Indian Journal of Psychology and Education
July, 2024, Vol. 14 No.2, pp 18-25

An exploration into personality and situational influences on social behaviour

Shashi Darolia* and Jyotshna Tyagi**

Abstract

The study was designed to explore main and interactive effects of personality and situation on behaviour in a dyadic setting. A total of 180 XIth and XIIth grade students (90 male, 90 female) was drawn from various schools in Kurukshetra and Karnal towns of Haryana (India). All the participants received NEO Five Factor Inventory-Revised (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Behaviour of the participants was observed through a video recording (with their knowledge) in three dyadic experimental situations, i.e., unstructured, co-operative, and competitive. Thirty-four behavioural characteristics were rated on Riverside Behavioural Q-sort (Funder, Furr & Colvin, 2000) by experimenter. In first two situations the pairs of male and female participants were random, while in third situation the pairs were same as in second situation. Only the behaviours which were endorsed by 25% of the participants were retained for further analysis. Current analysis involved 34 behaviours of low and high scoring cases on N and E personality traits across three situations through 2×3 ANOVA. Results of two-way ANOVA indicated that personality trait N had influence on seven of the thirty-four behaviours while E impacted eight of them. Influence of situation was more persistent than personality factors, nine of the social behaviours differed across situations. In two cases neuroticism-situation interaction was found significantly influencing the behaviour, while extraversion-situation interaction was found significant in one of the behaviours only. Results were discussed in the light of pertinent theoretical models and earlier researches in the field.

Keywords: Personality, situation, Q-sort, person-situation-behaviour triad.

The person-situation debate has been and continues to be highly crucial in psychology and other social sciences. It relates to the very basic question, what causes people to behave the way they do? For this, there are two distinct claims and explanations that either the behaviour is largely determined by the characteristic personality of the individual, or his immediate situation (Swann & Seyle, 2005). Personality psychologists believed that the behavioural differences in people and the uniqueness of every individual can be due to their traits. There is found consistency in personality over time, for example, if someone is extraverted during a period, s/he must be extraverted at all times, although the way of expressing trait may be changed. The issue of personality consistency over time and across situations has further been a topic of debate that gained prominence about four decades ago (Fleeson, 2001). It gave rise to a debate 'invariant- variant.' The issue of the invariant vs. variant in behavior means whether the behavior of an individual is consistent in different situations or it is varying. If behavior of an individual is stable enough across occasions and situations it is usually attributed to individual's characteristics. Another feasibility is that behavior is so unpredictable that predominantly the situation matters. But as of the time little efforts have been made to conceptualize or assess situations at fairly acceptable level (Funder, Guillaume, Kumagai, Kawamoto, & Sato, 2012). Question is what really matters a trait or a situation, and more precisely, to what extent variance in behavior is accounted for by a trait and by a situation?

Mischel's (1968) groundbreaking volume *Personality and Assessment* undermined the importance of personality in determining daily behaviour. He observed that there are greater *within-person* differences in behaviour across different situations, than *between-persons* differences in similar situations. He further used the phrase 'personality coefficient' to describe the correlation between any personality dimension and the criterion behaviour, which was found to be somewhere around .20-.30. However, Ross and Nisbett (1991), later observed that so-called personality coefficient is about r= .40. But the coining of the phrase 'personality coefficient' led to decades of confusion, not all of which has been alleviated, to date. The phrase was misleading in that 'left correlation' is solely attributable to situation. While newer studies have suggested that the size of some of the effects of situations are of equivalent, or even smaller magnitude (Funder et al., 2012). In a broad-based review, it was noted that the average size of the effect of situation variables on behaviour, in social psychological experiments, is r=.21 (Richard et al., 2003). So, this seems really difficult to say conclusively. This seems curial to note that behavior is not always caused by one factor and is determined by a combination of factors. Hence, there is need to find out main and interactive effects of personality and situation by taking fair measures of behaviour and defined variations between situations.

Lewin (1951) as well as Allport (1937) have also opined that invidious assessments miss the idea because behavior is the function of interaction between the situation and the person. Focusing on *interactionism* as a response to Mischel's challenge to trait consistency has intuitive appeal. As Mischel's debate with trait psychologists demonstrate that there are two conceivable explanations as for behavior, or why people do what they do in any given situation: first behavior is the function of personality traits,

* Professor of Psychology, IIHS, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra (India), Email: sdarolia@kuk.ac.in
** Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra (India), Email: sdarolia@kuk.ac.in

second behavior is a function of situational forces. The obvious way to integrate these two points of views to understand precisely that both personality and situations interact to produce behavior. For example, a person high on the trait of aggressiveness might be unaware of it as long as s/he did not encounter the frustrating situation. In his specification equation Cattell has also indicated that the individual's specific response to a given situation is a function of all the combined traits pertinent to the situation, each trait may interact with each situational factor that may affect it (see Cattell & Drager, 1978).

So, this is widely accepted that behavior is a function of the person, the situation, and their interaction. But it seems paradoxical that it is a bit challenging to identify reliable and replicable interactions. The paradoxical nature of personality-situation interaction does not imply that person-situation interactions are unimportant, but it does serve as a warning that we must not suppose them to be consistently reliable, accessible, or repeatable (Furr & Funder, 2021). One of the well-known ways to conceive the interaction between people and their situations is through Mischel and Shoda's (1995) "if then" pattern of behavior variability. Persons A and B, may exhibit the same degree of behavior on average, but their patterns of behavior expression vary depending on the situation (Funder, 2009). He raised very important questions. First, if "if-then" pattern is totally idiographic, then it seems daunting that for each behavior of every individual there must be a different plan for explaining different patterns of behavior. Preparing fewer number of "if –then" patterns of behavior need idea of *basic modes of adjustment*. For example, if people are at party they will try to partake joy, if they are at funeral they will behave seriously or sad. Because their basic modes of adjustment are same, we can say that there is effect of situation on their behavior.

Funder (2006) believed that to have more reliable data on person-situation issue it is imperative to assess behaviors directly as much as possible and, to check the behavioral consistency it is needed to observe behavior in more than one situation. Findings of certain studies show that not all behaviours are alike, some behaviours are more consistent than others. Funder and Colvin (1991) observed that an individual's operant behaviours ought to be more universally consistent than respondent behaviors. They established that significant behavioral variation can result from very minor situational changes. For example, in one of the studies Funder (2006) observed participants in two similar experimental situations with only difference that in the second situation participants were there for the second time. Results revealed that in the first situation participants appeared to be relatively tense, insecure, disinterested, distant and awkward whereas, in the second situation they were more relaxed, fluent, expressive, socially skilled and enjoying the situation. Because, second situation was less strange for them. With the change in the behaviors in different situations people also maintain their individual differences, means to say that if someone is most talkative in one situation then he or she must be most talkative in comparison to the other people (Funder et al., 2012).

Of late, many researchers realized that potential influence of situational forces cannot be explored until the wide ranged taxonomy of situations is development (e.g., Hogan & Roberts, 2000; Swan & Seyle, 2005). Funder (2001) also pointed out that little is known empirically and even theorized about how situations affect behaviour, or what are the basic types of situations (or alternatively, what characteristics are important for comparing situations with one another). In a way, there is dearth of 'major competing schemes' there needs to be a 'universally accepted scheme' for knowing what is intended by situation (Kenny, Mohr & Levesque, 2001). This way, there has been a point of concern about lack of systematic efforts in determining and evaluating the characteristic features of situations that make them psychologically meaningful. When it comes to behaviours, situation is considerably worse (Funder, 2006). There are many issues, like, understanding and considering various behaviour types, distinguishing them from one another, and the necessity of developing fair methods to measure them. Like Block's (2008) groundbreaking California Adult Q-Sort, Wagerman and Funder (2009) undertook the ambitious task of developing a tool for situation assessment- the Situation Q-Sort and a measure to tap distinct behaviours - Riverside Behavior Q-Sort (Funder, Furr, & Colvin, 2000).

Nonetheless, certain studies have established that ostensibly minor manipulations of situational variables have exerted considerable effects on social behaviour (e.g., Richard, Bond, & Stokes-Zoota, 2003). But many of such studies have uniformly focused on specific manipulations associated with single behavioral out comes in order to test particular, theoretically based hypotheses (see Funder, 2009; Kuper et al., 2022). Studies demonstrate that people have robust differences in their typical behavioral levels as well as robust situational variability. This calls for integrated theoretical viewpoints that account for both phenomena and point to potentially important new situationally-oriented dispositions. For example, Fleeson and Law's (2015) explored whether a person tends to change his/her behavior from one situation to another as a compelling facet of personality. Their findings propose that such tendencies do exist – some individuals have a greater tendency to vary their behavior than do other individuals, and such tendencies are stable. This reflects a way of thinking about person-situation interaction, in that it highlights a stable personality disposition that is defined by cross-situational behavioral variability.

Recent work suggesting the interplay of persons and situations is now more relevant than ever seeing the swing in attention towards a dynamic, process-based understanding of personality (Rauthmann, 2021). Studies have observed specific person-situation interactions (Lakey, 2016) and sizable interaction variance for interpersonal perception and behavior (Kenny, 2019). Fox et al. (2021) examined observed behavior of couples across four situations and found considerable degree of person - situation and couple - situation interactions. Likewise, significant interaction was observed for situation perception (Rauthmann & Sherman, 2019), Big Five tendencies (Lakey et al., 2021), and social skill with multiple tasks (Breil et al., 2022). Wrzus, Wagner, & Riediger (2016) explored links between the Big Five personality dimensions and certain types of situations. Expectedly, extraverted participants reported being with friends, colleagues, and strangers more than did introverted participants. Similarly, neurotic participants reported being alone more than did emotionally stable participants. This research does not divulge intentional selection or recreation of situations, though it certainly proposes that such processes might be occurring, and it points future efforts in the direction of specific person-situation relationship.

The person–situation debate has led to a wide range of arguments, but directly suitable data remain rare and research findings concerning pertinent issues have been inconsistent. Now after about two decades of research, it is being realized that the behavior of participants must be directly observed and appraised in more than one situation, so that the influence of situations and behavioural consistency can be measured. Direct behavioral observation and assessment being difficult it has been sporadic in personality research and repetitive behavioral measurement has been even rarer. However, with the invent of new methods to assess behaviours (e.g., Funder et al., 2000; Furr & Funder, 2004) and for the evaluation of psychological potential of situations (Funder, 2016) now it has become viable to address many questions relating the person-situation-behaviour triad with acceptable reliability. Therefore, the influence of person and situation on specific behaviours need to be relooked with possibility of greater precision and replicability. Moreover, to the knowledge of the authors no prudent efforts have been made to gather data from India, which is culturally diverse from western world. The current study investigates the independent and interactive influence of personality traits and diverse situations on behaviors exhibited during dyadic interactions. Such a natural interaction would allow for greater generalizability to the dyadic interactions that are encountered in everyday life. In addition, we intend to study wider range of behaviors than have been surveyed in previous studies of situational distinction or similarity. In view of these indications following are the objectives of the present study:

1. To examine the effect of Extraversion and Neuroticism on specific social behaviours in different situations.
2. To examine the influence of situational variation on specific social behaviours.
3. To explore the interactive effect of personality traits and situations on specific social behaviours.

In view of the paucity of empirical data and pertinent theoretical formulations relating the issues under investigation, it was thought advisable not to propose any specific hypotheses and the study may be taken as exploratory.

Method

Participants

There were 200 participants (100 male and 100 female) in the sample of this study. The participants were drawn from 11th and 12th grade class in various schools of Kurukshetra and Karnal towns in Haryana (India). Age of the participants ranged from 14 to 19 years, with a mean of 16.28. Enrolled participants were then categorised into low and high groups of Extraversion and Neuroticism traits based on 27 percent extreme scores. Number of males and females was balanced in each group.

Design

In order to meet major research objectives a 2×3 factorial design (repeated on 2nd factor) was employed. First factor comprised 2 levels (low & high) of each of the personality traits Extraversion (E) and Neuroticism (N). Second factor constituted three situations, i.e., unstructured, co-operative, and competitive.

Measures

1. **NEO Five Factor Inventory-Revised:** The NEO Five factor Inventory (NEO-FFI R, Costa & McCrae, 1992) is a concise measure of the five basic personality factors. The 60-item instrument, 12 items each for Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness, uses a five-point Likert response format. Two-week test-retest reliability is uniformly high, ranging from .86 to .90 for the five scales (Robins, Fradey, Roberts & Trzesniswski, 2001) and internal consistency ranging from .61 to .86 (Costa & McCrae, 1992).
2. **Riverside Behavioural Q-sort:** The Riverside Behavioural Q-sort (RBQ, Funder et al., 2000) is a 68-item tool meant to characterise a person's wide range of behaviour. RBQ is a flexible method for compiling a comprehensive account of how people behave in dyadic social interaction. Each of the items is placed into one of nine categories, which ranged from 1 (*extremely uncharacteristic*) to 9 (*extremely characteristic*), forming a forced-choice, quasinormal distribution. distribution. The reliability estimates in the unstructured situation ranged from .08 to .80, with a mean of .53.

reliabilities above .50 and only one had an estimated reliability below .10.

Procedure

Initially, NEO Five Factor Inventory-R was administered to all the participants before conducting the experimental sessions. After categorizing the participants into low and high groups on E and N personality traits their behaviour was observed in three dyadic experimental situations through a video recording (with their knowledge). In the *first situation* (denoted as unstructured) a pair of two opposite sex participants, selected at random were instructed to sit in a small laboratory containing two chairs, a table, and a video camera for recording their behavior. The experimenter instructed them "Relax, I will be back in few minutes, till then you can talk or whatever you would like to do" and activated the camera and left. In a way, five minutes were given to them to facilitate unstructured interaction. After 5 minutes' experimenter came back, turned off the camera and let them go.

The second situation (denoted as cooperation) occurred a week later, participants were paired randomly with a different opposite sex member. Both were there for second time. A cooperative task (nine dots problem) was given to them for 5 minutes in which they were instructed to work together for the solution of the problem. Again, experimenter activated the camera and left for 5 minutes. *Third situation* (denoted as competition) occurred immediately after 5 minutes of 2nd situation. The same pair of participants as in situation 2 was given a competitive task (preparing triangles with the help of matchsticks) for 5 minutes. Interaction during the three situations was videotaped with the participants' full knowledge and consent. Behavior of the participants during different situations was rated only on 34 statements of Riverside Behavioral Q-sort on nine-point scale by both researchers independently. Mid-rater score was considered for further analysis.

Results

Results of 2×3 ANOVA and related descriptive statistics are summarized in tables 1-4 separately for the main and interactive effects of personality and situations. To reduce undue volume of tables, only the values of significant behaviours are shown here. Results relating the effect of neuroticism personality

neuroticism have shown substantial amount of "physically animated, moves around" [F= (1/88) 8.18, p<.01], "signs of tension or anxiety" [F= (1/88) 3.98, p<.05], "act irritated" [F= (1/88) 7.29, p<.01], "avoid interpersonal relationship" [F= (1/88) 6.10, p<.05], and "seem detached from the situation" [F= (1/88) 4.90, p<.05]. In comparison, those low in neuroticism were found to be more "relaxed and comfortable" [F= (1/88) 5.78, p<.05] and "expressed agreement frequently" [F= (1/88) 7.78, p<.01) in dyadic situations.

In the case of Extraversion (E), 8 of 34 behaviours have portrayed significant differences between low and high E groups (see table 2). Those who are high in E (extroverted) were found to be "interested in what someone had to say" [F= (1/88) 6.21, p<.05], "seem to like other(s) present" [F= (1/88) 5.90, p<.05], "show high enthusiasm and energy level" [F= (1/88) 6.02, p<.05], "talkative" [F= (1/88) 7.78, p<.01]. They were also observed as "expressive in face, voice, or gestures" [F= (1/88) 8.18, p<.01], "seem to enjoy the situation" [F= (1/88) 9.74, p<.01], and "act in a self-indulgent manner" [F= (1/88) 3.84, p<.05]. While, those are low on E (introverted) were observed to be "reserved and unexpressive" [F= (1/88) 6.78, p<.05] in comparison to high E individuals.

Results presented in Table 3 provide strong evidence for the influence of situations in the prediction of one's behaviour in social situation. Experimentally manipulated situations have depicted a differential pattern of influence on behaviours elicited during dyadic interaction. In general, the participants appeared to be relatively uneasy and timid in unstructured situation (situation 1) in comparison to cooperation (situation 2) and/or competition situation (situation 3). In specific, they exhibited significantly greater extent of "signs of tension or anxiety" [F= (2/88) 6.68, p<.01], "act irritated" [F= (2/88) 8.48, p<.01], "behave in a fearful or timid manner" [F= (2/88) 12.62, p<.01], and "exhibit physical discomfort or pain" [F= (2/88) 9.83, p<.01] in situation1 as compared to situation 2 and 3. However, the participants typically depicted themselves as more "relaxed and comfortable" [F= (2/88) 10.08, p<.01], "high in enthusiasm and energy level" [F= (2/88) 7.08, p<.01], "seems to enjoy the situation" [F=

Table 1. Means, SDs, and F values of Behaviours in low and high Neuroticism groups

Behavioural items	Low N	High N	F (df=1/88)
2 Appears to be relaxed and comfortable	3.47 (1.49)	2.54 (1.35)	5.78*
6 Is physically animated; moves around	1.48 (1.31)	2.59 (1.56)	8.18**
11 Expresses agreement frequently	2.23 (.93)	1.22 (.57)	7.78**
13 Shows signs of tension or anxiety	2.50 (1.38)	3.22 (1.71)	3.98*
17 Acts irritated	2.16 (1.35)	3.13 (1.47)	7.29**
20 Avoids interpersonal relationship	2.02 (1.42)	3.01 (1.76)	6.10*
29 Seems detached from the situation	0.25 (.52)	0.32 (.56)	4.90*

Note: * p<.05; ** p<.01

(2/88) 10.86, p<.01], and "seeking advice" [F= (2/88) 7.94, p<.01] in situation 2 (cooperation) in comparison to situation 1 (unstructured) and/or situation 3 (competition). And, obviously were observed behaving in "a competitive manner" [F= (2/88) 13.16, p<.01] in situation 3 more than that of situation 1 and 2.

Interaction effects between personality traits and situational variable (see Table 4) emerged as significant contributor to the variability in three of the observed behaviours. Here, we find that personality trait neuroticism moderates significantly the impact of situations, or vice-versa, on behavioural manifestation of "relaxed and comfortable" [F= (2/88) 5.21, p<.01] and "signs of tension or anxiety" [F= (2/88) 6.58, p<.01]. It is evident from the mean values that in the case of "relaxed and comfortable" low and high N individuals score almost the same in situation 1 but in situation 2 and 3 low N cases were found to be markedly more relaxed and comfortable than their high N counterparts. Further, the difference in their scores is distinctly incremental with changing situations, i.e., from situation 2 (MD=1.12) to situation 3 (MD=1.74). In respect of "signs of tension or anxiety", high N individuals recorded strikingly higher mean than low N cases (MD=1.78) in situation 1 as compared to situation 2 (MD=.08) and situation 3 (MD=.30). Likewise, extraversion was found to have significant interaction with situation in influencing the extent of "high enthusiasm and energy level" [F= (2/88) 6.17, p<.01]. Results demonstrate that the impact of extraversion on enthusiasm and energy level is highest in situation 2 (MD=1.80) as compared to situation 1(MD=.66) and situation 3 (MD=.51).

Table 2. Means, SDs, and F values of Behaviours in Extraversion groups

Behavioural items	Low E	High E	F (df=1/88)
1 Seems interested in what someone had to say	0.85 (.72)	1.64 (1.36)	6.21*
3 Is reserved and unexpressive	3.51 (1.36)	2.54 (1.24)	6.78*
7 Seems to like other(s) present	0.58 (.65)	1.08 (1.13)	5.90*
9 Shows high enthusiasm and energy level	2.02 (1.39)	3.01 (1.64)	6.02*
12 Is talkative	1.22 (1.07)	2.23 (1.37)	7.78**
19 Is expressive in face, voice, or gestures	1.48 (1.19)	2.05 (1.28)	8.18**
22 Seems to enjoy the situation	0.90 (.85)	1.64 (1.12)	9.74**
33 Acts in a self-indulgent manner	2.50 (1.32)	3.22 (1.52)	3.84*

Note: * p<.05; ** p<.01

Table 3. Means, SDs, and F values of Behaviours in three Dyadic Situations

Behavioural items	Situation 1 Unstructured	Situation 2 Cooperation	Situation 3 Competition	F (df=2/88)
2 Appears to be relaxed and comfortable	1.85 (1.42)	3.85 (1.39)	3.31 (1.49)	10.08**
9 Shows high enthusiasm and energy level	2.35 (.89)	3.11 (.92)	2.08 (.90)	7.08**
13 Shows signs of tension or anxiety	3.47 (1.47)	2.25 (1.43)	2.86 (1.41)	6.68**
16 Seeks advice	1.04 (.98)	1.53 (1.17)	0.27 (.40)	7.94**
17 Acts irritated	3.28 (1.43)	2.21 (1.45)	2.41 (1.39)	8.48**
18 Behaves in a fearful or timid manner	1.85 (1.29)	0.56 (.87)	0.57 (.83)	12.62**
22 Seems to enjoy the situation	0.45 (.57)	1.71 (1.15)	1.06 (1.10)	10.86**
28 Behaves in a competitive manner	1.58 (1.28)	1.48 (1.12)	3.42 (1.23)	13.16**
34 Exhibits physical discomfort or pain	1.40 (1.16)	0.50 (.54)	0.38 (.49)	9.83**

Note: * p<.05; ** p<.01

Table 4. Means and F values of Personality × Situation interaction

Behavioural items	Personality Groups	Situation 1 Unstructured	Situation 2 Cooperation	Situation 3 Competition	F (df=2/88)
Appears to be relaxed and comfortable	N Low	1.81	4.41	4.18	5.21**
	N High	1.89	3.29	2.44	
Shows signs of tension or anxiety	N Low	2.58	2.21	2.71	6.58**
	N High	4.36	2.29	3.01	
Shows high enthusiasm and energy level	E Low	2.02	2.21	1.83	6.17**
	E High	2.68	4.01	2.34	

Note: * p<.05; ** p<.01

Discussion

The present study was designed to gather observations of each participant's behavior in three

dyadic situations, having some similarity and distinction with one another. It was aimed to explore the influence of personality traits and situational variables on individual differences in social behaviour. Findings of the study are interesting and revealing, and add to the validity of some of the earlier findings and are in agreement to the predictions from pertinent theories of personality. Firstly, the findings suggest, unequivocally, that it is not a question of what really matters a trait or a situation. Rather, both of them play important role in determining and shaping behaviour of a person in a specified situation. The present data provide strong evidence for consistent influence of personality traits-neuroticism and extraversion on behaviour in dyadic situations. In general, individuals scoring high in neuroticism exhibited kind of behaviours representing typical characteristics associated with the trait as delineated by the pioneers of respective models of personality (e.g., Cattell & Drager, 1978; Costa & McCrae, 1992; Eysenck & Wilson, 2008). The signs of tension or anxiety and act irritated are indicative of negative emotions; avoid interpersonal relationship and feeling detached from the situation are the consequences of low self-esteem; and relaxed and comfortable (-) and physically animated-moves around are suggestive of restlessness. These findings are consistent to the observations made by some of the previous researchers (e.g., Abbasi, Rattan, Kousar, & Elsayed, 2018; Orchard & Fullwood, 2010; Renshaw, Blais, & Smith, 2010). Among others Baranski et al. (2017) also observed high N individuals behaving as seeks advice from others, expresses agreement frequently (-), behave in a fearful or timid manner, and physically animated, moves around.

Behavioural differences between individuals scoring low and high in extraversion are very palpable and go well with defining attributes of this broader personality dimension. These persons tend to have people talk to (Eysenck & Wilson, 2008), have a high level of energy and like to keep active, cheerful, and optimistic (Costa & McCrae, 1992), described as outgoing, participating, cheerful, enthusiastic, venturesome (Cattell & Drager, 1978; Primi, Ferreira-Rodrigues, & de Francisco Carvalho, 2014). The behaviours observed in dyadic situations associated with differences in extraversion, like interested in what someone had to say, reserved and unexpressive (-), liking others, high enthusiasm, and energy level; talkative; expressive in gesture, and enjoy the situation are believed to be the behavioural manifestation of extraversion itself. Therefore, these findings not only demonstrate the influence of personality on specific behaviours, rather provide ample support to the models of personality describing extraversion as broader dimensions of personality, like Big Five. A few but consistent past studies have also reported more or less similar findings. For example, Fast and Funder (2008) reported that the individuals who are highly extraverted they tend to be self-dramatizing, physically animated and expressive in face, voice, and gestures. Likewise, extraversion is associated with behaviors, like animated, tendencies to be humorous, and forthcoming, and is negatively associated, with insecure, timid, and critical, awkward, and anxious, among many more (Rauthmann, Sherman, Nave, & Funder, 2015).

Three laboratory situations in which the behavior of participants was videotaped were designed to differ systematically in certain ways as earlier conceptualized and investigated by Markey, Funder and Ozer (2003). Strong influence of situations could be seen in nine of 34 RBQ items. In general, participants were observed to be uncomfortable, apprehensive, and irritated during Situation 1 (unstructured) when they interacted with randomly paired opposite-sex stranger for the first time. As expected, Situation 2 (cooperation) elicited positive emotions, like enjoying the situation, high enthusiasm, and high energy level. This significant difference can conveniently be attributed to the environment created by the requirement of the situation and the experience acquired during Situation 1. By the time of second situation the participants could understand how the situation can be best utilized. It is interesting to note that during situation 3 (competition) the participants felt more relaxed and comfortable because they were more experienced in dealing with the laboratory setting moreover, in this situation they were paired with same members as in the previous one. But due to variation in the structure and demand of the situation they tend to behaved in competitive manner. These results, in a way, symbolize the reciprocal nature of social interaction, in which an individual's behavior both causes and is caused by that of his or her interaction partners. Such a pattern of findings is highly expected in conformity to Sullivan's (1953) conceptualization of reciprocal emotion and Leary's (1957) operational definition of complementarity. Both of these conceptualizations suggest that an individual's behaviors are interrelated with the behaviors of others. In tune with present data results from some of the earlier studies give clear evidence that on the average the situational variability accounted for substantially more variance than did the personality. More recently, Kuper et al. (2022) found that 25.8% of the variance in RBQ behavioural domain is accounted for by situations. However, past research examining which of the various models of complementarity best predicts interpersonal behavior has yielded inconsistent results.

Interaction between personality traits and situational variables has been at the centre of person-situation-behaviour triad. Therefore, present study examined possible interaction effect between these variables for 34 RBQ rated behaviours in three experimentally manipulated laboratory situations. In the present data strong personality-situation interactions emerged in three of the RBQ behaviours signifying moderation

effect of neuroticism and extraversion. Only a few past studies have supported significant interaction effect. For example, Lakey (2016) and Lakey et al. (2021) found that large proportions of variance in social behaviours were attributable to person-situation interaction variance, highest person-situation interaction variance was reported to be 43.4% (Kuper et al., 2022). However, Breil et al. (2019) provided evidence for small but consistent person-situation interaction effects on observed behavior. A number of studies have proposed and empirically tested specific kinds of these interactions but effects were surprisingly small (e.g., Sherman & Pashler, 2019). Of the 10 personality-situation interactions tested, only one reached significance at .04 p level (Mueller, Ram, et al., 2019). Despite these conflicting findings these interactions are important and merit further probe preferably with newly developed measures for evaluating situations and broad range behaviours so that the studies can be replicated permitting generalizations of findings.

References

Abbasi, I. S., Rattan, N., Kousar, T., & Elsayed, F. K. (2018). Neuroticism and Close Relationships: How Negative Affect is Linked with Relationship Disaffection in Couples. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 1-14. DOI: 10.1080/01926187.2018.1461030

Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation.* New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.

Baranski, E., Gardiner, G., Guillaume, E…Funder, D. (2017) Comparison of daily behavior across 21 countries. *Social Psychology and Personality Science, 8*(3), 252-266.

Block, J. (2008). *The Q-sort method in personality assessment and psychiatric research* (rev. ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association [Original edition published 1961].

Breil, S. M., Forthmann, B., & Back, M. D. (2022). Measuring distinct social skills via multiple speed assessments: A behavior-focused personnel selection approach. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *38*(3), 224–236. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000657

Breil, S. M., Geukes, K., Wilson, R. E., Nestler, S., Vazire, S., & Back, M. D. (2019). Zooming into real-life extraversion - how personality and situation shape sociability in social interactions. *Collabra: Psychology*, *5*(1), Article 7. https://doi.org/10.1525/ collabra.170 1437

Cattell, R. B., & Drager, R. M. (1978). *Handbook of modern personality theory (Eds.)*. New York: Wiley.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO–PI–R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO–FFI) professional manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Eysenck, H. J., & Wilson, G. D. (2008). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Profiler (V6).* New South Wales: Cymeon Pty Ltd.

Fast, L. A., Funder, D. C. (2008). Personality as manifest in word use: Correlations with self-report, acquaintance report, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(2*), 334–346.* doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.334

Fleeson, W. (2001). Towards a structure- and process-integrated view of personality: Traits as density distributions of states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 1011–1027.

Fleeson, W., & Law, M. K. (2015). Trait enactments as density distributions: The role of actors, situations, and observers in explaining stability and variability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*(6), 1090–1104. doi:10.1037/a0039517

Fox, S. E., Thomas, K. M., Durbin, C. E., & Hopwood, C. J. (2021). A variance decomposition of the Continuous Assessment of Interpersonal Dynamics. *Psychological Assessment, 33*(5), 427–442. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000995

Funder, D. C. (2001). Personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 197–221.

Funder, D. C. (2006). Towards a resolution of the personality triad: person, situations, and behaviours. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*, 21-34.

Funder, D. C. (2009). Person, behavior and situation: An agenda for personality psychology. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*, 120-126.

Funder, D. C. (2016). Taking situations seriously: The situation construal model and the Riverside Situational Q-Sort. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *25*(3), 203-208. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721416635552

Funder, D. C., & Colvin, C. R. (1991). Explorations in behavioral consistency: Properties of persons, situations, and behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 773–794.

Funder, D. C., Guillaume, E., Kumagai, S., Kawamoto, S., & Sato, T. (2012). The person-situation debate and the assessment of situations. *Japanese Journal of Personality, 21*, 1-11.

Funder, D.C., Furr, R.M., & Colvin, C.R. (2000). The Riverside Behavioural Q-sort: A tool for the description of social behaviour. *Journal of Personality, 68*, 451-489.

Furr, R. M., & Funder, D. C. (2004). Situational similarity and behavioral consistency: Subjective, objective, variable-centered, and person-centered approaches. *Journal of Research in Personality, 38,* 421–447. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2003.10.001

Furr, R. M., & Funder, D. C. (2021). Persons, situations, and person–situation interactions. In O. P. John & R. W. Robins (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (4th ed., pp. 667–685). The Guilford Press.

Hogan, R., & Roberts, B. W. (2000). A socioanalytic perspective on person–environment interaction. In W. B. Walsh, K. H. Craik, & R. F. Price (Eds.), *Person-environment psychology: New directions and perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 23-36). Psychology Press.

Kenny, D. A. (2019). *Interpersonal perception: The*

foundation of social relationships. Guilford Publications.

Kenny, D. A., Mohr, C. D., & Levesque, M. J. (2001). A social relations variance partitioning of dyadic behavior. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(1), 128-141. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.1.128

Kuper, N., Gardiner, G., Funder, D., Members of the International Situations Project, & Rauthmann, J. F. (2022) Cultural differences in the personality triad: The interplay of personality traits, situation characteristics, and behavior across 62 countries. [Manuscript in preparation]

Lakey, B. (2016). Understanding the P×S aspect of within-person variation: a variance partitioning approach. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 2004. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.02004

Lakey, B., Hubbard, S. A., Brummans, J., Obreiter, A., & Perrin, P. B. (2021). The relational regulation of within-person variation in personality expression. *Journal of Personality, 90*, 152-166. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12659

Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality.* Oxford, England: Ronald Press.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social sciences*. New York: Harper.

Markey, P. M., Funder, D. C., & Ozer, D. J. (2003). Complementarity of interpersonal behaviors in dyadic interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 1082–1090.

Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system theory of personality: Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. *Psychological Review, 102*, 246–268.

Mischel, W. (1968). *Personality and assessment*. New York: Wiley.

Mueller, S., Ram, N., Conroy, D. E., Pincus, A., Gerstorf, D., Wagner, J. (2019). Happy Like a Fish in Water? The Role of Personality–Situation Fit for Momentary Happiness in Social Interactions across the Adult Lifespan. *European Journal of Personality, 33, 2198.* doi:10.1002/per.2198

Orchard, L. J., & Fullwood, C. (2010). Current perspectives on personality and Internet use. *Social Science Computer Review, 28(*2), 155–169. doi:10.1177/0894439309335115

Primi, R., Ferreira-Rodrigues, C. F., & de Francisco Carvalho, L. (2014). Cattel's Personality Factor Questionnaire (CPFQ): Development and preliminary study. *Paidéia, 24*(57), 29–37. https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-43272457201405

Rauthmann, J. F. (2021). Capturing interactions, correlations, fits, and transactions: A Person-Environment Relations Model. In J. F. Rauthmann (Ed.), *The handbook of personality dynamics and processes* (pp. 427–522). Elsevier Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-813995-0.00018-2

Rauthmann, J. F., & Sherman, R. A. (2019). Toward a research agenda for the study of situation perceptions: A variance componential framework. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 23*(3), 238-266. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868318765600

Rauthmann, J. F., Sherman, R. A., Nave, C. S., Funder, D. C. (2015). Personality-driven situation experience, contact, and construal: How people's personality traits predict characteristics of their situations in daily life. *Journal of Research in Personality, 55*, 98–111. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2015.02.003

Renshaw, K. D., Blais, R. K., & Smith, T. W. (2010). Components of negative affectivity and marital satisfaction: The importance of actor and partner anger. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*(3), 328–334. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.03.005

Richard, F. D., Bond, C. F. Jr., & Stokes-Zoota, J. J. (2003). One hundred years of social psychology quantitatively described. *Review of General Psychology. 7*(4), 331-363. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.7.4.331

Robins, R. W., Fraley, R. C., Roberts, B. W., & Trzesniewski, K. H. (2001). A longitudinal study of personality change in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality, 69*, 617– 640.

Ross, L., & Nisbett, R.E. (1991). *The person and the situation: perspectives of social psychology.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sherman, R., & Pashler, H. (2019). Powerful moderator variables in behavioral science? Don't bet on them (version 3). *PsyArXiv*. doi: 10.31234/osf.io/c65wm.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York: Norton.

Swann, W. B., & Seyle, C. (2005). Personality Psychology's Comeback and its Emerging Symbiosis with Social Psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(2), 155–165. doi:10.1177/0146167204271591

Wagerman, S. A., & Funder, D. C. (2009). Situations. In P. J. Corr & G. Mathews (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of personality* (pp. 27–42). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Wrzus, C., Wagner, G. G., Riediger, M. (2016). Personality-situation transactions from adolescence to old age. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110*(5), 782–799. doi:10.1037/pspp0000054.