CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Conflict is unavoidable in any interpersonal association or among members of any group. People come across numerous types of conflicts at varied times in their lives and vision of what is really apt to do. Conflict and related situations are most evidently viewed in adolescence and early adulthood as these are the phases of heightened energies and sensations in a person’s life. Most adolescents find conflicts in their personal dealings quite stressful and any conflict during this phase of life becomes overwhelmingly excruciating.

Adolescents usually avoid dealing with conflict because they consider conflict as something to be avoided or an experience of failure. However, the conflict does not lead to failure, or even to the termination of a relationship. The conflict management style is unique to every individual as is his personality. Every person starts out with a combination of ingredients that make him different from others. He is born with his own temperamental traits which constitute his personality and this is one of the underlying factors which help to decide how an individual manages a conflicting situation. Likewise, the intelligence of a person has a considerable role to play in deciding the style of managing conflict.

2.1 Conflict Management Styles

Different conflict management styles have been suggested by different psychologists. To describe the conflict management styles, the constituent terms - conflict and conflict management need to be described first and then define the term ‘conflict management styles’.

2.1.1 Conflict

Conflict, whether called by that name or some other, has already obtruded into several lines of psychological inquiry (Berlyne, 1960). Conflict is a ‘fact of life’; it is no one’s ‘fault’. Conflict is simply the condition in which the perceptions of individuals in conflict appear to be incompatible. Conflicts occur under two conditions - interdependence and differences. Interdependence exists when team members need to work together to satisfy their concerns. Interdependence is especially high in meetings when the team must make decisions that affect all members in a group. So conflicts are common in these meetings and not when team
members are working independently. Differences exist when team members have varying responsibilities, values, temperament, sources of information or experience. With more differences, members bring more diverse concerns to team decision making, tending to create more conflict that needs to be reconciled. Although differences create more conflict within a team, yet at the same time, they also provide an opportunity for richer understanding of an issue. For that reason, organizations often build differences into decision-making teams to make sure that diverse perspectives are represented (Thomas & Thomas, 2004).

Conflict is a condition of disagreement or antagonism. Conflict can be experienced by an individual alone or when he is in a group. Conflicts are omnipresent, come in many types, and have a variable array involving vastly different kinds of parties, ranging from an individual to large macro units such as countries. Some are dramatic and well-publicized, whereas others are much more subtle and hidden from public view (Blalock, 1989).

Individuals and groups who find the difference between them, be it physical, emotional, cultural, behavioural, in attitudes, on the basis of value etc. overpoweringly excruciating take an indifferent course of action. They may gently oppose each other or may become so antagonistic as to generate open conflict. In the words of Blalock (1989), “Conflicts are perhaps most obvious when the contestants are either individual persons as in marital conflicts, or major corporate actors such as two nations at war. Conflicts also involve much more loosely knit quasi-groups such as social classes or ethnic groups, whose boundaries are fuzzy and difficult to define. Conflicts may involve overt physical violence, at the one extreme or much more subtle punitive process, at the other.”

The phenomenon denoted by the term “conflict” has to be limited and undifferentiated; else the notion becomes too comprehensive. In this regard, it is easier to specify what is not considered to be conflict. Competition may be a significant basis of conflict, but it is not considered as conflict or a form of conflict (Coser, 1956; Kerr, 1954; Sorensen, 1951; Wright, 1951). Though closely associated to conflict and considered differentiable are antagonistic interests (Coser, 1956); misunderstandings (Bernard, 1957); aggressiveness (Bernard, 1957; Coser, 1956); hostility or hostile sentiments (Coser, 1956; Williams, 1947); aspiration or intention to combat (Kerr, 1954); public cleavages e.g. along class lines (Chein, 1956); logical
contradiction of targets or interests (Wright, 1951); tensions (Wright, 1951); and rivalry (Wright, 1951). These terms could possibly be among the essential sources of conflict, but not synonyms of conflicts.

Although the definitions of conflict are different from one researcher to another and are dependent on situational variables, conflict can be generally defined as the interaction of individuals who are interdependent, who perceive antagonism of targets, objectives and principles, and who view the other party as potentially meddling with the attainment of these goals (Putnam & Poole, 1987). There are a lot of emotional and intimate relationships e.g. friendship, marriage, or even the relation between parent-children that last for quite some time. Even these relations leave a sediment feeling of dislike and resentment. When this resentment or hostility is directed against people who are otherwise loved, there is conflict (Freud, 1948). He opined that opposite impulses exist parallel in the unconscious, with no discord. Conflict occurs when only the blatant, vocal, symbolic or emotional reactions which are needed to accomplish one motive are mismatched with those necessary to accomplish another. The situation frequently involves other motives that produce incompatible response tendencies.

Deutsch (1949) views conflict as incompatible interaction between two individuals, in which one individual makes the behaviour of other individual less effective by intervening in his working. He argues that the outcomes of conflict depend on cooperative or competitive handling of conflict.

Boulding (1963) defines conflict as “a situation in which the parties are aware of the incompatibility of probable prospects and in which each party wishes to inhabit a position that is incompatible with the wishes of the other.”

In the words of Mitchell (1981), “Conflict attitude means the aggressive or volatile nature of parties, which in a situation of conflict, converts into behaviours.”

According to Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychology (1992), “Conflict is the result of opposed motives applying simultaneously. Most conflicts, for example, between the desire to stay or finish an essay versus the duty of going out with friends, are easy to resolve. Some are much more difficult and result in ability to act and the abandoning of both objectives.”
Encyclopedic Americana (1995) defines conflict as a state of discomfort or strain caused by a person experiencing two or more wishes or needs that are incompatible.

Galtung (1998) refers to conflict as some type of incompatibility where one goal stands in the way of another.

Wilmont and Hocker (2001) state that conflict is an expressed effort between at least two interdependent parties who identify incompatible goals, sparse resources and intrusion from others in achieving their goals.

The New Encyclopaedic Britannica (2002) defines conflict as the stimulation of two or more strong motives that cannot be solved collectively. Psychologically, a conflict exists when the decline of one encouraging stimulus involves an increase in another, so that a new adjustment is demanded.

Conflict is an intricate occurrence because sensations, emotions and ethics are at its core and group cohesion is so sturdy that conflict resolution sometimes becomes a tough task. Conflict starts off from varied places, from myriad sources, arises for varied grounds and in innumerable forms. Conflicts vary in their bases, duration, means, outcomes and consequences. Conflict may be related to opposition or competition, but the two are not alike. Competition may or may not involve awareness, while conflict does. The most important difference is that the two parties in a competition are in quest of similar goals, while parties in a conflict may or may not be in conformity about the desirability and attainment of specific goals (Kriesberg, 1982).

Conflicts really are part of normal everyday life. With too few, life may become monotonous or boring. With too many, life becomes taxing. Conflicts are virtually always caused by individuals having dissimilar points of view or by people trying to accomplish what they want at the cost of others (Hanna, 1996).

Types of conflicts

Different conflicts of various kinds have been studied experimentally, often with rats. According to Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychology (1992) and Encyclopedic Americana (1995), conflicts are classified into three major types:
Approach-avoidance conflicts: In these types of conflicts, a goal is both desired and feared. The individual experiences both the desire to have and the desire to avoid a certain object or goal.

Avoidance-avoidance or double avoidance conflicts: These types of conflicts are very stressful if a choice has to be made. The individual is surrounded by non-satisfying conditions with little hope of achieving the things he desires, as in the example of a man who must choose between the boredom of unemployment and the monotony of a menial job. There is one other condition that commonly frustrates: a barrier that blocks or prevents the achievement of goals, as when lack of money prevents a student from continuing in school.

Approach-approach or double approach conflicts: In such conflicts, the individual is torn between a desire to gain two equally attractive but mutually exclusive goals. An example is the problem of a man who is very happy with his home but who also is anxious to gain a promotion in his job. He is offered the promotion if he will transfer to a much less desirable town.

Forms of conflicts

There are several forms of conflict. Prominent among them are:

Personal conflict: Personal conflict arises when apparent identity or physical traits are different and views are conflicting. Perception and communication are the vehicles to express views, opinions and comments (Kataria, 2005).

Racial conflict: It is a type of group conflict where humanity stands divided on the basis of caste, colour, creed, race etc. (Kataria, 2005).

Class conflict: This type of conflict grows out of one group holding itself superior and trying to dominate another for its own interests (which may include social prestige, ecclesiastical objective, political power or economic advantage) but giving flimsy grounds (Kataria, 2005).

Political conflict: It takes two forms; intranational and international. The former occurs within a nation state while the latter is a war between nations and is the most extensive and devastating form of group conflict (Kataria, 2005).

Endogamous conflict: Any conflict that is generated by internal situation, manifested by the acts of local actors is called endogamous conflict (Walter, 1969).
At individual level, husband and wife dispute over behavioural maladjustment or disagreement of two friends over an issue is a conflict. At group level, labour management conflict over wage-working conditions is of this type (Kataria, 2005).

**Exogamous conflict:** Conflicts which are imported into the systems from outside as in the case of trans-border insurgency (Walter, 1969).

**Communal and non-communal conflicts:** Simpson (1937) illustrates this distinction by illustrating a fundamental cleavage-conflict amid an income tax and a sales tax, presuming that the general agreement to charge taxes of some kind would be a considered as communal conflict and the American Civil War would be a non-communal conflict (Kataria, 2005).

**Extreme, aggressive, violent conflicts and non-violent diplomatic conflict:** Both are differentiated primarily on the basis of coercive means versus persuasive means. It is further assumed that in the former, destruction or annihilation of one of the parties is quite probable while in the latter, diplomatic channel is used for continued discussions to find mutually agreed solution (Kataria, 2005).

**Personal subjective conflict and impersonal objective conflict:** Personal subjective conflict is the conflict where personal relations are involved, e.g. a conflict between parents and children, or between husband and wife. On the other hand, in impersonal objective conflicts, the parties in conflict long for the same objective, e.g. a conflict between two lawyers each representing a client (Kataria, 2005).

**Absolute conflict:** Such conflicts occur between parties that fight to achieve a desired goal or rights or liberation or just to release their tension. One thing common in all absolute conflicts is normlessness. These conflicts are not governed by any law, norm or ethics, do not follow any legitimate or institutional means. Street clashes, riots, communal conflicts and certain international wars are of this kind (Kataria, 2005).

**Realistic conflict and non-realistic conflict:** Realistic conflict is distinguished by conflicting means and ends as well as by incongruity of ethics and interests. In realistic conflict, factors such as resource and position scarcity lead to incompatability of wants and needs. Unrealistic conflict is an anti-social form of hostile behaviour which results from factors such as personal frustration or antagonism and manifests itself as a family scuffle, a race insurgency or a wild shooting spree (Coser, 1968).
**Legitimate conflict and illegitimate conflict:** Any demonstration that is conducted by permissible means agreeable to the system and governed by a set of norms is called legitimate conflict, while conflict of unrecognized agitation, together with its violent nature earns the name illegitimate conflict (Kataria, 2005).

**Institutionalized and non-institutionalized conflict:** Institutionalized conflicts are described by clear set of laws, predictable behaviours and continuity. When conflict groups are recognized and acceptable areas and means of conflict are determined, such conflicts become institutionalized. Institutionalized conflicts can also be called legitimate conflicts because they, too, like the latter, follow agreed means of conflict expression. On the other hand, most racial conflicts, disorganized conflicts are non-institutionalized (Coser, 1968).

**Cultural conflict:** The term cultural conflict is used largely to include all other sorts and even seemingly ‘social’ conflicts between societies on the basis of nature of the contacts, religious interests, rights (Frazier, 1957).

**Ideological conflict:** Ideological conflicts can be described by a collision of “conceptions of the desirable” and authoritarian standards and attitudes which form the basis of governing particular behaviours. Ideological conflicts include the clash of absolute values, conflict of religious tenets or certain political dogmas; concerns what’s right or incorrect, good or dreadful, just or unfair (Kluckhohn, 1951).

**Conflicts of Values:** Values are beliefs about what are desirable and undesirable goals and about ways of reaching the goals (English and English, 1958). Each person has a hierarchy of values and when faced with a conflict between producing wealth or being honest, he/she will normally produce the value which is higher in his/her hierarchy. Conflict of values may arise between two sets of values that are incompatible or made to view compatible.

**Conflict of interests:** This concerns the change over cased by the introduction of new standards by replacing the old standards and roughly explains the dissimilarity between judicial and legislative conflicts. The conflict refers to industrial, global, racial and ethnic conflicts. There is tough competition for securing power and wealth and this has made people self-centric or egocentric. This situation leads to conflicts between have and have-nots on the one hand and within the ‘haves’ for exclusive reach to power and wealth on the other (Kataria, 2005).
**Industrial conflicts:** The basis for many conflicts exist within industrial organizations: between workers and managers, line and staff personnel, different departments (for example, marketing and production), different occupations and trades (such as carpenters and electricians) (Kriesberg, 1982).

**College and university conflicts:** Unlike the consumers of industrial outputs, the primary consumers of college and university services, students, are also organizational members. Divisions exist between many categories of members: faculty, staff, administrators, students and trustees or other supervisory units. Members of each of these categories can be further subdivided (for example, by rank or tenure) and are cross cut by discipline, schools and programs. Incompatibilities in the divisions can lead to conflicts (Kriesberg, 1982).

**Gender conflicts:** Dissensus between men and women in values and beliefs is popularly judged to be highly compatible. As long as each thinks that what the other wants is good for oneself and others, the dissensus can be complementary but as soon as the members of different categories start thinking that the differences between them are incompatible, it becomes a basis of a conflict (Kriesberg, 1982).

**Object conflicts:** These refer to mindful or unmindful variance and misinterpretation about something, often in terms of whether something is correct or not. Hall (2005) says that these are more of “fact” conflicts rather than ethical conflicts (whether a particular thing is correct or incorrect).

**Relational conflicts:** Relational conflicts consider the rights and responsibilities of individuals involved in the conflict situation, such as likes/dislikes, power relations, responsibilities expected in various roles, etc. (e.g. disagreements over what a connection should look like, on the roles of the teacher and the student) (Hall, 2005).

**Priority conflicts:** These are conflicts which prevail over ethical issues, whether a thing is right and wrong, or further what is more or less important (Hall, 2005).

**Expressive and instrumental conflicts:** In the opinion of Gudykunst (2004), intercultural or intergroup conflict can arise from misconception of behaviour of the other individual, from alleged incompatibilities, or from disparities in one’s own self and the other person’s attributions of one another’s behaviours. Expressive conflicts
are associated with thoughts and the release of emotional apprehensions; on the other hand, instrumental conflicts are associated to tasks which are to be accomplished, and, hence, related to objectives, practices, resources and so on.

**Causes of conflicts**

Conflict is a highly intricate phenomenon. Even the simplest conflict is most complex in nature. Only symptoms are observable, causes lie buried deep. The fundamental causes of conflict are differences between opinions or disagreement over an issue. The causes of conflict as given by Kataria (2007) are as under:

**Social causes:** There are two kinds of circumstances which underlie social conflict. One is consensus and the other is dissensus. In the case of consensus, the parties agree amicably to what each wants. Dissensual (dissension-based) conflict situations exist when the parties want different things or different values whereas such claims or conflicting demands militate against the spirit of cooperation and coordination.

**Economic causes:** Economic factors have close correlation with social maladjustment giving rise to social tensions. Inequality in economic levels brings about such tensions. For ensuring peaceful and reasonably compatible living, the humans require certain goods and services and their timely supply for satisfaction. Shortage of these wanted/desired goods and services causes dissatisfaction which gets converted into frustration and leads to conflict.

**Biological causes:** Conflict may erupt out of human physical and biological disorders and malfunctioning. These include biological abnormalities, inborn learning failures, psychopathology, unusual biological traits and maladaptive behaviour.

**Tension as cause of conflict:** Economic inequalities, insecurities and frustration are the main causes of tensions; create group and national conflicts.

**Personality causes:** Status, role, capacity, need fulfillment, social position, recognition etc. are all determinants of one’s personality. Any act of others amounting to contempt of these components is taken as contempt of one’s personality and hence leads to conflict.

**Ideological causes:** Varied ideologies cause tensions. An ideological society has commitments (rather affiliations) towards other society of similar ideology
resulting in opposing society or societies of different ideology leading to conflict, since each justifies its ideology as just and right and that of opponents as unjust and wrong.

**Ecological cause of conflict:** Environmental and ecological issues may initially cause low intensity conflicts culminating sooner or later into high intensity conflicts.

**Conflicts of interests:** A person’s objective is oriented to what one thinks as the best interest out of conceived alternatives compatible with his personality. Individual’s interest becomes a matter of conflict when it violates or transgresses the interests of the society or fellow being(s).

**Conflicts of goals:** Objective interests of a person crystallize into objective goals. Desire to fulfill an interest may become one’s objective. When the interests are put into action, the difference between the interest of the actor and that of the public (others) becomes incompatible to each other’s interests. This situation breeds evil designs and undesirable feelings, thus, leading to conflict.

**Conflict of means:** Most of the conflicts occur due to disagreement of the means adopted. Religious feuds and cultural conflicts emerge as conflicts of means. When the practices and percepts of different religions and cultures are not understood, they seem to be alien and antagonistic, hence causing conflict.

**Violation of norms:** Society is governed by enforcement of law and order through manmade judiciary or socially accepted moral codes and ethical laws. When the actions of individuals are not in accordance with the laws, there is violation of the laws. Such acts may cause inconvenience and trouble to others and lead to conflict.

**Frustration:** When any of the individual’s needs is unfulfilled or desired result not forthcoming or need fulfillment denied to a person, or an individual is deprived of and prevented from achieving it, it can be said that the individual is frustrated. The very existence of frustration heralds the presence of conflict.

**Conflict catalysts**

For conflict to take place, there are certain pre-requisites which can be called as the ground preparation for conducting conflict. They stimulate a conflict and propel it. Catalysts can be classified into positive and negative categories. Positive catalysts
help to promote conflict but restructure the confliction in such a manner so as to create a healthy environment for communication, indulgence and collaboration for reconciliation; hence, positive catalysts are innovative. Negative catalysts, on the other hand, stimulate the conflict in a manner to create commotion and bring a bad taste to it. They confirm and validate the conflict and soar it to an irrevocable stage, to the point of liquidating the parties in conflict (Bono, 1985). For the smooth conduct of conflict the positive catalysts have to be inducted and negative ones eliminated.

**Positive catalysts** include the following:

- **Fearlessness**: Fearlessness connotes courage and is a virtue which enables a person to analyse the conflict rationally and put forward right remedy and stand for that all the times.

- **Faith**: Complete faith in the goodness of all recognizes that everybody is humane. Such a faith distinguishes evil from the evil doer. This approach is a universal de-escalation of violence and an arrest to conflict escalation.

- **Love for the opponent**: In a complex social system, it is quite normal that a person is forced to play a conflicting role which can lead to termination of conflict.

- **Empathy**: Empathy is getting the feeling of others and showing concern of them which gives the opponent a room to put forward his case. This raises hope among the latter and creates an atmosphere of goodwill and positivity.

- **Morality**: Adherence to moral values raises the moral stature and has its own power of influence to terminate conflicts.

- **Openness**: Openness of one party reveals the party’s faith upon the other and its readiness of sharing (Gregg, 1960). It is an internal limiting factor that sets into motion the incrementally reciprocal de-escalation process of conflict.

- **Introspection**: A clear knowledge of what is right and what is wrong, whether oneself is on the right side or wrong, converts the opponent from his wrong deed (Gandhi, 1983). Hence examining oneself can help curb conflicts.

- **Confining to conflict points**: If a person remains confined to a conflict point and does not add on new points during the course of conflict, conflict can be terminated easily.
Readiness to compromise: The ultimate purpose of conflict is to arrive at an end which is satisfactory to the parties in conflict. One must therefore always be ready for compromise.

Voluntary initiation to dialogue: Communication is an effective medium to convey the intention, motive and temperament of the non-violent person to the opponent which can lead to suppression of conflict.

Negative catalysts include the following:

Fear: The fear of losing one’s dignity and pride in the eyes of the public, fear of precedence of the opponent or fear of future can promote conflict.

Force: Force is used to start a conflict, engineer or calibrate it and bring an end to it. Forces such as physical force, emotional force, coercive force, persuasive force and moral force result in spirals of action and reaction between the two parties and promote conflicts.

Language: Harsh language directly hurts the other and deteriorates the situation. Bad language is an instant provocation.

Exaggeration: Exaggeration of demands by the opponent and one’s own loss and other similar acts would mean that the opposite party tries to attain much more than what is due to it. Exaggeration may lead trivial incidents to big conflicts.

Secrecy: “Secrecy is lack of communication” (Bono, 1985). It heralds suspicion and mistrust and creates a bad atmosphere or environment, and unwillingness to cooperate on settlement of conflict.

Distrust: Distrust is one of the degrading catalysts in confliction which leads to a deadlock situation in which the minds and the hearts stay apart.

Prejudice: Prejudice incites pre-emptive attack which results in conflict escalation. Mirror-image, stereotyping and other forms of prejudice add only to the escalation of conflict.

Adding new conflict issues: Adding new conflict issues while the conflict is in progress complicates the situation and makes it difficult to end, thus conflict escalates.

Conflict can be positive when it helps to initiate the discussion of an issue to augment the level of individual concern and interests in an issue. It further develops a
level of communication between individuals, releases pent up emotions, helps individuals to widen their horizons of understanding and abilities, and finally results in the solutions of problems. On the other hand, conflict can be considered negative when it distracts people from dealing with the really significant matters, generates displeasure feelings among the people involved or leads to dogmatic and uncooperative individuals and groups (Hanna, 1996).

Every individual plays a number of roles and also experiences incompatibility in a number of ways, each transaction contributing and adding up some amount of satisfaction or frustration. So, conflicts are both functional and dysfunctional. Functional conflicts, for the sake of social well-being, can be allowed to proceed towards a positive conclusion. Dysfunctional conflicts, when unchecked, tend to escalate and end in the destruction of at least one of the parties. Therefore, dysfunctional conflicts have to be terminated then and there. For both positive conclusion and termination of conflict, an operational mechanism is needed.

According to de Reuck (1966), conflicts can be terminated in three ways. They can be determined or settled or resolved.

2.1.2 Conflict management

Mitchell (1981) opines that conflict arises as incompatibility of goals is recognized. In this understanding, incompatibility can be termed as incipient conflict when the presence of it comes to the knowledge of the concerned party. It becomes overt conflict when the party takes action over it. Incipient and latent conflicts are prevented from becoming violent manifestation through settlement procedures and resolution techniques. He suggests avoidance as a method of managing incipient conflict.

According to Sweeney and Caruthers (1996), conflict management is, “the process used by parties in conflict to reach a settlement.”

In the opinion of Moran (2001), conflict management is a philosophy and a set of skills which help individuals and groups to interpret and deal with conflict in a better manner as it occurs in all facets of their lives.

Conflict resolution is a comprehensive term which implies that the entrenched sources of conflict are attended to and resolved. This further implies that conduct of
people in conflict is not aggressive as it was, attitudes are no longer argumentative and the organization of the conflict has been altered. This term is used to refer both to the process to bring about these changes and to the completion of the process. Rather than the elimination of conflict, which is both unattainable and detrimental, the aim of conflict resolution is to convert actual or potentially violent condition into serene process of societal and political change. For achieving the same, there are certain pre-requisites for conflict management which include identification of conflict issue, cooperation, transformation of perception, communication, changing attitudes towards one another, persuasion, negotiation, bargaining, or mediation (Kataria, 2005).

To ensure desirable outcomes from conflict, one needs a systematic process for handling the same. According to Hanna (1996), a plan for conflict management involves the following four steps:

a. Diagnosis (anticipating conflict before it breaks): It includes clarification of the important issues, identifying the stakeholders, and finally the identification and assessment of the likely sources of disagreement.

b. Planning appropriate strategy: To plan an appropriate strategy, one must learn to recognize one’s own patterns, try to minimize the risks and develop a strategic plan.

c. Preparation for implementation of strategy: For this, an individual has to prepare to problem-solve and practice approaches, techniques and responses.

d. Implementation (taking action and evaluation the results): It includes execution of plan, evaluation of the outcomes and ensuring follow up.

Conflict management is affected by factors like gender, self-concept, expectations, situations, position (power) of the individual, practice, determining the best mode of management of conflict, communication skills, and life experiences.

2.1.3 Conflict management styles

There are numerous approaches or strategies that can be used in conflict situations, but everybody has a tendency to normally use some strategies more frequently than others. To most effectively resolve a conflict, one should use the strategy that is most appropriate for that particular conflict situation. Various psychologists have defined conflict management styles in different ways.
According to Thomas (1976), conflict management style is a “general and consistent orientation toward the other party and the conflict issues, manifest in observable behaviours that form a pattern and share common characteristics over time.” These patterns evolve into actions and reactions that are known as their “style” (Thomas & Kilmann, 1978).

According to Womack (1988), conflict management style refers to the way an individual chooses to manage conflict to satisfy one’s self or others.

Wilmont and Hocker (2001) refer to conflict management styles as “patterned responses, or clusters of behaviour, that people use in conflict” through diverse communication tactics.

According to Copley (2008), “An individual’s conflict handling style is a behavioural orientation of how to approach and handle conflict, with individuals choosing a pattern of principles to guide them through the conflict process.”

**Types of conflict management styles**

The skills of conflict management are important for the effective functioning of individuals at all organizational levels. Follett (1940) recognized five main styles of dealing with conflict which included: domination, compromise, integration, avoidance and suppression.

Blake and Mouton (1964) have given the five types of conflict management styles as forcing, withdrawal, smoothing, compromising (sharing) and confrontation (problem solving). Blake and Mouton (1973) also noted that though an individual dominantly uses one of these styles in his actions, however, the style could be changed to another, if the initial is not effectual.

Walton and McKersie (1965) have given a dual-concern model; the first one relates to the extent to which an entity makes efforts to convince one’s interest, the other one relates to the extent to which an entity makes efforts for the satisfaction of other individuals. Accordingly, they have given five interpersonal conflict handling styles: integrating, obliging, compromising, dominating and avoiding.

Hall (1969) conducted a survey of one’s characteristic reaction to and handling of conflict between himself and others. On the basis of the same, he has given five conflict management styles, namely:
**Competing/controlling** style is a power-oriented mode in which an individual tries to pursue his or her own concerns at the expense of the concerns of other people. An individual uses whatsoever power seems appropriate to triumph one’s own position, simply trying to win.

**Accommodating** is the opposite of competing. It could take the form of complying with the orders of another person’s, though unwillingly, charity or capitulating to another’s view point.

**Avoiding** individual does not address the conflict. Such a person does not pursue his own concerns or those of other person immediately.

**Collaborating** between two persons might take the form of searching a disparity to learn from each other’s insights, ultimately to resolve some condition.

**Compromising** is a midway between competing and accommodating. In this style, an individual gives up more than competing but less than accommodating.

Putnam and Wilson’s (1982) three-conflict management style model divides conflict management strategies into three factors: non-confrontation (obliging), solution-oriented (integrating) and control (dominating). Putnam and Wilson (1982) state that non-confrontation or obliging strategies manage conflict indirectly by either simply avoiding disagreements or by minimizing controversial issues. Solution-oriented or integrating strategies manage conflict both by finding out innovative, integrative resolutions and by making compromises. Control or dominating strategies manage conflict by arguing determinedly for their positions and by means of nonverbal messages to accentuate demands.

Rahim (1986) has given the following conflict resolution styles:

**Integrating** style involves candidness, information sharing along with assessment of disparities to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution, e.g., there is an encouragement of mutual commitment for a project between both supervisor and subordinates which is achieved by incorporating other party’s ideas in the final agreement.

**Obliging** comprises attempts to side step the dissensus and encouraging commonness to achieve the other party’s concern, e.g., in reaching a consensus, the opinions of the supervisor are more imperative than those of the subordinates.
**Dominating** is identified with a win-lose position or with impelling behaviours to win one's own viewpoint, e.g., a person in authority would take benefit of his position to make a verdict.

**Avoiding** is associated with abandonment, shifting the responsibility to others, or bypassing solutions, e.g., a person in subordinate position refuses to work together physically and mentally with the person in supervisory position in an assignment.

**Compromising** is a settlement by adopting a give-and-take policy, in which both the parties surrender something to make a commonly satisfactory solution, e.g., both the persons in supervisory as well as subordinate position need a quick but momentary way out to resolve a complicated situation.

Psychologists have compared the conflict management styles to certain animals. Wheeler (1995) has given five types of conflict management styles explained as below:

**Cooperative problem solving (dolphins):** It facilitates individuals to work mutually so that everyone is benefitted. This style of conflict management helps people to attempt or find a resolution that will help them satisfy their motives and maintain a cordial relationship. For example, dolphins use whistles to correspond with each other in order to catch food considerately and to beckon help.

**Competing (lion):** Person who chooses a competitive style means that he is putting his apprehension and interest higher than anyone else’s interest. A person using this style uses it so hard to get what he wants that he might ruin friendships in the same. For example, the lion’s roar helps it to persuade its interests.

**Compromising (zebra):** People prefer the compromising style when they feel it important to satisfy some of their interests. People who use this style are likely to say “let’s split the disparity”, or “half a loaf is better than none.” For example, the distinctive look of a zebra appears to show that it does not matter whether it was a black or a white horse, so it “split the difference” to choose black and white stripes.

**Avoiding (turtle):** A person who chooses this style does not get implicated in a conflict and may possibly say, “You make a decision but do not involve me.” For example, a turtle can pull its head and legs into its shell to get away from everyone and avoid everything.
Accommodation (chameleon): People who opt to use this style side-step their own interests and give way to others to have what they want. They often believe in maintaining a congenial friendship. For example, a chameleon changes its colors to match the colors of its environment.

Costantino and Merchant (1996) and Falikouski (2002) have also compared the conflict management styles to certain animals and have accordingly associated them as under:

The competing shark: They are highly goal oriented, who take relationships on a lower priority. They can be autocratic, authoritative, perverse, threatening and daunting, who use aggressive behaviour to resolve conflicts. They have a need to win, therefore others must lose.

The avoiding turtle: Turtles adopt this evading or withdrawing conflict management style. They would rather conceal and overlook conflicts than resolve them, making them uncooperative and unassertiveness. They tend to give up individual goals and exhibit a flaccid behaviour which creates lose-lose situations.

The accommodating teddy bear: The teddy bears exercise a smoothing or accommodating conflict management style which lays emphasis on human relations. They overlook their own targets and resolve conflicts by giving in to others.

The compromising fox: Foxes show concern for objectives and relationships while using the compromising conflict management style. They are assertive as well as cooperative and are agreeable to give up some of their goals while convincing others to give up part of theirs.

The collaborating owl: Owls value their targets and associations when they use the collaborating or problem tackling conflict management style. They perceive conflicts as troubles which need to be solved by finding solutions that are satisfying to all sides. Both the sides get what they want and pessimistic feelings are eradicated.

According to Hanna (1996), there are nine different conflict management styles that one can use when dealing with interpersonal differences. They may be used alone or in conjunction with each other. All of the styles may be used effectively. No single style is best for all situations. The primary objective is to use each style effectively and to match the right style to the situation at hand. These styles are:
**Maintenance** is used when one needs time to gather information, build up one’s resources, get support, or deal with high concerns. Time gained this way may also be used to build bridges, let people cool down after a blow-up, or let the dust settle after making changes.

**Smoothing** is effective when one knows what one’s position is, but doesn’t have time for a lengthy discussion or doesn’t have the authority to require that the other party would follow his wishes. This style is useful when one needs to withhold information because he thinks it may be hurtful or because, in his judgment, others may not be mature enough to handle it.

**Domination** is used when one needs something done in hurry or matters are confidential. A person also uses this style when the issue is of little importance to waste time on or when one knows that the others involved have no information that would change his mind.

**Decision rule** is useful when the outcome of a disagreement is not important to an individual and being perceived as impartial or fair is of primary interest. This is a good method to use when one doesn’t want a stalemate and one can live with any possible outcome.

**Coexistence** is primarily useful when both parties in a dispute think they are right, one sometimes requires firm evidence to persuade the other party to change its position. A wrong decision could be costly in both financial and human terms and it could be extremely difficult to go back once a path has been chosen. This allows time to compare solutions and gather data.

**Bargaining** strategy is most useful when both parties gain more from a mutual exchange agreement than they would from the best alternative solution if agreement is not reached.

**Non resistance** is a good strategy to use when the issue is a minor one or is of little importance to one person but important to another person. It is also useful when the other party has greater experience or expertise in the subject at hand. An individual is seen as a team player, open and flexible to the ideas of others.

**Supportive release** is a good strategy to use when one wants to encourage the initiative and commitment of somebody who may be capable but lacks confidence.
**Collaboration** is an appropriate tactic when all the issues are of equal importance and should not be compromised. The various parties should be capable, trustworthy, good communicators and willing to allow sufficient time to fully discuss the problem. This is a good style to use when the participating individuals desire a closer working relationship, or when a successful resolution of the problem depends on all parties agreeing to and supporting the solution.

According to Thomas (2002), assertiveness and cooperativeness are the most basic dimensions for describing the choices in a conflict situation. They form the two-dimensional space in which conflict handling behavior can be located, as shown in Figure 2.1. Assertiveness and cooperativeness are separate, independent dimensions; they are not opposites of each other.

![Figure 2.1. The assertiveness and cooperativeness dimension (Source: Thomas, 2002. Introduction to conflict management. California, Mountain View: CPP)](chart)

---

**Assertiveness:** It is the extent to which a person tries to satisfy his own concerns. Assertiveness might mean trying to meet one’s needs or get support for one’s ideas.

**Cooperativeness:** It is the extent to which a person tries to satisfy other person’s concerns. It might mean helping the other person meet his or her needs or being receptive to the other person’s ideas. The conflict handling modes form the four corners and the centre of the two dimensional space. They represent the following five major combinations of assertiveness and cooperativeness that are possible in a conflict situation.
**Competing** is assertive and uncooperative. One tries to persuade one’s own concerns at the expense of other person.

**Collaborating** is both assertive and cooperative. One tries to find a win-win solution that absolutely satisfies both people’s concerns.

**Compromising** lies on middle way between assertiveness and cooperativeness. One tries to find an adequate agreement that only moderately satisfies the concerns of both parties.

**Avoiding** is both unassertive and uncooperative. One sidesteps the conflict without trying to convince either person’s concern.

**Accommodating** is unassertive and cooperative. One tries to satisfy the concerns of the other person at the expense of his own.

Thomas (2002) further remarks that conflict-handling modes are general intentions and include one’s aims in a conflict situation—rather than specific behaviours. A person can use a range of behaviours to enact any conflict-handling mode, depending on the circumstances.

The conflict situation itself contains the solution of the conflict. Choosing a conflict management style appropriate to the conflict is the key to effective deterrence of conflict and conflict management. Every individual has a preferred style that he uses in conflict situations but is able to choose a different style as and when required.

### 2.2 Emotional Intelligence

The term ‘emotional intelligence’ comprises two words—‘emotion’ and ‘intelligence’. Hence, in order to have the clear understanding of emotional intelligence, it is relevant to define the terms separately and then define the term emotional intelligence.

#### 2.2.1 Emotion

The English word ‘emotion’ is derived from the Latin word ‘emovere’, which means ‘to stir up’, ‘to agitate’, ‘to excite’, ‘to move out’. So, emotion is stimulated or apprehensive state of mind; when our feelings become strong or energized, they become emotions. The term emotion, in general, is used to delegate ‘a state of consciousness which has to do with the arousal of feelings’ (Webster’s New World Dictionary, 2003). Emotions consist of (a) physiological alterations within the bodies,
for example, changes in the blood pressure, heart beat rate, and so on; (b) subjective cognitive states, for example, the personal experiences that are labelled as emotions; and (c) expressive behaviours, such as, apparent signs in response to these internal reactions (Taylor, 1999).

According to Young (1943), “An emotion is a disturbed state of organism: an emotion includes visceral changes due to increased activity of autonomic nervous system and emotion originates within psychological situation.”

Wukmir (1967) states that emotion is an instantaneous response of an individual that tells about the degree of favourability of the perceived condition. If the condition seems to favour its endurance, the living being undergoes an optimistic emotion (happiness, contentment, desire, serenity etc.); but if the situation seems to be unfavourable for survival, the individual experiences a pessimistic emotion (sadness, distress, agony, sorrow etc.). All living beings have their system of emotions which acts as a compass, directing them all the time, to find favourable circumstances to survive and to move away from the ones which are unfavourable for survival.

Izard and Malatesta (1987) define emotion as “a particular set of neural processes which lead to a precise expression of and an analogous specific feeling.”

According to Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Psychology (1992), “The term emotion refers to the experience of subjective feelings which have positive or negative value for the individual.”

Emotions have been described by Ekman (1992) as biologically given and an outcome of evolution since they provide fine solutions to old and recurring problems which were faced by our ancestors.

According to Watson and Clarke (1994), emotions are distinct and integrated psycho-physiological response systems. They propose three systems: expression (facial), a pattern of autonomic changes and distinct subjective feeling state. For example, the individual with an emotion of fear has a frightened facial expression, autonomic activity like sweating and increased pulse rate, along with self reports of feeling tense or terrified.

Keltner and Haidt (1999) portray emotions as vibrant processes which mediate the relation of an individual to a continuously varying social environment.
Gazzaniga and Heatherton (2003) state that emotions are a basic vital part of the human experience. They warn of peril, create attachments between people and bring pleasure to life. However, they can also cause problems. They further state that for a psychological scientist, emotion implies feelings that engross subjective assessment, psychological processes and cognitive beliefs. Emotions are instant responses to certain environmental occurrences such as being cut off in traffic or given a fine gift.

According to Singh (2004), “Emotion is a dynamic process involving activity on the part of virtually all aspects of the organism.” He further believes that consciousness is an essential component of the emotive process.

Scherer (2005) has given components processing model of emotion which includes five essential elements of emotions. For an emotional experience to occur, all of these processes are coordinated and harmonized for a short span of time, which are driven by appraisal processes. The component processing model presents a series of events that efficiently illustrates the coordination of occurrences in an emotional episode. The sequence is given as under:

- Cognitive appraisal: It provides an assessment of occurrences and objects.
- Bodily symptoms: The emotional experience manifests itself as a physiological component.
- Action tendencies: It is a provocational component which aids in the grounding and direction of motor reactions.
- Expression: An emotional state is accompanied by expressions of the face and change overs in voice which facilitate to communicate response and intention of actions.
- Feelings: It refers to the subjective familiarity of emotional situation after its occurrence.

According to Fox (2008), emotions are illustrated as distinct and steady responses to internal or external proceedings having a particular importance for the organism. Emotions comprise a synchronized set of responses and are usually brief in duration. Emotions may consist of verbal, physiological, behavioural, and neural mechanisms. Fox (2008) further opines that the term emotion is different
from numerous constructs within the field of affective neuroscience (like feelings, moods etc.) and it is important to differentiate these terms:

- Feelings are a subjective depiction of emotions, which are personal to the individual who experiences them.
- Moods, less in intensity than emotions, are diffused affective states which normally last for much longer time lapse than emotions.
- Affect is a broader term which is used to explain the subject matter of emotion, feelings, and moods collectively, though, many a times, it is used interchangeably with emotion.

According to Ciccarelli and Meyer (2009), emotion can be defined as “the feeling aspect of consciousness, which is evident in the form of physical arousal, a typical behavior which discloses the particular feeling to the external world, along with an inner awareness of feelings.”

It can, thus, be concluded that emotion is a condition of consciousness having to do with the stimulation of feelings. Emotions have evolved as signals and responses to changes in liaison between the individual and the environment. Emotions are observed in the form of overt behavioural responses to relationships or stimuli in the environment.

**Theories of emotion**

Different causes of emotions have been described by various psychologists through theories of emotions given below:

**James-Lange theory of emotion:** James (1890) argued that an emotion-related stimulus gives rise to certain psychological changes. The individual becomes aware of these changes and then recognizes the emotion being experienced. Similar ideas were simultaneously developed by a Danish psychologist, Lange and the theory is known as James-Lange theory of emotion.

**Cannon-Bard theory of emotion:** Cannon (1927) noted that although humans are quick to experience emotions, the body is much slower, taking at least a second or two to respond. He also noted that many emotions produce similar visceral responses, making it too difficult for people to quickly determine which emotion they are experiencing. For instance, anger, excitement etc. all produce similar changes in heart
rate and blood pressure. Cannon, along with Phillip Bard, proposed instead that mind and body operate independently in experiencing emotions. According to Cannon-Bard theory, the information from an emotion producing stimulus is processed in subcortical structures causing the experience of two separate things at roughly the same time, an emotional and physical reaction. When one sees a grizzly bear, he simultaneously feels afraid, begins to sweat and experiences a pondering heart and run, everything happens together.

**Schachter-Singer theory of emotion:** Schachter and Singer (1962) carried out an experiment that subsequently led to a third theory of emotion or the cognitive labeling theory of emotions. The findings led Schachter and Singer to hypothesize that, when a person is physiologically aroused, he is likely to label the emotions that he experiences according to circumstances in the situation. This approach is sometimes called the attribution theory of emotion.

Emotions are essentially adaptive reactions to specific situations. Emotions play a very important role in determining the overall quality of our lives and the theories of emotions contribute to our understanding of the nature of emotions.

### 2.2.2 Intelligence

Intelligence is the capacity to learn or comprehend from experience or to retort effectively to new experiences, the ability to attain and maintain knowledge. The possession of intelligence implies the use of reason or intellect in problem solving and directing conduct. The concept of intelligence has been defined in different ways.

Binet and Simon (1916) hold that the essential characteristic of intelligence is the ability to judge well, to comprehend well and to reason well.

Thorndike (1913) defines intelligence as “the power to make good responses from the point of view of truth or fact.” An intelligent person in his view is one who is able to come up with the right answers to difficult problems.

Stoddard (1943) states that intelligence is the capacity to undertake certain activities which are characterized by intricacy, complexity, abstractness, economy, adaptiveness to a target, social value and the emergence of original, and more so to sustain these activities under conditions that demand for a focus of energy and opposition to emotional forces.
According to Wechsler (1958), “Intelligence is the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally and to deal effectively with the environment.”

Piaget (1972) defines intelligence as a generic term to indicate the superior forms of organisation or equilibrium of cognitive structuring used for adaptation to physical or social environment.

Sternberg (1985) states that intelligence is the mental ability to automatize information processing and to emanate contextually appropriate behaviours in response to innovation; intelligence also includes metacomponents, performance components, and components to acquire knowledge.

According to Anastasi (1992), “Intelligence is a combination of several functions, and not a single, unitary ability. Intelligence is the amalgamation of abilities needed for survival and progression within a particular culture.”

In the view of Gottfredson (1997), intelligence is a common mental ability that involves the reasoning ability, planning, solving problems, thinking abstractly, understanding intricate ideas, learning promptly and learning from experience.

Seymour (1998) states that there are basically two forms of intelligence. First, the intelligence of the rational mind, which is what the intelligence tests measure, and second, the intelligence of the experimental mind, which can account for both practical intelligence and emotional intelligence.

Sattler (2001) states that intelligent behavior reflects the survival skills of the species, beyond those associated with basic psychological processes.

Encyclopedia Britannica (2006) defines intelligence as the ability to make effective adaptation to the environment, either by changing oneself or by making changes in the environment or finding a new one. Intelligence is not a single mental process, but a combination of many mental processes which are directed to make effective adaptations to the environment.

Cambridge Advance Learner’s Dictionary (2006) defines intelligence as the ability to learn, comprehend and take decisions or have reason based opinions.
It can, hence, be concluded that in general sense, intelligence means an aggregate of various cognitive abilities that facilitate the individual to make adaptations to different environments.

2.2.3 Emotional intelligence

Emotional intelligence is one of the most widely discussed intelligence these days. The term ‘emotional intelligence’ was not in existence even three decades ago. The concept was conceived in the footsteps of Edward Thorndike (1920). In order to describe the extent of an individual’s ability to relate to other individuals, he used the term social intelligence, which is considered distinct from the typically-discussed verbal and mathematical abilities. According to Thorndike (1920), traditional intelligence consists of three constructs: concrete, abstract and social intelligence. The ability to understand and manipulate with objects is concrete intelligence; the ability to understand and manipulate with mathematical symbols is abstract intelligence and; the ability to understand and relate with people is social intelligence. Later, Thorndike (1920) proposed that social intelligence consisted of two types of intelligence: interpersonal intelligence is the ability to understand others and intrapersonal intelligence is the ability to understand self, abilities of human beings to deal with changed situations.

Although a clear definition and valid measure are lacking (Sternberg, 1988), the concept of social intelligence initiated a critical discussion of interpersonal and intrapersonal ability sets which now underlie theories of emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995).

Payne (1985) coined the term and originally defined emotional intelligence as the ability to relate creatively to fear, pain, and desire, and explored many methods for developing emotional intelligence in one’s self and in others. Bar-On (1988) attempted to assess emotional intelligence, he used the term emotional quotient (EQ) which gained widespread popularity before Salovey and Mayer published their first model of emotional intelligence. Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) model of emotional intelligence was based on the pre-existing body of research on how people appraise, communicate, and utilize emotions. However, it was Goleman, who, in 1995 wrote a book on emotional intelligence and popularized the same. The notion was more recently revisited by Weis and Sub (2007) who demonstrated that social intelligence is in fact distinct from academic intelligence.
According to Salovey and Mayer (1990), emotional intelligence is the “ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and action.”

Goleman (1995) defines emotional intelligence as “a skill of self-control, zeal and persistence and the ability to motivate oneself.”

In the view of Cooper (1996), emotional intelligence is the capability to sense, comprehend and efficiently apply the power of acumen of emotions as a source of human energy, information, belief, creativity and influence.

Bar-On (1997) considers that emotional intelligence reflects one’s ability to deal with day to day environmental challenges and aids to foresee one’s success in life, including professional and personal pursuits.

According to Mayer and Salovey (1997) emotional intelligence is “the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to comprehend emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively control emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth.”

According to Freedman, Jenson, Rideout and Freedman (1998), “Emotional intelligence is a means to recognize, understand and choose how we think, feel and act. It shapes our communication with others and our understanding of ourselves. It characterizes how and what we learn, it allows us to set priorities, it determines the majority of our daily actions.”

Goleman (1998) defines emotional intelligence as the capacity for recognizing one’s own feelings and those of others, for motivating one’s own self, and for managing emotions well in oneself and in relationships. Emotional intelligence describes abilities distinct from, but complementary to academic intelligence, a purely cognitive capability measured by IQ.

In the words of Bar-On (2000), “Emotional intelligence is an array of emotional and social knowledge and abilities that influence our overall ability to effectively cope with environmental demands.”

Bhattacharya (2003) opines that emotional intelligence is a cumulation of individuals’ cognition of emotions of one’s own self and others, feeling, elucidation
and action as per the demand of the environment for the manipulation of the consequence which in turn results in superior performance and enhanced human relationships.

Singh (2003) defines emotional intelligence as the ability of an individual to aptly and effectively respond to a large array of emotional stimuli being elicited from the inner self and immediate environment. Emotional intelligence comprises of three psychological dimensions, namely, emotional sensibility, emotional maturity and emotional competency. These dimensions inspire a person for recognizing truthfully, interpreting honestly and handling tactfully the dynamics of human behaviour.

Bangar (2005) refers to emotional intelligence as the capacity to generate favorable outcomes in one’s relationship with oneself and with others.

Chabunghbam (2005) defines emotional intelligence as “the ability of a person to control impulses and persist in the face of frustration.”

Malekar (2005) refers to emotional intelligence as “a set of factors which include wakefulness of oneself and managing emotions, developing oneself with the power of sympathy and inspiration and building strong bonds with people.”

It can, hence, be concluded that emotional intelligence refers to the interpersonal and intrapersonal abilities of an individual which help him to understand the relationships and the world better and, furthermore, act wisely in human relations. Emotional intelligence helps the individuals to emerge successful in workplace and otherwise.

**Domains of emotional intelligence**

According to Salovey and Mayer (1990), emotional intelligence is a kind of social intelligence which comprises of the capacity to comprehend emotional information and reason with emotions. It comprises of four primary abilities: the capacity to (1) perceive emotions accurately, (2) use emotions for facilitating thinking, (3) understand emotional meanings, and (4) handle emotions.

Goleman’s (1995) hierarchical model proposes five emotional competencies: (1) the capacity to recognize and name one’s emotional states and to value the link amongst emotions, thought and action; (2) the ability to handle one’s emotional states;
the capability to willfully enter into emotional states, related with a drive to accomplish and be successful; (4) the ability to interpret, be sensitive to, and influence emotions of other people; and (5) the capacity to enter and maintain reasonable interpersonal relationships.

Bar-On (1997) proposed a model to capture emotional intelligence by categorizing it into five blanket areas or realms:

(a) **Intrapersonal realm:** It concerns the ‘inner self’ and determines how a person is in touch with his feelings, how good he feels about himself and about what he is doing in life. It includes emotional self awareness, assertiveness, freedom, self respect and self actualization.

(b) **Interpersonal realm:** It concerns with what are known as people skills. Individuals who perform well in this area tend to be responsible and trustworthy. It includes sympathy, social responsibility, and interpersonal relationships.

(c) **The adaptability realm:** It concerns with the ability to visualize and respond to a variety of difficult situations. It includes problem solving, reality testing and flexibility.

(d) **The stress management realm:** It concerns the ability to endure stress without caving in, falling apart, losing control or going under. It includes stress forbearance, and control of impulses.

(e) **The general mood realm:** It concerns one’s outlook on life, the ability to enjoy and the overall feeling of contentment or discontentment. It includes happiness, and optimism.

Emotional intelligence, according to Mayer and Salovey (1997) involves areas such as:

(a) **Identifying emotions:** It is the capacity to recognize how a person and those around him are feeling.

(b) **Using emotions:** It is the ability to generate and reason emotions.

(c) **Understanding emotions:** It is the ability to understand the complexity and chain of emotions and understand how the emotions transit from one stage to another.

(d) **Managing emotions:** It is the ability to manage one’s own emotions and those of others.
According to Goleman (1999), the emotional competence framework includes personal competencies and social competencies.

(a) **Personal competencies:** These competencies determine how a person manages himself. These are:

i. **Self-awareness:** It includes the understanding of one’s internal states, preferences, resources, and intuitions. Self awareness further comprises of emotional awareness, accurate self-assessment and self confidence.

ii. **Self regulation:** It is managing one’s personal states, inclinations, and resources. It further includes self control, fidelity, conscientiousness, adaptability, and novelty.

iii **Motivation:** It refers to emotional propensities that steer or facilitate in attainment of goals. It comprises of attainment drive, dedication, initiative, and optimism.

(b) **Social competencies:** These competencies determine how a person handles relationships. These include empathy and social skills:

i **Empathy:** It is the awareness of feelings, desires, and concerns of others. It includes thoughtfulness for others, developing others, leveraging diversity, service orientation, and political wakefulness.

ii **Social skills:** It comprises of expertise to induce desirable responses in others. It includes authority, communication, management of conflict, leadership, change catalyst, building relationships, alliance and cooperation, and team work.

Boyatzis, Goleman and Rhee (2000) have described a model of emotional intelligence competencies that reflect four domains: (a) self-awareness, (b) self-management, (c) social awareness, and (d) relationship management. The framework presents 20 competencies that nest in four divisions of general emotional intelligence abilities.

(a) **The self-awareness cluster:** This cluster deals with the understanding of feelings and accurate self-assessment, and comprises three competencies relating to performance at the workplace, i.e. emotional self realization, correct self-assessment, and self belief.
(b) The self-management cluster: This cluster refers to management of internal states, inclinations and assets, and includes six competencies relating to workplace performance, i.e. self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, achievement drive, and initiative.

(c) The social awareness cluster: This cluster refers to reading people and groups accurately, and encompasses three competencies relating to performance at work including empathy, service orientation, and organizational awareness.

(d) The relationship management cluster: This cluster refers to inducing desirable responses in others and has eight competencies relating to performance at work, i.e. developing others, influence, communication, conflict management, farsighted leadership, change catalyst, developing links, and team capabilities.

On the basis of the research on emotional intelligence in Indian executives, Bhattacharya (2003) has proposed a model of emotional intelligence which includes the following components of emotional intelligence:

(a) Self skills: Self skills include two sub-components, appraisal of emotions (negative as well as positive emotions) and emotional facilitation and goal orientedness.

(b) Interpersonal skills: Interpersonal skills also include two sub-components; conflict (interpersonal) and difficulty, and skill (interpersonal) and flexibility.

According to Singh (2006), the key dimensions constituting emotional intelligence are:

(a) Emotional competency: It is the ability to (1) give response to emotional stimuli which are elicited by different situations; (2) communicate; (3) tackle emotional distresses such as conflicts, frustrations, egoism and inferiority complexes; (4) enjoy emotions; (5) do what succeeds; (6) relate to others; (7) have emotional strength of mind; (8) evade emotional exhaustion such as stress and burn out; and (9) learn to avoid negativity of emotions.

(b) Emotional maturity: It is the ability to evaluate emotions of one’s own self and others; recognize and articulate feelings; balance the state of heart and mind;
appreciate others’ point of view; develop others; delay fulfillment of immediate psychological satisfaction; and being adaptable and flexible.

(c) Emotional sensitivity: It refers to the understanding of the emotional provocation threshold; organizing the immediate environment; maintaining rapport, agreement and comfort with others and making others feel at ease in one’s company. It also involves being sincere in interpersonal dealings, truthfully interpreting emotional indications; apprehending communicability of emotions, dispositions and feelings; and having an insight into how others evaluate and relate to a person.

It can be concluded that emotional intelligence is the extent to which a person responds emotionally to both positive as well as negative circumstances by making use of his/her reasoning. Having high emotional intelligence doesn’t indicate that the person never panics or loses his/her rage; rather it means that in the wake of an emotional response, he/she behaves in a dynamic manner to control his/her own feelings and converts them into prolific behaviours.

2.3 Spiritual Intelligence

In the last few decades, there has been a growing debate and some very substantive changes on the concept of intelligence. Gone are the days when the official line on intelligence was that it was a measurable quantity by means of IQ tests. Then the concept of emotional intelligence (EQ) was introduced. Emotional intelligence is not accessed like a fact or an answer, it is more a process of scanning the ways in which an individual experiences things working in the past and anticipating the ways he might operate in a new situation in the future.

The latest concept in intelligence is of spiritual intelligence (SQ). The spiritual intelligence helps an individual to live his individuality in line with the recent scientific discoveries about the true nature of reality. Since spiritual abilities underlie aspects of spirituality, it would be appropriate to start off with the definition of spiritualism (spirituality) and then come to the definitions of spiritual intelligence.

2.3.1 Spirituality

Prior to the emergence of spirituality within psychological literature, the words religion, religiosity and/or religiousness were more commonly used to describe all spiritual aspects of the human psyche (James, 1902/2002). While religiosity may
have been equated with spirituality at one time, psychologists now make sharp
distinctions between the two (King, 2008).

Koenig, McCullough, and Larson (2000) define religion as “an organized
system of beliefs, practices, symbols and rituals designed (a) to facilitate closeness to
the sacred or transcendent and, (b) to foster an understanding of one’s relation and
responsibility to others in living together in community.” In contrast, Koenig,
McCullough, and Larson (2000) define spirituality as “the personal quest for
understanding answers to ultimate questions about life, about meaning, and about
relationship to the sacred or transcendent, which may (or may not) lead to or arise
from the development of religious rituals and the formation of the community.”

Parks (2000) describes spirituality as “personal search for meaning,
transcendence, wholeness, purpose, and the realization of spirit as the animating
essence at the core of the life.”

“Spirituality stresses the dynamic wholeness of self in which the self is at one
with itself and with the whole of creation and it requires that people regard themselves
and others as whole beings” (Zohar & Marshall, 2000).

King, Speck, and Thomas (2001) state that religion is a framework for a
system of beliefs and ethics; whereas spirituality involves a person’s conviction in a
power apart from his own existence.

with the human spirit as opposed to physical things.”

Sinnott (2002) regards spirituality as one’s personal relation to the holy or
transcendent, a relation which enlightens other relationships and the significance of
one’s own life; while religious practices may be the peripheral sign of a spiritual
orientation, or simply a set of culturally cohesive practices, principles, and habits.

Waaijman (2002) defines spirituality as “that which touches the core of human
existence, namely, the relation to the absolute.”

Wink and Dillon (2002) define spirituality as “the self existential search for
ultimate meaning through an individualized understanding of the sacred.”

Vokey (2003) emphasizes spirituality as a relational event; it either consists of
or leads to experiences of connectedness with our deepest selves, other human and
non-human souls, to the natural world and the cosmos beyond and the larger purposes and powers that transcend an ego’s limited concerns.

In the words of King (2008), spirituality is best defined as an unbound set of personal forces, behaviours, experiences, ethics, and attitudes which are based on a pursuit for existential understanding, significance, rationale, and transcendence. In addition, this personal quest typically involves the apprehension of a spiritual depth or nonmaterial dimension to reality.

### 2.3.3 Spiritual intelligence

According to Zohar (1997), “Spiritual intelligence is the intelligence that makes us whole, that gives us our integrity. It is the intelligence of the soul, the intelligence of the deep self. It is the intelligence with which we ask fundamental questions and with which we reframe our answers.”

Emmons (2000) views spiritual intelligence as the suitable utilization of spiritual knowledge which facilitates day to day problem solving and accomplishment of goals.

According to Noble (2000) spiritual intelligence includes “an openness to unusual and diverse experiences broadly labeled ‘spiritual’”, as well as a continuous attempt to understand the meaning of these experiences in the various aspects of one’s life and “the awareness that the whole is always greater than the sum of its parts, no matter how cherished a part might be.”

According to Zohar (2000), “Spiritual Intelligence is the intelligence with which we access our deepest meanings, purposes, and highest motivations.”

Zohar and Marshall (2000) opine that spiritual intelligence represents the brain’s tertiary procedure of punitive philosophy, which mingles the lower processes of rational and emotional intelligence to reframe or reconceptualize one’s experience and thus change one’s understanding of it, allowing for higher-order cognition of a divine and moral nature. Spiritual intelligence helps the individuals to heal themselves. It makes them complete and gives them their integrity. It rests in that deep part of the self which is associated with wisdom from beyond the ego, or conscious mind. It is not dependent on culture or values. It not only facilitates us to recognize existing values, but also aids to creatively discern new values. In fact, it creates the very prospect of having values in the foremost place.
According to Buzan (2001), spiritual intelligence refers to the awareness of the world and an individual’s position in it.

Wolman (2001) defines spiritual intelligence as “the human capacity to ask ultimate questions about the meaning of life. It involves more than a set of mental abilities, a position which abandons practically all previously established criteria for intelligence. It is the ability to sense a spiritual dimension of life; which allows one to solve particular types of problems, primarily those of a spiritual or moral nature. Spiritual intelligence exists as a potential and innate human ability, which can be developed with training and experience.”

According to Vaughan (2002), “Spiritual intelligence is the capacity to recognize multiple levels of consciousness; the awareness of spirit as the ground of being; and the awareness of one’s relationship to the transcendent, to all people, and to the earth.” She believes that spiritual intelligence exists as a potential in all people and can be cultivated by a variety of practices or training. She also emphasizes the relationship between spiritual intelligence and adaptation to stressful events.

Nasel (2004) refers to spiritual intelligence as the application of spiritual capacities and resources to realistic context. Spiritual intelligence is used by individuals when they draw on their spiritual capacities and resources to take meaningful decisions, deliberate over existential matters, or attempt problem solving in everyday life.

Wigglesworth (2006) opines that spiritual intelligence is the ability to behave and perform with concern and wisdom; at the same time preserving inner and outer peace (equanimity) despite the circumstances.

In the words of King (2008), spiritual intelligence is a set of adaptive mental capacities which are based on non-material and transcendental facets of reality, particularly the ones which are related to nature of an individual’s existence, personal meaning, transcendence and extended states of consciousness. In application, these processes are adaptive in their ability to assist inimitable means of problem solving, abstract-reasoning and coping.

**Indicators for spiritual intelligence**

According to Zohar and Marshall (2000), there are certain indicators of a highly developed spiritual intelligence. These include the ability to be supple (actively
and spontaneously adaptive); an elevated degree of self-awareness; a competence to face and employ suffering; a proficiency to face and transcend pain; the eminence of being inspired by vision and ethics; being reluctant to cause needless harm; a propensity to see the connections between varied things (being ‘holistic’); a manifest tendency to ask ‘Why?’ or ‘What if?’ questions and to search for ‘fundamental’ answers; and a possession of facility to work against convention.

According to Emmons (2000), spiritual intelligence includes the ability for transcendence; the capability to enter into heightened spiritual states of consciousness; the capacity to invest day to day activities, events, and relationships with a sense of the sanctified; the knack to utilize spiritual assets for problem solving in living; and the capacity to engage in virtuous behaviour or to be virtuous (to show amnesty, to express gratefulness, to be modest, to display compassion).

In addition to Emmon’s model, two additional core abilities have been given by Noble (2001). The first ability is the conscious recognition that physical reality is rooted within a larger, multi-dimensional reality with which we consciously and unconsciously interact every moment; and the second ability is the conscious quest of psychological health, for the sake of oneself as well as the global community.

Zohar (2004) introduced 12 principles of SQ. These principles have been derived from the characteristics that define multifaceted adaptive systems:

**Self-awareness:** It is the knowledge of what a person believes in and values, and what profoundly motivates him.

**Spontaneity:** Spontaneity is to live in a moment and be responsive to that.

**Being vision and value-led:** It is to act on the basis of ideologies and deep beliefs, and to live accordingly.

**Holism:** Holism includes viewing larger patterns, relationships, and associations; having a sense of belongingness.

**Compassion:** It is the quality of "feeling-with" and profound sympathy.

**Celebration of diversity:** To celebrate diversity is to value other individuals’ divergent view points.

**Field independence:** To have the valor to stand up against the crowd and have one's own convictions.
**Humility:** It is the sense of being a performer in a bigger drama, to have the vision of one's actual place in the world.

**Tendency to ask fundamental "why?" questions:** Necessity to comprehend things and search out to their roots.

**Ability to reframe:** Seeing the larger picture by standing back from a condition or trouble and; viewing problems in a broader perspective.

**Positive use of adversity:** It is to learn and develop from errors, setbacks, and affliction.

**Sense of vocation:** It is the feeling to serve, to return something back.

Amram (2007) has identified seven key themes related to spiritual intelligence, which can be more accurately and broadly defined as the manifestation of a lived spirituality (i.e., a spirituality that is put into daily practice). These include meaning (experiencing meaning and purpose in daily activities); consciousness (trans-rational knowing, mindfulness, and practice); grace (trust, love, and reverence for the sacred); transcendence (holism, nurturing relationships and connections); truth (acceptance, forgiveness, and openness to all truth); peaceful surrender to self (egolessness, accepting one’s true nature); and inner-directed freedom (liberation from attachments and fears, discernment, integrity).

**Steps to become spiritually intelligent**

Bowell (2004) adds that there are seven steps to acquire the spiritually intelligent self for the practical pursuit of purpose, success and happiness. They include:

**Awareness:** A person becomes aware that he is lost, that he does not understand the purpose of his life, that this internal, “not knowing” sense is in fact the real sense of self, confined by the lack of any intelligence to escape.

**Meaning:** A person explores the bigger picture, to make keys that might open the space he is confined in.

**Evaluation:** A person tries the keys, fit them in the lock and turn.

**Being centered:** A person opens the door inward and enables what is on the other side to access.
**Vision:** A person allows the light from the new, “bigger picture” to flood in so that he can see.

**Projection:** A person projects his new level of self into the new territory he can see ahead.

**Mission:** A person acts within the new territory and is now aware and conscious of what he is doing within a greater territory.

Spiritual intelligence is expanded by following the three aspects of identification with one’s spirit rather than ego, understanding universal law and non-attachment. The tools of spiritual intelligence comprise of prayer, contemplation, meditation, conscious awareness of one's inclinations toward fright or rage, to shift one's emotional state away from fright, and the ongoing every day practice of staying conscious of one's views, emotions, and behaviors (Diedrich, 2008).

**Components of spiritual intelligence**

According to Wigglesworth (2006), there are certain skills which can be cultivated and seem to appropriately reflect a spiritually intelligent person. The descriptors of these four skills for spiritual intelligence reflect the vertical progress toward reduced ego and enhanced expansion of awareness. These include:

**Higher self/ego self awareness:** This includes awareness of ones’s own worldview, awareness of purpose or mission of life, a wakefulness of hierarchy of values, complexity of inner thought and awareness of ego self / elevated self.

**Universal awareness:** This includes awareness of interrelatedness of all life, awareness of others’ worldviews, breadth of time / space insight, consciousness of restrictions/power of perception of humans, awareness of spiritual regulations and experience of transcendent oneness.

**Higher self/ego self mastery:** This includes dedication to spiritual augmentation, keeping elevated self in charge, living one’s purpose and values, supporting one's faith and seeking direction from spirit.

**Social mastery/spiritual presence:** This includes being a judicious and effectual spiritual educator/mentor, a sensible and effective agent to bring out change, making empathetic and astute decisions, having a composed and curative presence and being allied with the ebb and flow of life.
Diedrich (2008) offers that there are three major characteristics of spiritual intelligence as follows:

**Identifying with one's higher self or spirit rather than with the ego** - A person identifies that he is not his physical self, difficulties, precedent, finances, profession, gender, or ethnicity. All of these are just roles that each person plays. An individual is actually a spiritual entity who is having a human experience.

**Understanding universal law of cause and effect** - Spiritual intelligence denotes that a person takes total responsibility for his life, situation, and for himself. The individual recognizes that he is the originator of his life, and that his thoughts, attitudes, and assumptions craft one’s world, and that no one is to blame for it.

**Non-attachment** - As a spiritual living being, an individual is unattached to end results, structures, or experiences. His spiritual identity shapes his well-being and it comes from within.

King (2008) suggests four main components of spiritual intelligence:

**Critical existential thinking:** It is the capacity to critically contemplate meaning, reason and other existential / metaphysical concerns (e.g. death, universe) and to come to original existential conclusions regarding the same.

**Personal meaning production:** It is the capacity to acquire personal meaning and purpose from all material and rational experiences, alongwith the capacity to procure and master (i.e. live according to) purpose of life.

**Transcendental awareness:** It is the capacity to recognize transcendent dimensions/patterns of the individual himself, of others and of the material world during usual states of consciousness. It is accompanied by the ability for identification of their relationship to one’s own self and to the material.

**Conscious state expansion:** It is the capability to enter and leave higher / spiritual states of consciousness at one’s own prudence (as in deep deliberation or reflection, meditation, prayer, contemplation etc).

Mamin (2008) suggests that it is useful to look at the qualities of spiritual intelligence in order to better understand it and its probable application context. Mamin (2008) has suggested, summarized and reconciled numerous diverse capacities which are pertinent to spiritual intelligence and resulting behavioural outcomes given as under:
**Existential thinking:** It includes the ability to critically ponder over the nature of metaphysical issues like survival, realism, the cosmos, space, time; the capacity to consider and re-frame non-existential issues from an existential viewpoint (King, 2008), the ability to ask basic deep-seated "Why?" questions, quest for meaning (Zohar & Marshall, 2000) and awareness of own worldview (Wigglesworth, 2002).

**Holistic thinking:** It is the capacity to see broader patterns and connections, capacity to be at the backfoot and view situations or problems from distance; having a feeling of belongingness to a larger whole (Zohar & Marshall, 2000), awareness of interconnectedness of all life (Wigglesworth, 2002) and understanding of universal cause-effect law (Diedrich, 2008).

**Transcendental awareness and spiritual presence:** It comprises of the ability to figure out transcendent (non-material) element of one’s own self, other individuals and substantial world while in normal states of consciousness (King, 2008), awareness of ego self and higher/spiritual self in one’s self and other individuals. It is the capacity to identify and perform according to spiritual self instead of ego habits (Wigglesworth, 2002; Diedrich, 2008; Belf, 2002) and consciousness of spiritual desires of others and facilitate to be spiritual teacher/guide.

**Expansion of consciousness:** It is the capacity to experience elevated states of consciousness (e.g. true consciousness, cosmic consciousness, harmony and oneness) at one’s own will as in deep stages of contemplation, prayer etc. (King, 2008).

**Connection to spirit:** It includes the awareness of relationship with universal Spirit, Heavenly, God, Divine, Higher Power, Basis, Eventual Consciousness or in any other words which an individual prefers (Wigglesworth, 2002) and the capacity to invite this eternal force or the Spirit for being a guiding force for day to day activities (Belf, 2002).

**Personal meaning creation:** It means the capacity to obtain personal meaning and reason from all material & intellectual experiences. It is the ability to generate and master a purpose of life (King, 2008) and the ability to create a sacred feeling in everyday experience (Emmons, 2002).

**Vision and values alignment:** It comprises of the knack to acquaint and live in accordance with hierarchy of our own ethics and deep inspirations, being encouraged by own calling and task (Zohar & Marshall, 2000). It is the ability to abide by one's
own convictions, despite the criticisms and condemnation of people in general (Zohar & Marshall, 2000).

**Perspective of service:** It is the feeling called upon to give service to fellow humans on a smaller context, and the world at large; capability to give something in return. It is the sense of casting a performer in a larger show (Zohar & Marshall, 2000).

**Compassion:** Compassion means the capacity of “feeling-with” and deep sympathy to other people regardless of any differences. It is the capacity to see innate beauty of everyone and everything (Tolle, 2007).

**Humility and acceptance:** It includes the capacity to accept hardship and affliction as an opportunity to learn, an ability to face and transcend pain. It is the ability to express gratefulness and have an optimistic approach (Diedrich, 2008).

**Spontaneity and non-attachment:** It comprises of the ability to be supple, dynamically and instinctively adaptive, while living in a moment and reacting to it (Davis, 2008). It means to be present here and now, being uncommitted to outcomes, forms or experiences (Diedrich, 2008).

Spiritual intelligence, in fact, executes quite well in accordance to the conventional and established criterion for intelligence. In the present study, spiritual intelligence is assessed on the domains of critical existential thinking, personal meaning production, transcendental awareness and conscious state expansion as given by King (2008).

2.4 Personality

Like snowflakes, no two people are entirely the same. Even identical twins, who share exactly the same genetic characteristics, develop their own personal styles. The unique pattern of psychological and behavioural characteristics that emerges from the blending of inherited and acquired tendencies to make each person an identifiable individual is known as personality, which is of great importance in psychology. Personality is a person’s characteristic pattern of thoughts, feelings and behaviour.

In the words of Warren and Carmichael (1930), “Personality is the entire mental organization of a human being at any stage of his development. It embraces
every phase of human character- intellect, temperament, skill, morality, and every attitude that has been built up in the course of one's life.”

In the words of Allport (1937), “Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment.”

Eysenck (1947) describes personality as “the sum-total of the actual or potential behaviour pattern of the organism, as determined by heredity and environment, it originates and develops through the functional interaction of the four main sectors into which these behaviour patterns are organized : the cognitive sector (intelligence), the conative sector (character), the affective sector (temperament) and the somatic sector (constitution).”

According to Hall and Lindzey (1957), “Personality is the essence of a human being.”

Guilford (1959) refers to an individual’s personality as “a unique structure of traits.”

In the words of Cattell (1965), personality is “that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation.”

According to Mischel (1976), “Personality usually refers to distinctive patterns of behavior (including thoughts and emotions) that characterize each individual’s adaptation to the situations of his or her life.”

According to, Lindzey and Campbell (1989), “Personality consists completely of a set of scores or descriptive terms that describe the individual being studied in the terms of the variables or dimensions that occupy a central position with the particular theory utilized.”

According to Encyclopedia Americana (1995), personality is the sum of the patterns of thinking, feeling and behaving that are characteristic of a person. The emphasis in the field of personality is on individual differences and on the organization of psychological processes in the person.

Funder (1997) defines personality as “an individual’s characteristic patterns of thought, emotion and behaviour, together with the psychological mechanisms, hidden or not, behind those patterns.”
According to Moynihan and Peterson (2001), “Personality traits are the key antecedents of an individual’s cognitions and affective states that may influence his or her task and interpersonal or socio-emotional role behavior (in teams).”

The New Encyclopedic Britannica (2002) defines personality as the characteristic way in which a particular person thinks, feels, and behaves. Personality embraces the moods of a person, his attitudes, and opinions and is most evidently expressed in interactions with other people. Personality refers to those behavioral characteristics, both inherent and acquired that distinguish each individual and are observable in the individual’s relations to the environment and to the social group.

According to Collins Discovery Encyclopedia (2005), “Personality is the sum total of all the behavioural and mental characteristics by means of which an individual is recognized as being unique.”

Mayer (2005) defines personality as “an individual's pattern of psychological processes arising from motives, feelings, thoughts, and other major areas of psychological function. Personality is expressed through its influences on the body, in conscious mental life, and through the individual's social behavior.”

In the words of Haslam (2007), “Personality refers to those individual differences that are psychological in nature, fall outside the intellectual domain, are enduring dispositions rather than transient states and form relatively broad or generalized patterns.”

According to the Collins English Dictionary (2009), Personality is “the sum total of all the behavioural and mental characteristics by means of which an individual is recognized as being unique.”

Thus, personality is the summation of the attitudes and reactions, both physical and emotional which constitute an individual. The personality includes the inherent enduring characteristics of an individual.

2.4.1 Personality theories

Most personality theories can be grouped into one of the subsequent classes (Aurther, 2007):
**Trait theories:** Personality traits are the prominent aspects of personality which are manifested in a broad range of significant personal and social contexts. It can be said that people have certain characteristics which help in determining their behaviour partly. According to the theory, if an individual has a friendly trait, he will probably act friendly in any situation owing to the trait in his personality. One limitation of the trait theory of personality on the whole is that it leads professionalisms in clinical psychology and lay-people alike to accept classifications, or worse, proposes advice, on the basis of superficial analysis of one’s profile. The majority of familiar models of trait theories include five broad dimensions or factors: extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. Allport (1937), Cattell (1950a), Goldberg (1993) and Jung (1968) are some of the major proponents of trait theories.

**Psychodynamic theories:** According to psychodynamic theories, human behaviour is explained as an interaction between the different dimensions of personality. Sigmund Freud (1963/1917) coined this term based on the prevalent ideas of physics. He divided the human personality into id, ego and superego. The id or the unconscious mind follows the principle of pleasure, which insists for instantaneous satisfaction of its desires, despite the external environment. The ego or the conscious mind emerges afterwards to satisfy the id’s needs and demands. It is based on the principle of reality. Lastly, the superego or the preconscious mind comes into play, which instills ethical morality upon the ego. Consequently, the realistic as well as moral demands of the id are satisfied. The superego is the final function to be developed in personality. It is the personification of the ideals (parental and social) developed and imbibed during childhood. According to Freud (1963/1917), personality is shaped by the vibrant interaction of these three components.

**Behaviourist theories:** The term personality is explained as the reaction to external stimuli by the behaviourists. Skinner (1953) initiated this school of thought. According to the behaviourist theories, processes such as operant conditioning form people’s behaviour. Skinner opined that bad things are done by children because such acts on their part attract attention which further serves to reinforce the behaviour. E.g. a child cries since his crying in the previous times has given him attention. Behaviourist theories believe in the consequences and reinforcement of the responses. The crying of the child is response, and the notice which the child gets is the
reinforcing consequence. Skinner (1953) put forward a “Stimulus - Response - Consequence Model”. The model facilitates to endorse analysis of behaviour which seeks to find an answer to the critical question: “Under what conditions or antecedent ‘stimuli’ does the individual engage in a certain behaviour or ‘response’, which in turn fabricates a particular ‘consequence’?” The actions and reactions of both animals and humans are explained on the principles of conditioning by the behaviourists.

**Cognitive and Social-cognitive theories:** Cognitivists explain behaviour as directed by cognitions about the world, and particularly those about other individuals. This school of thought was propagated by a social learning theorist, Bandura (1977). He suggested that the forces of memory and emotions worked in combination with the influences of the environment. According to Ciccarelli and Meyer (2009), in the social cognitive view, behaviour is administered by an influence of external stimuli and response patterns, alongwith cognitive processes such as anticipating, judging, memory and learning by imitating models. They opine that although some critics think that human personality and behaviour are too complex to explain as the result of cognitions and external stimuli interacting, others point out that this view point has enabled the development of therapies based on learning theory that have become effective in changing undesirable behaviour.

**Humanistic theories:** Humanistic psychology emphasizes that individuals have free will, and that, they themselves are responsible for playing a dynamic role in determining their behaviour. Consequently, humanistic school of psychology centers on the subjective experiences of people instead of factors which determine behaviour. Maslow (1987) and Rogers (1961) were proponents of this view. They focus on things which make people exclusively human such as personal emotions and the liberty to choose one’s own fortune. According to Ciccarelli and Meyer (2009), humanistic theory is very complex to test scientifically. Rather than being a psychological elucidation, it is more of a philosophical vision of human behaviour. Its greatest impact has been on the formulation of therapies for promoting self-growth and helping people understand themselves and others in a better manner.

### 2.4.2 Personality types

In the description of personality, two terms are often invoked; these are ‘type’ and ‘trait’. Many authors consider that a theory invoking ‘traits’ must certainly be
opposed to a theory invoking ‘types’, on the context that trait theory presupposes a normal distribution of the characteristics measured, while type theory presupposes a bimodal distribution. Type theory tends to classify people into strikingly divided groups, whereas trait theory assumes an incessant gradation, with most people near the average (Stagner, 1937). Thus, type theory would call all people either introvert or extravert while trait theory would find that most people tended to be ambivert (Conklin, 1927).

Jung (1971) categorized people into definite personality types based on the outward and inward flow of their libido, i.e. life energy. Jung (1971) asserted that an individual’s psychological make-up (psyche) is constantly working on two levels: the conscious and the unconscious. Moreover, an individual’s conscious and unconscious states are self-balancing, i.e. when conscious side or position becomes dominant, the unconscious will manifest in some way to resolve the balance. Jung (1971) divided psychic energy into two fundamental general attitude types: introverted and extraverted. The extraverted attitude is oriented towards the outside or external world. The people who prefer to be extraverted would like to spend some time interacting with the outside world, the dealing with the inner world of subjective experiences and mental events. The introverted attitude is oriented towards the internal, subjective world. People who prefer to be introvert like to spend some time in quiet contemplation and reflection. In addition to the two attitudes of introversion and extraversion, Jung (1971) identified four basic psychological functions: thinking, feeling, sensation and intuition. A person’s preferred function is dominated and conscious, while the non-preferred function is auxiliary and unconscious.

Various personality types have been described by various psychologists from time to time, some of which are extraverted vs introverted (Jung, 1923), objective vs subjective (Binet, 1900), sthenic vs asthenic (Burt, 1937), cyclothymics vs schizothymic (Kretschmer, 1926), extratensive vs introvertive (Rorschach, 1942), surgent vs desurgent (Cattell, 1933), inhibitory vs excitatory (Pavlov, 1941), explosive vs obstructive (James, 1890), shallow broad vs deep narrow (Gross, 1902), syntropic vs idiotropic (Wertheimer & Hesketh, 1926), adient vs avoidant (Holt, 1931), viscerotonic vs cerebrotonic (Sheldon, 1942), manic vs melancholic (Heymans & Wiersma, 1908).
Eysenck (1947) was the pioneer psychologist to formulate his trait or temperament business into somewhat more mathematical. He gave a long list of adjectives to innumerable people and used a unique statistics called the four factor analysis to find out what factors trait dimensions – carry the most weight. Using the results of this work, Eysenck created a test named the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ). Rather than making these traits ‘either’ ‘or’ like Jung, he viewed them as dimensions. The trait dimensions were:

(a) **Extraversion-introversion:** A low score meant that an individual is introverted and a high score meant that an individual is extraverted.

(b) **Neuroticism:** A person scoring high on this scale meant that he tends to be a very nervous or emotional kind of a person. It doesn’t mean that he is compulsarily a neurotic, but it surely means that in comparison to a person who scores low on this scale, he is more probable to develop neurotic problems like phobias, obsessions and compulsions. These days, low neuroticism is often termed as emotional stability.

(c) **Psychotism:** It was added later, after he had collected further data from natives of mental institutions. Complying with the name, these are people who have tendencies for psychosis, which means that there is a greater possibility of these people to have problems dealing with reality. Psychotic people sometimes suffer from hallucinations and generally have delusions. A middle score on psychotism would mean that a person is somewhat eccentric or that he is capable of taking risks more likely than other people. A low score implies that a person is pretty normal in this context.

Psychologists, concerning the basic dimensions of personality known as the ‘Big Five’ (Goldberg, 1993) or the five factor model (Mc Crae & Costa, 1990) have viewed the following five factors as the major individual difference variables:

(a) **Extroversion-introversion:** The individuals with this trait are energized, amiable, sociable, talkative, assertive and emotionally expressive, to name a few characteristics.

(b) **Agreeableness:** This dimension of personality embraces attributes like conviction, altruism, compassion, warmth, self-sacrifice and other pro-social behaviours.
(c) **Conscientiousness:** The general characteristics of this dimension are elevated level of contemplation, good control over impulses and a behaviour directed towards the goal. Individuals with high conscientiousness are likely to be highly organized and wary of details.

(d) **Neuroticism:** The individuals scoring high on this trait are liable to experience emotional unsteadiness, apprehensions, sulkiness, irritability, moodiness and unhappiness.

(e) **Openness:** The individuals scoring high on this trait have characteristics like imagination, insight and a wide array of interests.

The personality types given by Jung (1933) are probably the most widely used. Jung believed that all people could be divided into two personality types; extraverts and introverts. Extraverts are outgoing and sociable while introverts are more solitary and dislike being the centre of attraction. Extravert people are more talkative and believe in taking action, prefer to work in groups rather than alone, have a knack to interpret body language and face expressions, counter well to admiration and antagonism, choose a prompt, less accurate approach, perform well in tasks which involve short time memory and need happenings in the outer world. On the other hand, introverts speak less and reflect more before performing an act, like to remain calm, are good at thoughtful problem solving and errands which involve long term memory, are fond of working independently, prefer subtle and slow but more precise approach, have problem in establishing relationships with others, oriented towards internal world of ideas and thoughts and have a lot going on in their inner world.

These dimensions represent broad areas of personality. Research has established that these groups of characteristics tend to occur collectively in many people. For example, a person who is sociable tends to be talk more. However, these traits may not occur together necessarily. Personality is the summation of the actual or probable behaviour patterns of an individual which are influenced by heredity or environment. It originates and expands through the functional interaction of the four main sectors into which these behaviour-patterns are organized: the cognitive sector (intelligence), the conative sector (character), the affective sector (temperament) and the somatic sector (constitution). Personality is a composite conception and each individual may exhibit behaviours across these types or traits.