersonal reactions by means of which individual expresses himself in relations with others. *Cratch and associates* call them "*style of interpersonal functioning*". These characteristics can be expressed in everything an individuals do in a social circumstance, and that is:

- 1) *competitiveness- uncompetitiveness* (glorifies himself, finds a cause for competition in every relationship, cannot cooperate)
- 2) *aggressiveness-non-aggressiveness* (quarrelsome, attacks others, shows ill-tempered disposition towards government),
- 3) *preoccupied with himself- social balance*(suffers from jitters, uncertain whether to take part in group discussion, does not like to be watched by others at work)
- 4) *exhibitionist- reserved*(stands out and behaves in an unusual way in order to attract attention, requires recognition and applause)

Descriptions of personality represents a main source of data for determining and measuring of interpersonal reactions. Descriptions of personality are obtained by means of the personalities inventory or by clinical interviews. The main features of interpersonal reactions are sorted out by *factors analysis*. When we know what the features of the interpersonal reactions of one individual are, we can predict quite a great part of its behavior towards other individuals, even its activities that are not strictly of social character. However, making a list of the characteristics of interpersonal reactions of an individual is not sufficient, since these individuals differ in many dimensions. These characteristics are: *stability, energetic manifestation, consistency and structure*.

Stability denotes that the characteristics of the interpersonal reaction can be rather stabile in the course of time.

Energetic manifestation of a characteristic of interpersonal behavior relates to the level to which it is expressed in the individual behavior. If the energetic manifestation of the characteristic more general, its role in determining behavior is more decisive.

Consistency as a characteristic of interpersonal reaction is as larger as it enables us to predict the behavior of the individual under observation. The level of consistency is measured by the average inter-correlation between the scores of that characteristic in various circumstances were it is manifested.

Structure of scores with individuals that have the same general score is very important for characters indicators in behavior of these persons.

CONCLUSION

From the theories on connection between interpersonal relations and personality emanate several basic postures. Except of the hereditary basis, the development of personality is influenced not only by cultural and social circumstances but by interpersonal relations. They are an important factor for the development of personality especially in early childhood. During individualization the influence of interpersonal relations to personality development is smaller. The same influence on a mature personality is still smaller. Now personality with its interpersonal characteristics

influences interpersonal relations, with a creative approach to other people, satisfying its needs and the needs of others. Which of the phenomena: interlaced set of personality or interpersonal relations, is more dynamic and more decisive in shaping the other is difficult to evaluate. Both phenomena are multi-directionally linked and they are engaged in mutual interaction. Bojanović thinks that the link between personality and interpersonal relations (and culture) can be significantly resolved when we start, in our considerations, from the question *how much are the persons under scrutiny differentiated as personalities?* Very often a close link of the phenomenon of interpersonal relations and personality can be noticed. Personalities that are not sufficiently differentiated as personality are the personalities formed in interpersonal relations and suffused with cultural forms. Those are the personalities with whom the individualization process gave no significant results and with whom the values system is insufficiently developed. To be differentiated as a personality means to be emancipated from influences to a great extent. Already differentiated personalities have active role in receiving the influences of interpersonal relations. Such a personality reflects distance, does not soak everything and behaves in a creative way. Interpersonal relations very often act in the direction of making a uniformity modeled personality, but how successful they will prove depends very much on the particular person. Apart of that interpersonal relations offer to individuals many incentives for development of their individuality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Zvonarević, M., Socialna psihologija (Social psychology), Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1985.
2. Rajkov, M., Ljudska strana menadžmenta (Human facet of management), Beograd, 1996.
3. Pešić-Golubović, Z., Problemi savremene teorije ličnosti (Problems of the contemporary personality theory), Kultura, Beograd, 1966.
4. Bujas, Z., Osnove psihofiziologije rada (The Basics of the psycho-physiology of interpersonal relations), Zagreb, 1964.
5. Bojanović, R., Psihologija međuljudskih odnosa, Beograd, 1988.
6. Cratch, D., Cratchfield, R., Balaki, I., Pojedinaac u društvu (An individual in society), Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd, 1972.
7. Adiges, I., Upravljanje promenama (Managing the changes), Prometej, Novi Sad, 1991.
8. Mihailović, D., Psihologija organizacije (Psychology of organization), FON, Beograd, 2000.
9. Pec, B., Psihologija rada (Psychology of work), Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1987.
10. Rot, N., Osnovi socijalne psihologije (The basics of the social psychology), Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd, 1994.
11. Hornay, K., Naši unutrašnji konflikti (Our inner conflicts), Pobjeda, Podgorica, 1976.
12. Fulgosi, A., Psiholoija ličnosti, teorija i istraživanja, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1985.

Sažetak

INTERAKCIJA LIČNOSTI I INTERPERSONALNIH ODNOSA

Priroda interakcije između fenomena ličnosti i fenomena interpersonalnih odnosa je veoma kompleksna i dinamična. Koji će od ova dva fenomena, splet ličnosti ili interpersonalni odnosi, biti dinamičniji i presudniji u oblikovanju drugog teško je ocijeniti. Specifičnost ove interakcije nije u dovoljnoj mjeri istražena.

Ključne riječi: interpersonalni odnosi, ličnost, interakcija.