CHAPTER VII
CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS

The present chapter intends to examine the relationship of conflict management styles with emotional intelligence, spiritual intelligence and personality types of undergraduates. The following hypotheses have been tested in the present chapter:

5.

(a) There exists significant relationship between conflict management styles and emotional intelligence of undergraduates.

(b) There exists significant relationship between conflict management styles and spiritual intelligence of undergraduates.

(c) There exists significant relationship between conflict management styles and personality types of undergraduates.

Testing of Hypotheses

7.5.1 Hypothesis 5(a)

Hypothesis 5(a) states, “There exists significant relationship between conflict management styles and emotional intelligence of undergraduates.”

Results

Hypothesis 5(a) has been tested with the help of Table 7.5.1.

Table 7.5.1
Coefficients of correlation between conflict management styles (CMS) and emotional intelligence (N=954)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Management Style</th>
<th>Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing</td>
<td>-0.330**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>0.273**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>0.131**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>-0.307**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td>0.286**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level  ** Significant at .01 level
Table 7.5.1 represents the coefficients of correlation between different conflict management styles and various dimensions of emotional intelligence. The entries made in this table show that the coefficients of correlations between competing CMS and emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) are -0.330, -0.138, -0.174 and -0.280 respectively, which are all significant at 0.01 level of significance.

The coefficients of correlation between collaborating CMS and emotional sensitivity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) are 0.273, 0.140 and 0.213 respectively which are all significant at 0.01 level. The coefficient of correlation between collaborating CMS and emotional maturity dimension of emotional intelligence is 0.066 which is significant at 0.05 level.

The coefficients of correlation between compromising CMS and emotional sensitivity and emotional intelligence (Total) are 0.131 and 0.105 respectively, which are significant at 0.01 level. The coefficient of correlation between compromising CMS and emotional competency dimension of emotional intelligence is 0.067, which is significant at 0.05 level. Further, the coefficient of correlation between compromising CMS and emotional maturity is 0.043, which is not significant.

The entries made in Table 7.5.1 further show that the coefficients of correlations between avoiding CMS and emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) are -0.307, -0.141, -0.206 and -0.290 respectively, which are all significant at 0.01 level of significance. Further, the coefficients of correlation calculated between accommodating CMS and emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) are 0.286, 0.186, 0.200 and 0.294 respectively which are all positively correlated and are significant at 0.01 level of significance.

Discussion of results

The results entered in Table 7.5.1 indicate that the different dimensions of emotional intelligence, namely, emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) have a negative but significant relationship with competing conflict management style. This means that the undergraduates who have higher emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and total emotional intelligence give less preference to competing
conflict management in a conflict. It can be concluded that the undergraduates who tackle emotional upsets well, balance the state of heart and mind, are honest in interpersonal dealings and who handle the dynamics of human behaviour well are low in pursuing their own concerns at other person’s expense.

Table 7.5.1 further reveals that emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) have a significant and positive relationship with collaborating CMS. The positive relationship shows that the undergraduates who have higher emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) make higher use of collaborating CMS. It implies that the undergraduates with high ability to respond tactfully to emotional stimuli, identify and express feelings, understand the threshold of emotional arousal and appropriately respond to a vast variety of emotional stimuli are both assertive as well as cooperative while dealing with conflicts in life.

The relationship of compromising CMS with different dimensions of emotional intelligence, namely, emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) reveals that the compromising CMS is significantly and positively correlated to emotional sensitivity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total). It means that the higher the emotional sensitivity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) among undergraduates, the more compromising CMS they use in situations of conflict. It implies that the more the emotionally sensitive, competent and emotionally intelligent the undergraduates, the more compromising they are i.e. the more they try to seek a quick middle ground position while encountering a conflicting situation. Further, there is no significant relationship of maturity dimension of emotional intelligence with compromising CMS which means that emotional maturity is not correlated to compromising CMS of undergraduates.

The correlational values worked out between avoiding CMS and sensitivity, maturity, competency and emotional intelligence (Total) are all negative and statistically significant. It means that the less developed the emotional intelligence of undergraduates, the more avoiding they are in a conflict. It can be interpreted that the undergraduates low in emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) tend to diplomatically side step an issue, postpone an issue until a better time or simply withdraw from a threatening
situation in a conflict. Further, the accommodating CMS of undergraduates is positively and significantly correlated with emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total). These results suggest that the higher the emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) of the undergraduates, the more often they use accommodating CMS, i.e. when in a conflict, the undergraduates with high emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence neglect their own concerns to satisfy the concerns of the other person in a conflict.

On the basis of discussion of results, it can be concluded that emotional intelligence and its dimensions are significantly correlated with the conflict management styles of undergraduates. The undergraduates who are sensitive, mature, competent and hence emotionally intelligent are less competing while resolving conflicts. The undergraduates who are high on emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) are more collaborating in conflict management. Further, the undergraduates who have high emotional sensitivity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) are more compromising in resolving conflicts whereas there is no correlation between emotional maturity and compromising conflict management style. Further, the undergraduates who are low in emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, emotional competency and emotional intelligence (Total) use avoiding style of managing conflicts more frequently than those who are higher on these dimensions and vice versa. Also, the undergraduates with high emotional intelligence (Total) and its dimensions, namely, emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity and emotional competency prefer accommodating style of conflict management more than those with low emotional intelligence.

Hence, Hypothesis 5(a), namely, “There exists significant relationship between conflict management styles and emotional intelligence of undergraduates” stands accepted to a great extent. These results are in line with the findings of Abas (2010), Abas et al. (2012), Ely (2006), Henderson (2006) and Lee (2003) who have found positive relationship of emotional intelligence with integrating and compromising CMS; Aliasgari anf Farzadnia (2012) and Ellis (2010) who have found significant relationship between emotional intelligence and CMS. These results also support the findings of Malek (2000) and Morrison (2005) who have found significant
relationships between emotional intelligence and collaborative CMS and Kumar (2012) who has found significant positive correlation between emotional intelligence and collaborating, accommodating and avoiding conflict management styles. The results are also in line with the findings of Di Fabio and Blustein (2010), Kimball and Scot (2004), Majid (2006), On (2009), Rahim et al. (2002) who have reported significant correlations between conflict management style and emotional intelligence. Further, the results are in contradiction with the findings of Morrison (2005) who has found negative relationship between accommodating CMS and emotional intelligence and Gambill (2008), Ivshin (2001) who has found no significant correlations between emotional intelligence and conflict management styles.

7.5.2 Hypothesis 5(b)

Hypothesis 5(b) states, “There exists significant relationship between conflict management styles and spiritual intelligence of undergraduates.”

Results

To test Hypothesis 5(b), Table 7.5.2 has been prepared.

Table 7.5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Management Style</th>
<th>Critical Existential Thinking</th>
<th>Personal Meaning Production</th>
<th>Transcendental Awareness</th>
<th>Conscious State Expansion</th>
<th>Spiritual Intelligence (Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competing</td>
<td>-0.086*</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.187**</td>
<td>0.154**</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>0.078**</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.100**</td>
<td>-0.125**</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.091**</td>
<td>0.077*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.072**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>-0.164*</td>
<td>-0.242**</td>
<td>-0.221*</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-0.179**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td>0.137**</td>
<td>0.130**</td>
<td>0.257**</td>
<td>-0.110**</td>
<td>0.132**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level  ** Significant at .01 level
Table 7.5.2 represents the coefficients of correlation between different conflict management styles and various components of spiritual intelligence. The entries made in this table show that the coefficients of correlations between competing CMS and various components of spiritual intelligence, including, critical existential thinking, transcendental awareness and conscious state expansion are -0.086, -0.187 and 0.154 respectively, which are all significant at 0.01 level of significance; whereas the coefficients of correlation between competing CMS and personal meaning production and spiritual intelligence (Total) are -0.008 and -0.037, respectively which are not found to be statistically significant.

The correlation coefficients calculated between collaborating CMS and transcendental awareness and conscious state expansion components of SI are 0.100 and -0.125 respectively, which are significant at 0.01 level. The calculated correlation coefficient between collaborating CMS and critical existential thinking is 0.078, which is significant at 0.05 level. The results also show that the coefficients of correlations between collaborating CMS and personal meaning production and spiritual intelligence (Total) are 0.050 and 0.028 respectively, both of which are statistically insignificant.

The coefficients of correlation between compromising CMS and personal meaning production and spiritual intelligence (Total) are 0.091 and 0.072 respectively, which are significant at 0.01 level. The coefficient of correlation between compromising CMS and transcendental awareness has been worked out as 0.077, which is significant at 0.05 level. Further, the correlation coefficients calculated between compromising CMS and critical existential thinking and conscious state expansion are 0.052 and 0.000 respectively, which are statistically insignificant.

The coefficients of correlation calculated between avoiding CMS and critical existential thinking, personal meaning production, transcendental awareness and spiritual intelligence (Total) are -0.164, -0.242, -0.221 and -0.179 respectively which are all significant at 0.01 level and the correlation coefficient between avoiding CMS and conscious state expansion is 0.068, which is statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. Table 7.5.2 further shows that the coefficients of correlations between accommodating CMS and critical existential thinking, personal meaning production, transcendental awareness, conscious state expansion and spiritual intelligence (Total) are 0.137, 0.130, 0.257, -0.110 and 0.132 respectively, which are all significant at 0.01 level of significance.
Discussion of results

The results entered in Table 7.5.2 represent the coefficients of correlation between conflict management styles and spiritual intelligence. The results show that the competing CMS is negatively but significantly related to critical existential thinking and transcendental awareness components of spiritual intelligence; on the other hand, competing CMS and conscious state expansion are positively and significantly related. This suggests that the undergraduates who are lower on critical existential thinking and transcendental awareness, i.e. who have less developed ability to critically contemplate existential as well as non-existential issues and the ability to identify patterns of self give more preference to competing CMS in situations of conflict. On the other hand, the undergraduates who are high in conscious state expansion are more competing in managing conflicts which suggests that the undergraduates who have higher pure and cosmic consciousness make higher use of competing CMS. The insignificant coefficients of correlation between competing CMS and personal meaning production dimension of spiritual intelligence and total spiritual intelligence suggests that personal meaning production and total spiritual intelligence do not influence the undergraduates’ choice of competing CMS.

Table 7.5.2 further shows that the coefficients of correlations between collaborating CMS and critical existential thinking and personal meaning production are positive as well as significant which suggests that the undergraduates who have more developed critical existential thinking and personal meaning production, i.e. the undergraduates who critically contemplate existential and non-existential issues as well as the undergraduates who derive purpose from all experiences are more collaborating in resolving conflicts and vice versa. But the results show negative relationship between conscious state expansion and collaborating CMS which implies that the undergraduates with high conscious state expansion, i.e. the ability to enter and exit higher states of consciousness are less collaborating in conflict management. The results further reveal that personal meaning production and spiritual intelligence (Total) are not correlated with collaborating CMS as is evident from their insignificant coefficients of correlation. This suggests that personal meaning production and spiritual intelligence (Total) do not influence the choice of collaborating CMS of undergraduates.
The results also reveal that spiritual intelligence (Total) and its components including personal meaning production and transcendental awareness are positively and significantly correlated with compromising CMS. It implies that the higher the personal meaning production, transcendental awareness and spiritual intelligence (Total) of undergraduates, the more compromising they would be and vice versa. However, no relationship has been recorded between compromising CMS and critical existential thinking and conscious state expansion components of spiritual intelligence which implies that critical existential thinking and conscious state expansion do not affect the use of compromising CMS of the undergraduates.

Table 7.5.2 further shows that there is negative but significant correlation between avoiding CMS and spiritual intelligence (Total) and its components i.e. critical existential thinking, personal meaning production and transcendental awareness. The results suggest that the lesser the critical existential thinking, personal meaning production, transcendental awareness and spiritual intelligence the undergraduates have, the more the avoiding they would be, i.e. the undergraduates who have lower set of adaptive mental capacities which are related to one’s existence, personal meaning, transcendence and spiritual intelligence are higher in the use of avoiding CMS. Such undergraduates postpone issues or withdraw from threatening situations in conflict. Further, the significant and positive coefficient of correlation between avoiding CMS and conscious state expansion suggests that the undergraduates with high conscious state expansion, i.e. expanded states of consciousness are more avoiding in situations of conflicts.

The coefficients of correlation between accommodating CMS and components of spiritual intelligence, namely, critical existential thinking, personal meaning production, transcendental awareness and spiritual intelligence (Total) are all significant and positive. It can be interpreted that the higher the critical existential thinking, personal meaning production, transcendental awareness and spiritual intelligence of undergraduates, the higher they use the accommodating CMS in situations of conflict. Further, the negative but significant correlation coefficient between accommodating CMS and conscious state expansion suggests that the undergraduates who are low in conscious state expansion make higher use of accommodating CMS and vice versa.
On the basis of discussion of results, it can be concluded that the undergraduates who are high on conscious state expansion and low in critical existential thinking and transcendental awareness components of spiritual intelligence are more competing. Further, the undergraduates who have more developed critical existential thinking and transcendental awareness, they are more collaborating in conflict management; and those who have highly developed conscious state expansion are less collaborating.

It can also be concluded that more developed the personal meaning production and transcendental awareness and total spiritual intelligence of undergraduates, the more compromising they are. The undergraduates who have less developed critical existential thinking, personal meaning production, transcendental awareness and spiritual intelligence (Total) are more avoiding in conflict management. Also, the undergraduates who have highly developed conscious state expansion are more avoiding. Finally, the undergraduates who are high on critical existential thinking, personal meaning production, transcendental awareness and spiritual intelligence (Total) are more accommodating in conflict management, while the undergraduates who have more developed conscious state expansion are less accommodating.

Hence, Hypothesis 5(b), namely, “There exists significant relationship between conflict management styles and spiritual intelligence of undergraduates” has been accepted to a great extent. The present findings are partially in line with the findings of Animasahun (2008) who has found out positive correlations between spiritual intelligence and conflict management styles of respondents.

7.5.3 Hypothesis 5(c)

Hypothesis 5(c) states, “There exists significant relationship between conflict management styles and personality types of undergraduates.”

Results

Hypothesis 5(c) has been tested with the help of Table 7.5.3.
Table 7.5.3

*Coefficients of correlation between conflict management styles (CMS) and personality types (N=954)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Management Style</th>
<th>Boldness</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Self-Sufficiency</th>
<th>Social Warmth</th>
<th>Introversion Extraversion (Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competing</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.265**</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.146**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>0.109**</td>
<td>-0.199**</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.092**</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>0.100**</td>
<td>0.204**</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.215**</td>
<td>-0.105**</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.122**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level  **Significant at .01 level

Table 7.5.3 shows the coefficients of correlation between conflict management styles and various dimensions of personality. The entries made in this table show that the coefficients of correlations worked out between competing CMS and different dimensions of personality, i.e. competition and introversion-extraversion (Total) are 0.265, and 0.146 respectively, which are significant at 0.01 level of significance. The correlation coefficients between competing CMS and boldness, enthusiasm, self-sufficiency, and social warmth are -0.027, 0.056, -0.029 and 0.035 respectively, all of which are statistically insignificant. The coefficients of correlation between collaborating CMS and boldness and competition dimensions of personality are 0.109 and -0.199 respectively, which are significant at 0.01 level. The coefficient of correlation between collaborating CMS and social warmth is 0.070, which is significant at 0.05 level. The coefficients of correlation calculated between collaborating CMS and enthusiasm, self-sufficiency, and introversion-extraversion (Total) are 0.017, 0.018, and 0.013 respectively, which are all statistically insignificant.

The calculated value of coefficient of correlation between compromising CMS and competition is -0.092, which is significant at 0.01 level of statistical significance. The coefficients of correlation worked out between compromising CMS and boldness, enthusiasm, self-sufficiency, social warmth and introversion-extraversion (Total) are 0.017, 0.029, -0.026, -0.047 and -0.051 respectively. All these values are statistically insignificant. The coefficients of correlation calculated between avoiding CMS and
various dimensions of personality, i.e. boldness and competition are 0.100 and 0.204, which are significant at 0.01 level of significance. The coefficients of correlation between avoiding CMS and enthusiasm, self-sufficiency, social warmth and introversion-extraversion (Total) are 0.007, -0.026, -0.057 and 0.007 respectively, which are all statistically insignificant.

Table 7.5.3 further shows that the coefficients of correlations between accommodating CMS and competition, enthusiasm and introversion-extraversion (Total) dimensions of personality are -0.215, -0.105 and -0.122 respectively, which are all significant at 0.01 level of significance; whereas the correlation coefficients between accommodating CMS and boldness, self-sufficiency and social warmth dimensions of personality are -0.040, 0.060 and 0.000 respectively, all of which are statistically insignificant.

**Discussion of results**

The results entered in Table 7.5.3 show the coefficients of correlation between conflict management styles and various dimensions of personality, namely, boldness, competition, enthusiasm, self-sufficiency, social warmth and introversion-extraversion (Total). The results indicate positive and significant correlations between competing CMS and two dimensions of personality i.e. competition as well as introversion-extraversion (Total) which shows that the undergraduates who are high on competition and introversion-extraversion (Total) dimensions are more competing in resolving conflicts. It implies that the undergraduates who are self-assured and extroverts give more preference to competing CMS in managing conflicts. There is no relationship between competing CMS and boldness, enthusiasm, self-sufficiency and social warmth dimensions of personality which suggests that these dimensions of personality are not associated with the use of competing CMS of the undergraduates.

The undergraduates who are high on boldness and social warmth dimensions of personality, i.e. the undergraduates who are sociable and good natured are more collaborating while the undergraduates high on competition dimension of personality are less collaborating in conflict management. Further, enthusiasm, self-sufficiency and introversion-extraversion (Total) are not correlated with the collaborating style of management of conflict. The results with regard to compromising CMS and different dimensions of personality reveal that the undergraduates with higher level of
competition dimension of personality, i.e. the undergraduates who have more developed competition skills are less compromising in a conflict situation as is evident from the significant negative correlation between the two. Further, various dimensions of personality, namely boldness, enthusiasm, self-sufficiency, social warmth and introversion-extraversion (Total) do not have any relationship with the choice of compromising CMS of the undergraduates.

Further, there is significant positive correlation between avoiding CMS and two dimensions of personality types, namely, boldness and competition. It implies that the more sociable and independent-minded the undergraduates are, the more avoiding they would be in a conflict. The other dimensions of personality, i.e. enthusiasm, self-sufficiency, social warmth and introversion-extraversion (Total) are not significantly correlated with avoiding CMS. This means there is no relationship of these dimensions of personality with avoiding style of conflict management.

The results also reveal that competition, enthusiasm and introversion-extraversion (Total) dimensions of personality are significantly and negatively correlated with accommodating CMS. The negative relationship shows that the undergraduates who are more competitive, enthusiastic and extroverts, they are less accommodating while in a conflicting situation. However, the accommodating CMS has not been found to be significantly correlated with boldness, self-sufficiency and social warmth dimensions of personality.

It can be concluded from the discussion of results that the undergraduates who are competitive and extroverts use competing CMS in a conflict situation and vice versa. The relationship of collaborating conflict management style with different dimensions of personality indicates that the undergraduates who are bold and socially warm are more collaborating in conflict management and vice versa. Also, the undergraduates who are high in boldness and competition dimensions of personality use the avoiding conflict management mode more often. The results further reveal that undergraduates who are more competitive are less collaborating, less compromising and less accommodating in conflict management.

The boldness, enthusiasm, self-sufficiency and social warmth dimensions of personality types are not correlated with the competing conflict management style of undergraduates. The dimensions of personality, namely, enthusiasm, self-sufficiency
and introversion-extraversion (Total) are not correlated with the collaborating conflict management style of the undergraduates. Also, boldness, enthusiasm, self-sufficiency, social warmth and introversion-extraversion (Total) are not related with the compromising conflict management style of the undergraduates. The enthusiasm, self-sufficiency, social warmth and introversion-extraversion (Total) do not have any relationship with the avoiding conflict management style of undergraduates. Further, the dimensions of personality, namely, boldness, self-sufficiency, social warmth and introversion-extraversion (Total) do not have any relationship with accommodating conflict management style.

Hence, Hypothesis 5(c), namely, “There exists significant relationship between conflict management styles and personality types of undergraduates” stands partially accepted. The above results support the findings of Antonioni (1998), Earnest (1992), Garcia (1995), Landa-Gonzalez (2005) and Marion (1995) who have given mixed results for relationship between conflict management styles and personality types. The present findings are also in line with the findings of Moberg (2001) who has found that preferences for conflict strategies are found to relate to personality dimensions. The results are partially in contradiction to the findings of Whitworth (2005) who has found that no relationship exists between the personality factor and the preferred conflict handling mode.