Tilburg University

Personality, temperament, and homesickness

van Heck, G.L.; Vingerhoets, A.J.J.M.; Voolstra, A.; Gruijters, I.; Thijs, H.; van Tilburg, M.A.L.

Published in:

Psychological aspects of geographical moves. Homesickness and acculturation stress

Publication date:

2005

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Heck, G. L., Vingerhoets, A. J. J. M., Voolstra, A., Gruijters, I., Thijs, H., & van Tilburg, M. A. L. (2005). Personality, temperament, and homesickness. In M. A. L. van Tilburg, & A. J. J. M. Viingerhoets (Eds.), *Psychological aspects of geographical moves. Homesickness and acculturation stress* (pp. 161-177). Amsterdam University Press.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

11 Personality, Temperament, and Homesickness

Guus L. Van Heck, Ad J.J.M. Vingerhoets, Aafke Voolstra,
Irma Gruijters, Hannie Thijs, and Miranda A.L. Van Tilburg

Introduction

It certainly is not a voluminous literature that examines the links between homesickness, on the one hand, and temperament and personality traits on the other hand. As a matter of fact, only a few studies focus directly on these relationships. For instance, dependency, predominantly on family and parents, was found to be a characteristic feature of homesick students (Carden & Feicht, 1991). Also in a recent longitudinal study, it has been shown that individual differences in dependency were systematically related to homesickness (Brewin, Furnham, & Howes, 1989). In a way, these findings support a possible linkage of homesickness to separation anxiety.

Of course, dependency is not the only personality characteristic that has received attention of researchers in the field of homesickness. Fisher (1989) found in first-year university students substantial links between introversion, depression, and obsession, on the one hand, and homesickness on the other hand. Fisher showed that introverts reported slightly more homesickness experiences than extroverts. It was also demonstrated convincingly that levels of depression and obsession were already heightened in homesick persons *prior to leaving home*, indicating the existence of a vulnerability factor.

Eurelings-Bontekoe, Vingerhoets, and Fontijn (1994) compared homesick military conscripts with normal controls and patients with psychiatric symptoms of a different nature. They reported the following characteristics of homesick military conscripts: (1) high levels of rigidity, somatization, and introversion, (2) low levels of dominance and self-esteem, (3) a high need for social support together with a lack of adequate social skills, and (4) from an early age onwards, homesick experiences problems with separation from parents, a strong emotional bond with parents, fewer of shorter holidays and stays without parents or alone, and avoidance of dating and going out. Rigidity proved to be the best predictor of homesickness. Moreover, it was shown that homesick conscripts stuck to their old habits and were strongly attached to a very regular life, tending to avoid new situations that require psychological adaptation.

In a study with male soldiers, homesick subjects appeared to be less extraverted, less dominant and less assertive, but more rigid (Eurelings-Bontekoe, Verschuur, Koudstaal, Van der Sar et al., 1995). Compared with controls, women with either chronic feelings of homesickness or episodic attacks of homesickness were less assertive, less extraverted and more rigid, but did not differ in terms of

dominance scores (Eurelings-Bontekoe, Tolsma, Verschuur, & Vingerhoets, 1996).

In line with the Dutch psychiatrist Rümke's (1940) view that neurotic individuals are more vulnerable with respect to homesickness, Bergsma (1963) found relatively more neurotic characteristics in Dutch homesick military conscripts compared with non-homesick soldiers. In another Dutch Army investigation, Fontijn (1990) also reported a positive relationship between neuroticism and homesickness. Finally, Gasselsberger (1982), in a study on boarding school children, has provided additional empirical support for a link between neuroticism and homesickness.

With regard to self-esteem, highly contradictory results have been reported. For instance, Eurelings-Bontekoe et al. (1994) found lower self-esteem among homesick adults, whereas Fisher (1989) obtained no differences between homesick and non-homesick students. These findings possibly reflect cultural differences, or differences in the operationalization of homesickness and self-esteem.

Homesickness and the five-factor model of personality

Recently, taxonomic research in personality psychology has focused on the development of a parsimonious way of describing the full range of personality traits, attempting to establish an integration of the diversity of existing individual difference measures. In this context, the five-factor approach has achieved appreciable popularity. This five-factor structure of trait descriptors has been reported by various researchers pursuing the so-called lexical strategy (Goldberg, 1982; John, Angleitner, & Ostendorf, 1988; Norman, 1963; Tupes & Christal, 1961). The five global factors, incorporating "hundreds, if not thousands of traits" (Goldberg, 1993, p. 27) are: (I) Extraversion, (II) Agreeableness, (III) Conscientiousness, (IV) Emotional Stability, and (V) Openness to Experience. This trait taxonomy has been traditionally labelled as the *Big Five*. Extraversion reflects such traits as sociability, assertiveness, and activity level, while introversion reflects silence, passivity and reserve (Goldberg, 1993). Agreeableness reflects a preference for a particular way of dealing with other people. Individuals with high scores on Agreeableness are helpful, friendly, considerate, warm, etc.; low-scorers are quarrelsome, demanding, rude, egocentric, cynical, etc. Conscientiousness contrasts such traits as industry, order, reliability, self-discipline, etc. with characteristics such as careless, negligent, undependable, disorganised, unreliable, etc. Neuroticism includes such traits as nervousness, anxiety, hostility, depression, vulnerability, etc. The fifth factor, in the early days of the Big Five interpreted as Intellect, has been labelled more recently as Openness to Experience, a broad construct that implies, amongst others, receptivity to many varieties of experience (McCrae, 1994). According to

their advocates, this structure of five dimensions of interpersonal and intrapersonal conduct "...captures, at a broad level of abstraction, the commonalities among most of the existing systems of personality description, and provides an integrative descriptive model for personality research" (John, 1990, p. 96). Adoption of the five-factor model as the universal framework for personality description has been propagated by many personality psychologists who are convinced that these five factors "are both necessary and reasonably sufficient for describing at a global level the major features of personality" (McCrae & Costa, 1986, p. 1001).

It seems reasonable to expect that Openness to Experience, the fifth of the Big Five, should be related to measures of homesickness. Open individuals are not only characterized by a broader and deeper scope of awareness, but also by a need to enlarge and examine experiences. They are, amongst others, exploring, curious, and unconventional (McCrae & Costa, 1991). Because of these characteristics, it is plausible to assume that high-scorers on Openness to Experience will have less difficulties in adapting to new environments. However, one should not expect very high correlations, due to the fact that open people experience both the good and the bad more intensely (Costa & McCrae, 1984). It is much more difficult to conceive of possible associations between Agreeableness and Conscientiousness and homesickness. There are no theoretical reasons to suspect that there may be structural associations between these basic personality variables and homesickness.

Homesickness and temperaments

There are also reasons to expect that there are systematic links between temperament and homesickness. Temperaments, forming a special class of personality traits, are the constitutional origins of personality and can be conceived of as the most fundamental aspects in which individuals differ from each other (Buss & Plomin, 1984). They are largely hereditary in origin. Pointing at person-environment interactions, Buss and Plomin (1984, p. 155) have suggested that temperaments "might influence the environment by choice of environments, contributing to social contexts, and modifying the impact of environments." Taking this into account, significant relationships between homesickness and temperaments, in as far as they reflect susceptibility to environmental stimulation and preferences for particular social episodes and behavioral contexts, can be expected.

Finding evidence for a substantial role for temperaments would reveal *built-in* tendencies towards homesickness. An implication of this would be a certain degree of 'resistance' to modifications via therapy, training, etc. Especially those temperamental variables that reflect adaptability, that is, the ways people react to new or altered situations, seem to be relevant in this context. In the pediatric

approach to temperament, which has been dominated by Thomas, Chess, and their colleagues, *adaptability* is one of the major dimensions of temperament (Thomas, Chess, Birch, Hertzog, & Korn, 1963). This dimension also plays a crucial role in the Pavlovian perspective on temperament (see, e.g., Strelau, 1983), which focusses on strength of excitation, strength of inhibition, and mobility. Strength of excitation reflects the strength of the nervous system expressed mainly by its working capacity, namely endurance of intense and/or prolonged excitation without passing into defensive inhibition. Individuals high on strength of excitation are not held back by threatening situations; under intense circumstances, they are not inclined to stand by with folded arms. They love to undertake risky activities. Furthermore, they lack emotional disturbances in stressful situations. When they have to perform under severe social or physical pressure, then, they are still able to behave in highly efficient ways. Moreover, they are better able to withstand fatigue during conditions of intense or long-lasting stimulation. Finally, they can operate in an adequate way, even when they are under severe emotional strain. Strength of inhibition refers to the capacity of the nervous system for conditioned inhibition. Strength of inhibition concerns the ability of restraining from emotional, verbal, or motor reactions. People high on scales for strength of inhibition, compared with low-scorers, can easily delay their actions and are less disturbed when interrupted. Mobility reflects the degree of mobility or flexibility in the nervous system, manifested in the individual's capacity for responding quickly and adequately to all sorts of changing environmental conditions.

Summarizing, it can be said that the picture of the role of personality factors in the development of homesickness is far from complete (see also Van Tilburg, Vingerhoets, & Van Heck, 1996; Eurelings-Bontekoe, this volume). Until now there are no systematic attempts to relate homesickness to the major individual difference variables of modern temperament and personality psychology. Therefore, the major aim of the research reported in this chapter was to fill this gap. For instance, information on Extraversion and Neuroticism, the 'Big Two' in the current five-factor approach of personality, is very limited, and information on the other basic factors in the five-factor model is completely absent. The use of this model in homesickness research deserves more attention, because the personality characteristics in the five-factor model "represent individual differences in the qualities or resources individuals can draw upon to solve adaptive problems" (Buss, 1996).

Table 11.1. Situations of the S-R Homesickness Inventory

Item nr.	Duration	Situations	
		Company (with)	Distance ^{1,2}
7	a few days	partner and/or fam	1
3	a few days	partner and/or fam	2
12	a few days	familiar persons	1
1	a few days	familiar persons	2
8	a few days	alone	1
6	a few days	alone	2
2	a couple of months	partner and/or fam	1
11	a couple of months	partner and/or fam	2
9	a couple of months	familiar persons	1
5	a couple of months	familiar persons	2
4	a couple of months	alone	1
10	a couple of months	alone	2

1 = close to home

2 = far away from home

Table 11.2. Response Forms of the S-R Homesickness Inventory

Item nr.	Responses
1	Keeping your mind on your activities
2	Your stomach is giving you troubles
3	Yearning for home
4	Being able to adopt to the new environment
5	Not fancying something
6	Thinking of home
7	Having lack of appetite
8	Trying to get in touch with home
9	Feeling at home in the new environment
10	Being interested in the new things surrounding you
11	Missing home
12	Having sleep problems
13	Withdrawing
14	Feeling homesick

The present research

For the investigations reported here, subjects were recruited via announcements in local newspapers. Three-hundred and thirty persons agreed to participate and asked for sending a test-booklet. Two-hundred and six persons (62%) returned the mailed set of questionnaires. The age of the subjects ranged from 18 to 73 years. Fifty-five subjects were males. Their average age was 45.3 years ($SD = 14.6$). The group of females consisted of 149 persons with an average age of 40.0 years ($SD = 14.5$). In the case of two subjects no information regarding gender was available.

The following measures were employed. Homesickness was measured using a scale (Grujters, 1992) constructed according to the Stimulus-Response Questionnaire methodology (cf. Endler, Hunt, & Rosenstein, 1962; see for a critical review Furnham & Jaspars, 1983). By means of this type of questionnaire data can be collected on cognitions, feelings and behaviors of individuals, sifted according to different reaction forms, in a series of situations. Each individual reports the intensity of every response variable for every situation.

Grujters (1992) presented 12 hypothetical situations (see *Table 11.1*) to subjects and asked them to imagine being in such a situation and to indicate the intensity of their homesickness symptoms, using seven-point scales ranging from 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Very much*). The 12 situation descriptions differed systematically in terms of *distance* (nearby versus far away), *length of stay* (short versus long), and *companionship* (alone versus with acquaintances or close persons).

Fourteen response forms were used in the S-R Homesickness Inventory reflecting cognitions, feelings, bodily reactions, and behaviors indicating homesickness (see *Table 11.2*).

Grujters (1992) found that the situation Short/Nearby/With Familiar Persons was indicated as arousing the least homesick feelings and Long/Far Away/Alone the most. More interesting, however, was the observation that length of stay and type of companionship were more important than distance, as can be seen from an inspection of the means and standard deviations in *Table 11.3*.

The S-R Homesickness Inventory assesses homesickness in a very reliable way. The internal consistency coefficients for each situation range between a lowest value of 0.86 and a highest coefficient of 0.93.

Table 11.3. Means and standard deviations of homesickness scores for the 12 situations of the S-R Homesickness Inventory

Item	Mean	SD
a couple of months-alone-far away from home	44.54	16.32
a couple of months-alone-close to home	42.18	16.48
a couple of months-with fam. persons-far away from home	41.33	16.03
a couple of months-with fam. persons-close to home	38.77	15.22
a few days-alone-far away from home	36.84	16.27
a couple of months-with partner/fam.-far away from home	33.68	14.36
a few days-with fam. persons-far away from home	32.41	13.65
a few days-alone-close to home	32.19	14.34
a few days-with fam. persons-close to home	30.70	13.82
a couple of months-with partner/fam.-close to home	28.87	12.09
a few days-with partner/fam.-far away from home	26.53	12.92
a few days-with partner/fam.-close to home	23.80	10.23

In the present study, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience were measured by using a set of 60 bipolar standard markers, 12 for each of the Big-Five factors, as proposed by Goldberg (1989). Items were administered with 9-step rating scales. The bipolar rating scales ranged from (1) *Very* [Trait A], through (5) *Neither* [Trait A] *nor* [Trait B], to (9) *Very* [Trait B]. In the bipolar inventory, the items were ordered such that those expected to be associated with the same factor were separated by items from each of the other four factors (cf. Goldberg, 1989). The Pavlovian temperament variables were assessed with the Pavlov Temperament Survey (PTS; Strelau, Angleitner, Bantelmann, & Ruch, 1990) with three scales, Strength of Excitation (SE), Strength of Inhibition (SI and Mobility (MO), designed to assess specific properties of the nervous system by means of their behavioral manifestations.

Table 11.4. Factor analysis with Varimax rotation; bipolar trait scales

Bipolar Trait Scales	Factor				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Introverted - extraverted	0.76				
Reserved - spontaneous	0.69	0.33			
Silent - talkative	0.67				
Timid - bold	0.66			0.31	
Inhibited - impulsive	0.64				
Submissive - assertive	0.49			0.42	
Temperamental - even tempered	-0.39		0.33	0.34	
Unkind - kind		0.70			
Uncooperative - cooperative		0.64			
Innconsiderate - considerate		0.61			
Unfriendly - friendly		0.60			
Cold - warm		0.56			
Unsociable - sociable		0.54	0.32		
Selfish - unselfish		0.53			
Inflexible - flexible		0.51	0.40		
Stingy - generous	0.30	0.50	0.31		
Irresponsible - responsible		0.49			0.44
Unenthusiastic - enthusiastic		0.48			0.39
Rude - polite		0.46	0.40		
Distrustful - trustful		0.46			
Imperceptive - perceptive		0.33			0.33
Rash - cautious			0.68		
Frivolous - serious			0.58		
Unfair - fair			0.55		
Negligent - conscientious			0.53		0.31
Unrefined - refined		0.38	0.53		
Unpredictable - predictable			0.48		
Careless - thorough			0.47	0.41	
Disorganized - organized			0.44	0.34	
Extravagant - thrifty			0.43		
Boastful - modest			0.42		
Unreflective - reflective			0.41		
Shallow - deep			0.33		

(Table to be continued)

Table 11.4. (continues)

Bipolar Trait Scales	Factor				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Insecure - secure	0.39			0.75	
Unstable - stable				0.74	
Tensed - relaxed				0.72	
Unassured - self-confident	0.44			0.67	
High-strung - imperturbable				0.66	
Nervous - at ease				0.65	
Irritable - good natured				0.58	
Self-pitying - spartan				0.58	
Unenergetic - energetic		0.37		0.55	
Emotional - unemotional				0.55	
Discontented - contented		0.33		0.55	
Inefficient - efficient			0.35	0.52	
Angry - calm	-0.41			0.50	
Passive - active		0.41		0.45	0.34
Envious - not envious				0.44	
Lazy - hardworking				0.43	
Unsophisticated - sophisticated					0.31
Uncreative - creative					0.80
Not artistic - artistic					0.72
Not innovative - innovative					0.58
Unimaginative - imaginative	0.34				0.58
Impractical - practical					0.55
Undependable - reliable		0.39	0.40		0.42
Not adventurous - adventurous			-0.33		0.36
Unanalytical - analytical			0.30		0.35

Note. Only secondary loadings exceeding |0.30| are presented.

The PTS contains 20 items for each subscale, making it a 60-item questionnaire. The PTS is a reliable instrument: Cronbach's alpha coefficients are 0.88, 0.78 and 0.91 for SE, SI and MO, respectively. The intercorrelations are $r_{SE-SI} = 0.35$, $r_{SE-MO} = 0.64$, and $r_{SI-MO} = 0.25$ (Van Heck, De Raad, & Vingerhoets, 1993). Finally, the Dutch Personality Questionnaire (DPQ; Luteijn, 1974; Luteijn, Starren, & Van Dijk, 1985) was used in order to test earlier findings regarding neuroticism, rigidity and self-esteem. The DPQ is a questionnaire containing 133 *True - ? - False* items arranged in 7 scales: Neuroticism, Social Inadequacy, Rigidity, Hostility, Self-sufficiency, Dominance, and Self-esteem. The questionnaire is based upon the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1987).

The correlations among the self-descriptions obtained with the list of 60 bipolar trait scales were subjected to exploratory factor analysis. A principal components analysis resulted in a five-factor solution. The number of extracted factors was five, based upon the scree plot of eigenvalues (Cattell, 1966). The five varimax factors accounted for 44.7% of the total variance.

Inspection of the varimax-rotated factor-solution (see *Table 11.4*) revealed that the five dimensions did not correspond completely with the usual Big Five pattern. Two striking things happened. First, the surgency aspect of extraversion, as measured by markers such as *Unenergetic—Energetic*, *Passive—Active*, had a primary loading on Emotional Stability. Second, also some Conscientiousness markers, for instance, *Lazy—Hardworking*, moved to Emotional Stability. In spite of these peculiarities, the five factors clearly reflect the Big Five. Therefore, Factor I is conventionally labeled Extraversion, Factor II Agreeableness, Factor III Conscientiousness, Factor IV Emotional Stability, and Factor V Openness to Experience. Cronbach alpha's were rather satisfactory: 0.71 (Extraversion), 0.85 (Agreeableness), 0.73 (Conscientiousness), 0.89 (Emotional Stability), and 0.78 (Openness to Experience).

Table 11.5. Personality and Homesickness: Big Five data

Big Five	Total (N=199)	Males (N=55)	Females (N=142)
Extraversion	-0.24***	-0.37***	-0.22**
Agreeableness	-0.09	-0.16	-0.08
Conscientiousness	-0.05	0.09	0.01
Emotional stability	-0.42***	-0.29*	-0.42***
Openness to experience	-0.02***	-0.29*	-0.21***

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 11.5 contains the correlations of the Big Five scores with a Total Homesickness score (average score over all situations for 13 response forms, excluding the 'Feeling homesick' item; see *Tables 11.1 and 11.2*). *Table 11.4* reveals that the pattern of relationships is more or less the same for males and females. For the total group ($N = 199$; 55 males and 142 females) significant correlations were found in the case of Extraversion, Emotional Stability, and Openness to Experience. The data reveal that introverted, neurotic persons who are closed to new experiences are especially vulnerable. The correlations between PTS scores and the Total Homesickness score are presented in *Table 11.6*.

Table 11.6. Temperament and Homesickness; Pavlov Temperament Survey (PTS) data

PTS scales	Total (N=205)	Males (N=55)	Females (N=148)
Strenght and Excitation (SE)	-0.49**	-0.41**	-0.49**
Strength of Inhibition (SI)	-0.22**	-0.08	-0.23*
Mobility (MO)	-0.57**	-0.55**	-0.57**

* $p < 0.01$; ***, $p < 0.001$.

Strength of Excitation correlated negatively with homesickness. Looking at different aspects of Strength of Excitation (data not shown in *Table 11.6*), it was found that the highest correlations were obtained for a facet of Strength of Excitation reflecting the fact that having to act under social and/or physical load does not evoke emotional disturbances ($r = -.45$, $p < .001$, for males as well as females).

With respect to Strength of Inhibition, we see a modest negative correlation with homesickness. But here the gender effect is clear. Only female subjects produced significant correlations. The highest correlations were obtained for females in the case of items that reflect difficulties in waiting with task performance when delay of such performance is expected.

For obvious reasons, in the case of Mobility, the highest correlations were expected. These expectations were confirmed by the results. Substantial negative correlations, for males as well as females, were found between Mobility and homesickness, especially for Mobility-items regarding adaptation to new surroundings.

The correlations between DPQ scores and homesickness are presented in *Table 11.7*. With the exception of self-sufficiency, all variables correlated significantly with homesickness. The analysis of the total data set revealed relatively high positive correlations between neuroticism and social inadequacy, on the one hand, and homesickness, on the other hand. Furthermore, it was found that homesickness was negatively related to dominance and self-esteem. In separate analyses for males and females, the same pattern was obtained for the two groups. However, in the case of females there were also positive links with rigidity and hostility.

Table 11.7. Personality and Homesickness: Dutch Personality Questionnaire data

Big Five	Total (N=205)	Males (N=55)	Females (N=148)
Neuroticism	0.49 ^{***}	0.32 ^{**}	0.50 ^{***}
Social inadequacy	0.45 ^{***}	0.41 ^{***}	0.45 ^{***}
Rigidity	0.21 ^{***}	0.04	0.29 ^{***}
Hostility	0.15 ^{**}	-0.01	0.24 ^{**}
Self-sufficiency	0.05	-0.10	0.12
Dominance	-0.31 ^{***}	-0.24 [*]	-0.30 ^{**}
Self-esteem	-0.47 ^{***}	-0.45 ^{***}	-0.46 ^{***}

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Discussion

The results reported here provide positive evidence for links between basic individual difference variables and homesickness. According to the correlations in the *Tables 11.6, 11.7 and 11.8*, homesick individuals, males as well as females, are relatively introverted, emotional unstable, and closed to new experiences. Furthermore, they have less ability to act in adequate ways under emotional strain, they have difficulties with restraining from emotional, verbal or motor reactions. They further lack the capacity to adapt to changing environmental conditions. Finally, they have a negative view of themselves as reflected in low scores on self-esteem. In addition, female homesick persons are also inclined towards rigidity and submissiveness. The picture that emerges from these characterizations represents an extension of our knowledge regarding the role of personality in homesickness. Earlier found associations, especially those regarding extraversion-introversion and emotional stability-neuroticism (e.g., Bergsma, 1963; Eurelings-Bontekoe et al., 1994, 1995, 1996; Fisher, 1989; Fontijn, 1990; Gasselsberger, 1982), could be replicated. In addition to these replications, new information could be obtained with respect to other broad supertraits, such as Openness to Experience, and temperamental factors reflecting important formal characteristics of behavior, such as Mobility in nervous system processes.

Van Tilburg et al. (1996) have proposed a distinction between (1) homesickness that is linked to the adversity of the new environment and (2) homesickness that reflects missing the old environment or significant persons. It is conceivable that the first type of homesickness is related to other personality characteristics than the other type. For instance, it can be expected that scores on the fifth of the Big Five, Openness to Experience, are more substantially linked to

the first type of homesickness than to the second type. Thus an interesting issue for research would be the extent to which personality is related to different types of homesickness.

We would like to close this chapter by suggesting ways in which research on homesickness phenomena might be improved. We believe that future investigations could benefit by greater use of theory. Recently, Scheier and Bridges (1995) have pointed to this in the broader context of the mediating and moderating roles of personality with respect to stress-illness relationships: "Often variables are included in protocols simply because the relevant measures are readily available. This gives rise to a disjointed literature that is hard to integrate and understand. Future research needs to be more focused and more systematic. To accomplish this task, more comprehensive biobehavioral models are needed that integrate psychological and biological characteristics and mechanisms" (Scheier & Bridges, 1995, p. 266). Taking this statement seriously, we would like to point to two theoretical frameworks that might have a high relevancy for further research on the role of personality in homesickness, due to the fact that both models make possible to study personality as an organized system or a complex of systems with many different components.

The first model has been suggested by McCrae and Costa (1996) in an attempt to construct a metatheoretical framework for personality theories. This framework contains five categories of personality variables: (1) *basic tendencies* which define the individual's potential and direction and which include the five major personality dimensions but also physical characteristics, cognitive capacities, physiological drives, and focal vulnerabilities; (2) *characteristic adaptations* such as learned behaviors, interpersonal adaptations, acquired competencies, attitudes, beliefs, and goals; (3) the *self-concept*; (4) the *objective biography*, and (5) *external influences* reflecting developmental influences such as parent-child relations, peer socialization and education, as well as microenvironmental (e.g., situational constraints, motivational press) and macroenvironmental influences (e.g., culture, subculture, neighborhood).

The second model is the model of ecological congruence, developed by Hobfoll (1988), which states that *resources* (e.g., social support, personality resources, coping strategies) will reduce or increase psychological and physical strains or will have no effect on psychological distress and physical symptoms, depending upon the fact whether the resource complex meets, does not meet, or interferes with task demands, emotional demands and biological demands made on the individual. Crucial in this framework is the *fit of resources with demands*, which will depend on several factors, such as environmental constraints, personal and cultural values, perceptions of degree of threat, assessment of need, and perceptions of the availability and suitability of potential support as seen by the individual for a given situation.

Both models allow to study personality-homesickness relationships from a holistic ecological perspective. We strongly believe that only by focussing on the person's unique patterns of adjustment to the environment, we will deepen our understanding of the 'forgotten' phenomenon of homesickness.

References

- Bergsma, J. (1963). *Militair heimwee* [Homesickness in the army]. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Groningen: Groningen University.
- Brewin, C. R., Furnham, A., & Howes, M. (1989). Demographic and psychological determinants of homesickness and confiding among students. *British Journal of Psychology*, 80, 467-477.
- Buss, A. H., & Plomin, R. (1984). *Temperament: Early developing personality traits*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Buss, D. M. (1996). Social adaptation and five major factors of personality. In: J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of personality. Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 180-207). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Carden, A. I., & Feicht, R. (1991). Homesickness among American and Turkish college students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 22, 418-428.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavior Research*, 1, 140-161.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1984). Personality as a lifelong determinant of well-being. In: C. Malatesta & C. Izard (Eds.), *Affective processes in adult development and aging* (pp. 141-157). Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Endler, N. S., Hunt, J. McV., & Rosenstein, A. (1962). An S-R Inventory of Anxiousness. *Psychological Monographs*, 536, 1-31.
- Eurelings-Bontekoe, E. H. M., Tolsma, A., Verschuur, M. J., & Vingerhoets, A. J. J. M. (1996). Construction of a homesickness questionnaire using a female population with two types of self-reported homesickness: Preliminary results. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20, 415-421.
- Eurelings-Bontekoe, E. H. M., Verschuur, M., Koudstaal, A., Van der Sar, S. et al. (1995). Construction of a homesickness questionnaire: Preliminary results. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19, 319-325.
- Eurelings-Bontekoe, E., Vingerhoets, A. J. J. M., & Fontijn, A. (1994). Personality characteristics of conscripts suffering from homesickness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 16, 229-235.
- Fisher, S. (1989). *Homesickness, cognition, and health*. London: Erlbaum.
- Fontijn, A. J. (1990). *Heimwee als een stress-reactie* [Homesickness as a reaction to stress]. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Leyden: Leyden University.
- Furnham, A., & Jaspars, J. (1983). The evidence for interactionism in psychology. A critical analysis of the situation-response inventories. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 4, 627-644.
- Gasselsberger, K. (1982). Depressionsfördernde soziale und territoriale Faktoren von Heimweh-Reaktionen [Depression-related social and territorial factors of homesickness reactions]. *Zeitschrift für Klinische Psychologie, Forschung und Praxis*, 11, 186-200.
- Goldberg, L. (1982). From Ace to Zombie: Some explorations in the language of personality. In: C. D. Spielberger & J. N. Butcher (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (Vol. 1, pp. 203-234). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Goldberg, L. R. (June, 1989). *Standard Markers of the Big-Five factor structure*. Invited Workshop

- on Personality Language, University of Groningen, The Netherlands.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-34.
- Gough, H. G. (1987). *The California Psychological Inventory administrator's guide*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Grujters, I. (1992). *Heimwee en situatiekenmerken* [Homesickness and situation characteristics]. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Tilburg: Tilburg University.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1988). *The ecology of stress*. New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.
- John, O. P. (1990). The 'Big Five' factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In: L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality. Theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York/London: The Guilford Press.
- John, O.P., Angleitner, A., & Ostendorf, F. (1988). The lexical approach to personality: A historical review of trait taxonomic research. *European Journal of Personality*, 2, 171-203.
- Luteijn, F. (1974). *De constructie van een persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst* [The construction of a personality questionnaire]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Groningen University, Groningen, The Netherlands.
- Luteijn, F., Starren, J., & Van Dijk, H. (1985). *Handleiding bij de NPV (Herziene uitgave)* [Manual of the Dutch Personality Questionnaire (rev. ed.)]. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- McCrae, R. R. (1994). Openness to experience: Expanding the boundaries of Factor V. In: B. De Raad & G. L. Van Heck (Eds.), *The fifth of the Big Five*. Special issue of the *European Journal of Personality*, 8, 251-272.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1986). Clinical assessment can benefit from recent advances in personality psychology. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1001-1003.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1991). Adding Liebe und Arbeit: The full Five-Factor Model and well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 227-232.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1996). Toward a new generation of personality theories: Theoretical contexts for the five-factor model. In: J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of personality. Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 51-87). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 574-583.
- Rümke, H. C. (1940). Over heimwee [On homesickness]. *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde*, 84, 3658-3665.
- Scheier, M. F., & Bridges, M. W. (1995). Person variables and health: Personality predispositions and acute psychological states as shared determinants for disease. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 57, 255-268.
- Strelau, J. (1983). *Temperament- personality- activity*. New York: Academic Press.
- Strelau, J., Angleitner, A., Bantelmann, J., & Ruch, W. (1990). The Strelau Temperament Inventory Revised (STI-R): Theoretical considerations and scale development. *European Journal of Personality*, 4, 209-235.
- Thomas, A., Chess, S., Birch, H., Hertzog, M., & Korn, S. (1963). *Behavioral individuality in early childhood*. New York: New York University Press.
- Tupes, E. C., & Christal, R. E. (1961). *Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings* (USAF ASD Tech. Rep. No. 61-97). Lackland Air Force Base, TX: U.S. Air Force. Reprinted in *Journal of Personality* (1992), 225-251.
- Van Heck, G. L., De Raad, B., & Vingerhoets, A. J. J. M. (1993). De Pavlov Temperament Schaal

(PTS) [The Pavlov Temperament Survey (PTS)]. *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor de Psychologie*, 48, 141-142.

Van Tilburg, M. A. L., Vingerhoets, A. J. J. M., & Van Heck, G. L. (1996). Homesickness: A review of the literature. *Psychological Medicine*, 26, 899-912.