

## Personality Traits as Predictors of Interpersonal Difficulties in University Students in Pakistan

Arif Nadeem, Zahid Mahmood, and Sadia Saleem  
Institute of Clinical Psychology  
University of Management and Technology

Personality traits are considered to be relatively enduring and stable components of personality which have become an area of keen interest for researchers in psychology. In the West, over the last few decades, considerable efforts have been put to find empirical evidence of the theorized association between personality traits and interpersonal problems. The current study was designed to investigate the relationship between personality traits and interpersonal difficulties in Pakistani students. A sample of 600 university students (48% men & 52% women) with age range of 17 – 25 years ( $M = 20.79$ ,  $SD = 1.67$ ) was administered the Interpersonal Difficulties Scale and the Big Five Inventory. Analysis of the data revealed significant negative correlation between extraversion and interpersonal difficulties as well as between conscientiousness and interpersonal difficulties, while a significant positive correlation was found between neuroticism and interpersonal difficulties. Implications and suggestions for future researchers were discussed in terms of the collectivistic culture of Pakistan.

*Key words:* personality traits, interpersonal difficulties, university students, culture

Personality is viewed as an everlasting and structured synthesis of psychological traits that can direct and fortify individuals' relationships in the process of adjustment and may predict their distinctive ways of behaving in the surroundings (Kalish & Robins, 2006). Personality is considered responsible to handle the self, others, and the surroundings that include discernment of the self and the surroundings, sentiments, and feelings in diverse circumstances (Basavanthappa, 2007). Certain personality traits may serve as risk and protective factors for several psychopathologies (Pervin & John, 2001) as number of researchers have suggested that numerous types of abnormal behavior may be considered as exaggerated versions of normal personality traits (Widiger, Verheul, & van den Brink, 1999). It is asserted that the Five-Factor Model (i.e., extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism) of personality offers a significant theoretical outline to propose the possibility that specific personality attributes play a vital role in making the interpersonal relationships strong or weak (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001; Hough & Furnham, 2003).

Healthy interpersonal relationships of the individual provide valuable outcomes of their aims anywhere (Ayodele & Bello, 2008) as cooperation, inter-dependence, and inter-relationships are considered necessary for healthy functioning in the social life. The more healthy the interpersonal bonding, the more an individual gets adjusted in the society (Ayodele, 2010). Such kind of healthy interpersonal relationships may be formed by people who are ready to be in contact with their feelings and desires and similarly be paying attention to others' feelings and wishes (Rosenberg, 2003).

The individual has inborn needs of attachment, socialization, belongingness, and development of close bonds with significant

others, siblings, and peers (Bowlby, 1973; Fromm, 1976). However, when an individual grows up, his social world also gets bigger and his social connections become more strong, diverse, and multifaceted; resultantly, he may experience some interpersonal difficulties (Saleem, Ihsan, & Mahmood, 2014). Interpersonal difficulties are defined as recurrent difficulties in relating to other people (Horowitz, Rosenberg, & Bartholomew, 1993) including a wide range of issues related to an individual's social dealings and engagement with other people such as family and peers (Ambwani & Hopwood, 2009).

Such kind of expansion in the social world and its consequences may be witnessed in university students due to the change of educational institution (from college to the university). The change confers new challenges to the students demanding novel techniques of adjustment and learning of new talent to establish and maintain interpersonal relationships (Al-Khatib, Awamleh, & Samawi, 2012; Bouteyre, Maurel, & Bernaud, 2007; Hwang, 2000). In this process, university students face several problems in their educational, social, and emotional life (Rodgers & Tennison, 2009; Verger, Guagliard, Gilbert, Rouillon, & Kovess-Masfety, 2010). If they fail to adjust to this new environment, they may develop interpersonal difficulties or other issues while affiliating with others (Lange & Couch, 2011). In educational setup, it is therefore, predominantly considered that personality traits affect the quality and strength of students' interpersonal relationships in a number of ways (Ayodele & Bello, 2008).

Since, the psychological health of university students is recognized worldwide as an imperative community health concern (Saleem, Mahmood, & Naz, 2013), the predictable prevalence of mental health problems in university students (19.20%) offers confirmation that this population is at-risk to a larger extent and signifies the need for worldwide timely remedial measures (Stallman, 2010). Almost one-third of university students exhibit difficulties in interpersonal relationships (American College Health Association, 2010). Timely identification and remedial measures in this regard are considered necessary as healthy interpersonal relationships may increase the likelihood of better mental health (Umberson & Montez, 2010) and resultantly, ensure improved academic satisfaction in the university students (Kemerer,

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Sadia Saleem Associate Professor, Institute of Clinical Psychology, University of Management and Technology, Lahore. Email Id: [sadia.saleem@umt.edu.pk](mailto:sadia.saleem@umt.edu.pk)

Baldrige, & Green, 1982). In this scenario, the association between personality attributes and interpersonal relationship problems particularly in students has obtained the interest of researchers for last few decades (Ayodele, 2013).

University years is a crucial time of developing and maintaining intense social bonding and interpersonal relationship that eventually facilitate better well-being (Hefner & Eisenberg, 2009). In a broader perspective, a significant positive correlation has been found between affiliation quality and adjustment to the environment in college students (Swenson, Nordstrom, & Hiester, 2008) and a significant positive correlation was found between the negative social connections and symptoms of poor psychological health (Edwards, Hershberger, Russell, & Markert, 2001). Furthermore, the interpersonal bonding is proved to have a direct impact on the students' adjustment, well being, and academic performance (Martin & Dowson, 2009).

In the specific domain of personality traits, it is found that teacher-student interpersonal relationship was negatively associated with conscientiousness and neuroticism and agreeableness, and positively associated with openness to experience and extraversion (Ayodele, 2013). Students having high score on openness to experience were inclined to have more friends on Facebook, but interestingly extraversion did not appear to have a strong relationship with Facebook friendships (Skues, Williams, & Wise, 2012). However, Jenkins-Guarieri, Wright, and Hudiburgh (2012) found that extravert students were more likely to use Facebook. Moreover, individuals with high score on extraversion, agreeableness, and openness to experience were inclined to have more interpersonal competency. In another study, Fetterman and Robinson (2012) found that there was a positive and significant correlation between neuroticism and passivity. The individuals high on this attribute tend to think submissively in the formation and maintenance of interpersonal bonding.

The individuals who were more conscientious, agreeable, and emotionally stable (i.e., less neurotic) were more likely to perform better in their jobs of public dealing due to their good bonding with clients as compared to the individuals who were lacking these attributes. Also, more agreeable and emotionally stable individuals were more likely to perform better in team where workers have to relate with one another effectively (Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 2011). Moreover, extraversion has been found to be positively and neuroticism negatively linked to the level of satisfaction and healthy relationships among the couples (Stroud, Durbin, Saigal, & Knobloch-Fedders, 2010). Agreeableness and extraversion are negatively correlated with the interpersonal difficulties while neuroticism has a strong positive link with interpersonal problems (Nysaeter, Langvik, Berthelsen, & Nordvik, 2009). Individuals high on conscientiousness were found to enjoy better associations with peers (Jensen-Campbell & Malcolm, 2007). Other studies have also provided evidence that extraverts were inclined to maintain solid, healthy, and diverse interpersonal relationships (Berry, Willingham, & Thayer, 2000; Kalish & Robins, 2006).

It is found that neuroticism is positively correlated with interpersonal problems (Bono, Boles, Judge, & Lauver, 2002; Lopes, Salovey, & Straus, 2003) as the individuals low in emotional stability (i.e., high on neuroticism) often express anger, moodiness and insecurity in their friendships (Klein, Lim, Saltz, & Mayer, 2004). Agreeableness is established to be significantly associated with supportive behavior (LePine, Jeffrey, Dyne & Linn, 2001) and long term healthy interpersonal relationships in adolescents (Jensen-

Campbell, Gleason, Adams, & Malcolm, 2003), and is negatively correlated with interpersonal conflicts in students (Bono et al., 2002) as the individuals with higher score on agreeableness are usually described as selfless, bendable, fair, kind (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1992) and amicable (Sprecher & Regan, 2002). Individuals with higher score on extraversion are considered to be vigorous, participative, outgoing, self-assured, daring in nature (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Also, openness to experience is considered as a typical appreciation for capability, vigor, venture, acceptance for others, and diverse kind of experiences (McCrae, Costa, & Dye, 1999). The extraversion and openness to experience were found positively correlated with the participants' adjustment, healthy social relationships, and psychological well-being while neuroticism was found to have inverse relationship with these variables (Soldz & Vaillant, 1999). After evaluating the results of more than one hundred studies, Barrick and Mount (1991), found that conscientiousness was significantly as well as consistently correlated with better job performance while extraversion was found to be a strong and valid predictor of success in occupations where social interactions were involved.

Since psychology is considered to be bounded by the culture in which it exists; likewise, interpersonal difficulties may not be studied apart from specific cultural effects (Saleem et al., 2014). Culture has an imperative role in determining individuals' behaviors (Delgado, Updegraff, Roosa, & Umana-Taylor, 2011; Matsumoto, 2000) as it defines the customs, values, traditions, and different approaches to interact with others (Berscheid, 1995). Individualistic culture put more emphasis on individual's development, self-actualization, and individual's own preferences for his decisions of life as compared to the collectivistic culture (Phinney, Ong, & Madden, 2000). Consequently, the person has to learn new skills like selection of his or her own preferences, taking decision at his or her own, and dealing with others more efficiently (Schwartz, 1990; Triandis, 2001). Collectivistic culture, however, emphasizes more on the group synchronization, unity, and compliance to culturally suggested behaviors (Triandis, 1993) but at the cost of individuals' free will (Schwartz, 1990; Triandis, 2001).

There is a conventional collectivistic culture in Pakistan where parents remain in command of their children for a long time (Saleem, Mahmood, & Daud, 2017). Consequently, the individuals' relationships with peers and other social groups get affected as their autonomy is suppressed most of the times. Elder family members have control over the younger ones who are supposed to abide by the family traditions (Stewart, Bond, Zaman, McBride-Chang, Rao, Ho, & Fielding, 1999). Moreover, obedience, conventionality, respect, and inter-reliance are supposed to be present in the younger family members (Chao, 1994). The fear to be dominated by elders and losing self control prevails to a large extent in collectivistic cultures thus, affects the interpersonal relationships negatively (Stewart et al., 1999; Wang & Leichtman, 2000). Consequently, uniqueness of the person is suppressed as well as the relationships of those children in later ages can awaken old fears of babyhood (Saleem et al., 2014).

Keeping this scenario in view, this study was designed to explore the relationship between personality traits and interpersonal difficulties in university students within the Pakistani collectivistic culture. It can safely be said that it is the least studied aspect in Pakistan as no published work has found examining the relationship between these variables. University students are supposed to be at greater risk to have interpersonal problems and the personality traits have been shown to be one of the major underlying factors of such

problems. Based upon the existing literature, it was hypothesized that extroversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness would be negatively, and neuroticism would be positively, correlated with interpersonal difficulties.

## Method

### Participants

The study was conducted in Faisalabad city, using multistage sampling technique; since the sample was drawn from different segments (strata) i.e. university sector, class wise and lastly gender wise therefore it was more appropriate to use multistage sampling. Initially, two universities (one public sector and one private sector) were selected randomly (one university from each stratum i.e., public and private sector). At the second stage, a sample of 600 (48% men, 52% women) students (300 from public sector and 300 from private sector) was drawn randomly; 156 (26%) from 1<sup>st</sup> stratum, 151 (25%) from 2<sup>nd</sup>, 149 (25%) from 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 144 (24%) from 4<sup>th</sup> stratum i.e., BS 1<sup>st</sup> year, BS 2<sup>nd</sup> year, BS 3<sup>rd</sup> year, and BS 4<sup>th</sup> year respectively, with age range of 17 – 25 years ( $M = 20.79$ ,  $SD = 1.67$ ). However, in each stratum, there were equal chances for men and women to be selected as sample of the study.

### Instruments

**Demographic Sheet:** A demographic sheet was developed including gender, age, class, and sector of university.

**Big Five Inventory (BFI):** The BFI (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991; John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008) is a widely used reliable self-report inventory to explore the big five personality attributes. It consists of 44 items (short phrases) measuring five big personality traits including extraversion, agreeableness, openness to experience, conscientiousness, and neuroticism. Each item is rated on five point likert scale (from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” having rating of 1 – 5) by the respondents. In the current research, the English version of BFI (Srivastava, 2016) was used.

**Interpersonal Difficulties Scale (IDS):** The IDS (Saleem, Ihsan, & Mahmood, 2014) is an indigenously standardized measure in Urdu (The National language of Pakistan) with Cronbach Alpha (.87) to assess interpersonal difficulties in the students. The factors of the measure include; Dominated by Others, Low Self-confidence, Mistrust, Lack of Assertiveness, Lack of Boundaries, and Unstable Relationships. Each item is rated on five point likert scale (from “not at all” to “always” having rating of 0 – 4 respectively) by the respondents.

### Procedure

After getting the permission for data collection from the concerned authorities of the universities, the participants were selected by using the aforementioned sampling strategy. Informed consent of participation in the research was taken from the participants. They were briefed about the purpose of the research and were assured that the information obtained through the questionnaires would be kept confidential and will be used for research purpose only. Moreover, they were informed about the right to withdraw from the research at any stage. Since, it was a group testing, a helper (psychologist) assisted the researcher during measures administration to handle the participants’ queries as well as to ensure the completion of demographic sheet and participants’ seriousness while responding the items of the measures.

## Results

Table 1  
*Demographic Properties of the Participants (N=600)*

Demographic Variables	Men <i>f</i> (%)	Women <i>f</i> (%)	Total <i>f</i> (%)
Gender	287(48)	313(52)	600(100)
Class			
BS 1 <sup>st</sup> Year	85(30)	71(23)	156(26)
BS 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	62(21)	89(28)	151(25)
BS 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year	66(23)	83(27)	149(25)
BS 4 <sup>th</sup> Year	74(26)	70(22)	144(24)
University			
Public Sector	138(48)	162(52)	300(50)
Private Sector	149(52)	151(48)	300(50)
Father’s Education			
Illiterate	31(11)	13(4)	44(8)
Up to Matric.	82(28)	59(19)	141(23)
12 to 14 year	126(44)	148(47)	274(46)
16 year & above	48(17)	93(30)	141(23)
Mother’s Education			
Illiterate	77(27)	47(15)	124(21)
Up to Matric.	116(40)	126(40)	242(40)
12 to 14 year	71(25)	113(36)	184(31)
16 year & above	23(8)	27(9)	50(8)
Family System			
Joint	196(68)	106(34)	302(50)
Nuclear	91(32)	207(66)	298(50)

Table 1 shows a slight difference in the percentage of sample in terms of gender (i.e., 52% women & 48% men). Two age groups were derived on the basis of the above and below mean and  $SD$  of the participants’ age in years, dividing them in 17 – 20 years category (45%) and 21 – 25 years category (55%). Moreover, there was almost equal percentage of participants in all semesters however; there were predominantly more students from Public Sector University (67%) as compared to the Private Sector University (33%) as per the pre-determined ratio of the sample.

Table 2 reveals that the students having significantly higher scores on neuroticism tend to have more interpersonal difficulties (IDs), while, higher significant level of extraversion and conscientiousness is associated with the decreases in the IDs in the students. However, agreeableness and openness to experience do not have significant relationship with IDs.

In order to identify the determinants of interpersonal difficulties in university students, hierarchical regression analysis was carried out. In Step I, personal characteristics of the participants (i.e., gender, age in categories, age in years, class, and sector of university) were included. Step II was consisted of familial characteristics of the participants (family system, fathers’ education, and mothers’ education). While in Step III, personality traits (i.e., extraversion, agreeableness, openness to experience, conscientiousness, and neuroticism) were entered.

Table 3 indicates that in Step I and II, class and university of the participants was found to be the significant negative predictors of interpersonal difficulties in university students. In Step III, the participants’ class, university, and extraversion and conscientiousness were found to be negative predictors while neuroticism was appeared to be positive predictor in university

Table 2

Summary of Inter-correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Scores on the Sub-Scales of Big Five Inventory and Interpersonal Difficulties Scale (N=600)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Neuroticism	-	.14**	.05	-.22**	.05	.22**
2. Extraversion		-	.11**	.03	.20**	-.12**
3. Openness			-	-.07	.19**	-.06
4. Agreeableness				-	.07	-.06
5. Conscientiousness					-	-.08*
6. IDS						-
M	36.29	37.95	36.97	36.37	39.44	76.12
SD	4.89	4.47	3.99	3.99	4.74	23.39

Note. \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ . S = Interpersonal Difficulties Scale

Table 3

Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Predictors of Interpersonal Difficulties in University Students (N= 600)

Predictor	SEB	B	t	p
Step I (R= .17, $\Delta R^2 = .02$ )	20.19		3.26	.001
Control variables				
Class	1.45	-.18	2.58	.01
University	2.07	-.14	3.32	.001
Step II (R= .18, $\Delta R^2 = .02$ )	20.79		3.14	.002
Class	1.46	-.18	2.59	.01
University	2.16	-.14	3.14	.002
Step III (R= .32, $\Delta R^2 = .08$ )	26.45		3.48	.001
Class	1.41	-.15	2.29	.022
University	2.12	-.13	3.07	.002
Neuroticism	.19	.23	5.67	.001
Extroversion	.21	-.12	2.96	.003
Conscientiousness	.20	-.08	1.98	.048

Note. only significant results are presented in each step; Step I:  $F = 3.690$ ,  $df = 5$ ; Step II:  $F = 2.097$ ,  $df = 9$ ; Step III:  $F = 4.805$ ,  $df = 14$ .

students. To sum-up the results, students of initial semesters of BS program, students of Public Sector University, and students with higher scores on neuroticism are more likely to have IDs while the students having higher scores on extraversion and conscientiousness are less likely to develop IDs.

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, t, and p Values on Interpersonal Difficulties Scale (IDS) of Gender and University type

Factors	Gender	N	M	SD	t	p
IDS	Men	287	75.47	22.62	.64	.520
	Women	313	76.71	24.09		
Total	Public	300	78.22	22.79	3.15	.01
	Private	300	71.90	24.04		

$df = 598$ .

The data given in table 4 revealed that, no significant differences were found on IDS in both the genders. Table further revealed that the students of Public Sector University tend to have more interpersonal difficulties as compared to students of the private sector university.

## Discussion

The university students are considered to be at greater risk to

experience interpersonal difficulties (IDs) while connecting and interacting with one another (Stallman, 2010) and personality traits have repeatedly been found to be correlated with IDs (e.g., Ayodele & Bello, 2008; Fetterman & Robinson, 2012). In the West, many studies have been carried out to explore the relationship between personality traits and IDs in various populations particularly in university students. The current study was designed to explore the relationship between personality traits (i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) and IDs in Pakistani university students. Analysis of the data has given rise to some findings as discussed below.

The statistical analysis of the data depicted that the neuroticism was positively correlated with IDs. The findings were in line with the previous studies (e.g., Klein, Lim, Saltz, & Mayer, 2004) which have concluded that individuals low in emotional stability (i.e., high in neuroticism) often express anger, moodiness and insecurity in their friendships resultantly, may cause IDs. Moreover, neuroticism was found to be the significant positive predictor of IDs in university students also supported by previous studies (e.g., Ayodele, 2013; Saulsman & Page, 2004; Barrick & Mount, 1991).

It was evident in findings of the current study that the relationship of IDs with extraversion was inverse and significant. Since the extraverts are considered to be vigorous, participative, outgoing, expressive, social, self-assured and daring in nature, they can establish and maintain healthy interpersonal relationships (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Prior studies have also provided evidence that extraverts were inclined to maintain solid, healthy, and diverse interpersonal relationships (e.g., Berry, Willingham & Thayer, 2000; Kalish & Robins, 2006). Furthermore, extraversion was also found to be the significant negative predictor of interpersonal difficulties in university students again supported by the earlier studies (e.g., Ayodele, 2013; Saulsman & Page, 2004; Barrick & Mount, 1991) depicting that the extrovert students tend to have lesser vulnerability to develop IDs.

The results of the current study depicted inverse but insignificant relationship between openness to experience and IDs. Earlier research shows openness to experience as typical appreciation for capability, vigor, venture, inquisitiveness of ideas, inventive energy, acceptance for others, and diverse kind of experiences (McCrae, Costa, & Dye, 1999). The expression of inventive energy and acceptance for others, in Pakistani collectivistic culture is quite different from that of the other individualistic cultures and the culture is considered to have imperative role in determining individuals' behaviors (Delgado, Updegraff, Roosa, & Umana-Taylor, 2011; Matsumoto, 2000). It is the culture that defines the customs, traditions, and different approaches to interact with others

(Berscheid, 1995). Individualistic culture where the inventory (BFI) was standardized, put more emphasis on individual development and individual preferences for decisions of life as compared to the collectivistic culture (Phinney, Ong, & Madden, 2000). Collectivistic culture like in Pakistan, however, emphasizes more on the group synchronization, unity, and compliance to culturally suggested behaviors (Triandis, 1993). This might be the reason of insignificant findings with respect to the relationship between the said variables.

Moreover, results of this study depicted inverse but insignificant relationship between agreeableness and IDs. Agreeable individuals are usually described as selfless, bendable, fair, kind (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1992) and amicable (Sprecher & Regan, 2002). Thus, it can again be asserted that the insignificant findings were affected by cultural variations and its impact on the individuals' behaviors (Delgado et al., 2011; Matsumoto, 2000). The fear to be dominated by elders and losing self control prevail to a large extent in collectivistic cultures (like in Pakistan) and the younger are supposed to be obedient and compliant to the elders instead of their own exploration of the world around and own experiences. This situation consequently, affects the interpersonal relationships negatively (Stewart et al., 1999; Wang & Leichtman, 2000). Particularly, the uniqueness of the person is suppressed as well as the relationships of those children in later ages can awaken old fears of babyhood reliance on the elders and loss of autonomy giving rise to low self-confidence (Saleem et al., 2014).

In this study, there was a significant negative correlation between conscientiousness and IDs as well as the conscientiousness was found to be significant negative predictor of IDs in university students. The results are also in line with the findings of previous studies suggesting Big Five personality traits as predictors of IDs (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Saulsman & Page, 2004) and declaring higher level of conscientiousness as the most powerful indicator of healthy interpersonal relationships (e.g., Ayodele, 2013). Moreover, the reason of lesser IDs in conscientious individuals might be their predisposition to be planned, devoted, disciplined, trustworthy, and careful as described by Costa and McCrea (1992).

The results also revealed that no significant difference between both genders was found IDs. This might be because the university life is difficult for both the genders in the same way putting forward almost similar stress on them, hence, both of the genders exhibited more or less the same level of IDs as supported by other literature (e.g., Saleem et al., 2014). Furthermore, it was revealed that the students of public sector university tend to have more IDs than that of students of private sector university indicating the supportive environment of the private university. Because, as far as the university culture is concerned, an environment that supports and encourages the students can develop positive interpersonal connections throughout the university (Kemerer et al., 1982).

#### Conclusion and Implications

Conclusively, it was found that high score on neuroticism and low score on extroversion and / or conscientiousness can predict the vulnerability towards IDs in university students. Moreover, the culture to culture variations cannot be neglected in psychological research as the nature and manifestation of every psychological phenomenon is bound by culture. Findings of this study signify the role of student counseling centers in the academic institutions to deal with interpersonal difficulties in the students. These centers should be run by trained and certified psychologists / professionals

as mere educationist-cum-counselor cannot deal effectively with these issues especially with personality. An awareness movement on the issue can also be launched for the university students.

#### Limitations and Suggestions

Based on the findings of current study, it cannot be claimed strictly that personality traits impact interpersonal difficulties independent of factors related to educational set-up and demographics of the participants. Hence, in future, contribution of personality traits in interpersonal difficulties can be explored. The participants may also be interviewed in future studies on this issue, to explore the phenomena qualitatively as well. An indigenously standardized personality inventory should be developed and used in future studies to eradicate the cultural variations in future research. Longitudinal studies may be carried out in future to have clearer picture of the manifestation of interpersonal difficulties at different stages of life and its association with personality traits.

#### References

- Al-Khatib, B. A., Awamleh, H. S., & Samawi, F. S. (2012). Student's adjustment to college life at Albalqa Applied University. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 11*(2), 8–16.
- Ambwani, S., & Hopwood, C. J., (2009). The utility of considering interpersonal problems in the assessment of bulimic features. *Eating Behaviors, 10*, 247–253.
- American College Health Association. (2010). *New York University–National college assessment 2010* (NYU Report). Retrieved from New York University website: <http://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/live-well-nyu/staff/interpersonal-relationships.html>
- Ayodele, K. O. (2013). The influence of big five personality factors on lecturers-students' interpersonal relationship. *The African Symposium: An Online Journal of the African Educational Research Network, 13*(1), 28–33.
- Ayodele, K. O. (2010). *The comparative effectiveness of rational emotive behaviors therapy, enhanced thinking skills and social skill training in improving adolescents' inter and intra-personal relationship skills* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ogun State, Nigeria.
- Ayodele, K. O., & Bello, A. A. (2008). Reduction of bullying behavioral tendencies among secondary school students; a multiple regression analysis. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 1*(1), 146–151.
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*(1), 9–30.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount M. K. (1991). The Big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis review. *Personal Psychology, 44*, 1–26.
- Basavanthappa, B. T. (2007). *Psychiatric mental health nursing* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). New Delhi: Jaypee Brothers Medical Publishers Ltd.
- Berry, D. S., Willingham, J. K., & Thayer, C. A. (2000). Affect and personality as predictors of conflict and closeness in young adults' friendships. *Journal of Research in Personality, 34*(1), 84–107.

- Berscheid, E. (1995). Help wanted: A grand theorist of interpersonal relationships, sociologist or anthropologist preferred. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *12*, 529–533.
- Bono, J. E., Boles, T. L., Judge, T. A., & Lauver, K. J. (2002). The role of personality in task and relationship conflict. *Journal of Personality*, *70*(3), 311–344.
- Bouteyre, E., Maurel, M., & Bernaud, J. L. (2007). Daily hassles and depressive symptoms among first-year psychology students in France: The role of coping and social support. *Stress and Health*, *23*(2), 93–99.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Separation, anxiety, and anger* (Vol. 2). NY: Basic Books.
- Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style, understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development*, *65*, 1111–1119.
- Costa, P. T., & 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.
- Delgado, M. Y., Updegraff, K. A., Roosa, M. W., & Umana-Taylor, A. J. (2011). Discrimination and Mexican-origin adolescents' adjustment: The moderating roles of adolescents', mothers', and fathers' cultural orientations and values. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, *40*, 125–139.
- Edwards, K. J., Hershberger, P. J., Russell, R. K., & Markert, R. J. (2001). Stress, negative social exchange, and health symptoms in university students. *Journal of American College Health*, *50*(2), 75.
- Fetterman, A. K., & Robinson, M. D. (2012). Interpersonal cognitive self-focus as a function of neuroticism: Basal tendencies and priming effects. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *52*(4), 527–531.
- Fromm, E. (1976). *To have or to be?* NY: Harper & Row.
- Hefner, J., Eisenberg, D. (2009). Social support and mental health among college students. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *79*(4), 491–499.
- Horowitz, L. M., Rosenberg, S. E., & Bartholomew, K. (1993). Interpersonal problems, attachment styles, and outcome in brief dynamic psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, *61*, 549–560.
- Hough, L. M., & Furnham, A. (2003). Use of personality variables in work settings. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 131–169). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Hwang, Y. (2000). A theory foundation in college student affairs-psychosocial development of college students in Taiwan. *Bulletin of Civic and Moral Education*, *9*, 161–200.
- Jenkins-Guarieri, M. A., Wright, S. L., & Hudiburgh, L. M. (2012). The relationships among attachment style, personality traits, interpersonal competency, and facebook use. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *33*(6), 294–301.
- Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Malcolm, K. T. (2007). The importance of conscientiousness in adolescent interpersonal relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*(3), 368–383.
- Jensen-Campbell, L. A., Gleason, K. A., Adams, R., & Malcolm, K. T. (2003). Interpersonal conflict, agreeableness, and personality development. *Journal of Personality*, *71*(6), 1059–1085.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 114–158). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory – Versions 4a and 5a*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- Kalish, Y., & Robins, G. (2006). Psychological predispositions and network structure: The relationship between individual predispositions, structural holes and network closure. *Social Networks*, *28*(1), 56–84.
- Kemerer, F. R., Baldrige, J. V., & Green, K. S. (1982). *Strategies for effective enrollment management*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Klein, K. J., Lim, B. C., Saltz, J. L., & Mayer, D. M. (2004). How do they get there? An examination of the antecedents of centrality in team networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, *47*(6), 952–963.
- Lange, T. M., & Couch, L. L. (2011). An assessment of links between components of empathy and interpersonal problems. *The New School Psychology Bulletin*, *8*(2), 83–90.
- LePine, A., Dyne, V., & Linn, G. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with Big Five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(2), 326–336.
- Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., & Straus, R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, personality, and the perceived quality of social relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *35*(3), 641–658.
- Martin, A., & Dowson, M. (2009). Interpersonal relationships, motivation, engagement, and achievement: Yields for theory, current issues, and practice. *Review of Educational Research*, *79*, 327–365.
- Matsumoto, D. (2000). *Culture and psychology: People around the world* (2nd ed.). NY: Wadsworth, Inc.
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T. Jr., & Dye, D. A. (1999). The Neo Personality Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *12*, 887–898.
- Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Stewart, G. L. (2011). Five-factor model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance*, *11*(2-3), 145–165.
- Nysaeter, T. E., Langvik, E., Berthelsen, M., & Nordvik, H. (2009). Interpersonal problems and personality traits: The relation between IIP-64C and NEO-FFI. *Nordic Psychology*, *61*(3), 82–93.
- Pervin, L. A., & John, O. P. (2001). *Personality: Theory and research* (8th ed.). NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Phinney, J. S., Ong, A., & Madden, T. (2000). Cultural values and intergenerational value discrepancies in immigrant and nonimmigrant families. *Child Development*, *71*, 528–539.
- Rodgers, L. S., & Tennison, L. R. (2009). A preliminary assessment of adjustment disorder among first-year college students. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, *23*(3), 220–230.
- Rosenberg, M. (2003). *Compassionate Commutation*. Retrieved December 17, 2003, from <http://partnering.inet.netn2/-newsletter306.html>.

- Saleem, S., Mahmood, Z. & Daud, S. (2017). Perceived parenting styles in Pakistani adolescents: A validation study. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 32(2), 487-509.
- Saleem, S., Mahmood, Z. & Naz, M. (2013). Mental health problems in university students: A prevalence study. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(2), 124-130.
- Saleem, S., Ihsan, Z., & Mahmood, Z. (2014). Development of Interpersonal Difficulties Scale for university students. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 29(2), 277-297.
- Schwartz, H. S. (1990). Individualism-collectivism critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 21, 139-157.
- Skues, J. L., Williams, B., & Wise, L. (2012). The effects of personality traits, self-esteem, loneliness, and narcissism on face-book use among university students. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(6), 2414-2419.
- Soldz, S., & Vaillant, G. E. (1999). The big five personality traits and the life course: A 45-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33(2), 208-232.
- Sprecher, S., & Regan, P. C. (2002). Liking some things (and some people) more than others: Partner preferences in romantic relationships and friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 19(4), 463-481.
- Srivastava, S. (2016). *Measuring the big five personality factors*. Retrieved from <http://pages.uoregon.edu/sanjay/bigfive.html>.
- Stallman, H. M. (2010). Psychological distress in university students: A comparison with general population data. *Australian Psychologist*, 45(4), 249-257.
- Stewart, S. M., Bond, M. H., Zaman, R. M., McBride-Chang, C., Rao, N., Ho, M. L., & Fielding, R. (1999). Functional parenting in Pakistan. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 23(3), 747-770.
- Stroud, C. B., Durbin, C. E., Saigal, S. D., & Knobloch-Fedders, L. M. (2010). Normal and abnormal personality traits are associated with marital satisfaction for both men and women: An actor-partner inter-dependence model analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(4), 466-477.
- Swenson, L. M., Nordstrom, A., & Hiester, M. (2008). The role of peer relationships in adjustment to college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(6), 551-568.
- Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism and collectivism: Past, present, and future. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), *The handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 35-50). NY: Oxford University Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1993). Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 27, 155-180.
- Umberson, D., & Montez, J. K. (2010). Social relationships and health: A flashpoint for health policy. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 51, 54-58.
- Vergier, P., Guagliardo, V., Gilbert, F., Rouillon, F., & Kovess-Masfety, V. (2010). Psychiatric disorders in students in six French universities: 12-month prevalence, comorbidity, impairment, and help-seeking. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 45(2), 189-199.
- Wang, W., & Leichtman, M. D. (2000). Same beginnings, different stories: A comparison of American and Chinese children's narratives. *Child Development*, 71, 1329-1346.
- Widiger, T. A., Verheul, R., & van den Brink, W. (1999). Personality and psychopathology. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 347-366). NY: Guilford.

Received: 29th March 2016

Revisions Received: 16<sup>th</sup> April 2018