CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

This chapter focuses on the various results on the level of internalization of conflict in relation to the personality types and also the relationship between the personality types and the management of conflict styles. It describes the relationship between the level of internalization of conflict for each index of Personality types, (EI, SN, JP, TF), the relationship between clear preference for extraversion and introversion for various dimensions of internalization of conflict. It also focuses on the prediction of the behavioural and emotional symptoms due to internalization of conflict.

The results obtained through vigorous statistical analysis for different purposes show that the phase before manifestation of conflict, i.e., internalization of conflict vary with various functions and the attitude (Jung 1921/1973) as discussed in earlier chapter.

The results and their interpretation of these results would be described in terms of:

1. The behavioural and emotional symptoms experienced by managers during conflicting situations in organization.

2. The indices of personality type namely (EI, SN, TF and JP).
3. The two personality types, which were obtained among the sample of managers.
4. The clear extraverts and clear introverts.
5. The two levels of internalization of conflict i.e. high and low.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

Discriminant analysis is the statistical technique most commonly used to investigate a set of problems where the concept is that the linear combinations of the independent variables sometimes called predictor variables are formed and serve as the basis of classification into one of the groups. It aims to identify how well the predictors distinguish between the two groups of dependent variable. In the present study, the predictors are the eight dimensions of the internalization of conflict in organizations and the two groups of dependent variable are (1) the group representing presence of the symptom (2) the group representing absence of the symptom.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS FOR DIFFICULTY IN GETTING SOUND SLEEP

TABLE 3.1(a)

Number of Respondents in Terms of Presence & Absence of Symptoms

	GROUP I (SYMPTOM ABSENT)	GROUP II (SYMPTOM PRESENT)	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
NO. OF RESPON-DENTS	140	135	275

In a sample of 275, it was found that 135 respondents were identified with Group II, i.e., the presence of symptom and 140 respondents were identified with the Group I, i.e. the absence of symptom.

TABLE 3.1(b)

Canonical Discriminant Function

EIGEN VALUE	CANONICAL CORRELATION	WILK'S LAMBDA	CHI SQUARE	df	Sig
0.1006	0.3024	0.9086	25.797	8	0.001

The canonical correlation (0.3024) when converted to Wilk's Lambda (0.9086) and then to chi-square (25.796) implies that it

is significant at 0.001 level. In other words, there are 99.9% chances of occurance of this symptom due to internalization of conflict and only 0.01% of probability is there of occurance of this symptom due to any other factor.

TABLE 3.1(c)

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Functions Coefficient

PREDICTORS	COEFFICIENT
JP/WC	-0.57663
UWS	0.36558
WGS	- 0.30685
T	0.92946
WC	0.10406
RS	0.21102
II	0.29073
RC	- 0.36381

The group centroid for Group II i.e. group representing presence of symptom is higher (0.32189) than Group I, i.e. the group representing the absence of symptoms. The above given table (table 3.1.c.) shows that the T i.e. situation of threat (0.92946) maximally discriminate the presence of the symptom of insomnia. The other predictor which discriminates the presence of this symptom from the absence of symptom is UWS.

The predictor, JP/WC, WGS and RC were found to be associated maximally with the group I, i.e., symptom absent.

The group means for the Group II, which represents the presence of the symptom was also found to be higher than the

group means for Group I in case of UWS, T, RS, and II whereas the group means for Group I was higher or equal to the group means for Group II in case of JP/WC, WGS, WC, RC. This implies their contribution to this symptom, irrespective of the level of contribution.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS ON GROUPS DEFINED BY THE SYMPTOM OF DIFFICULTY IN CONCENTRATION

TABLE 3.2(a)

Number of Respondents in Terms of Presence & Absence of Symptom

	GROUP I (SYMPTOM ABSENT)	GROUP II (SYMPTOM PRESENT)	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
NO. OF RESPON-DENTS	143	132	275

The table 3.2(a) shows the distribution of a sample of 275 on the basis of presence or absence of the symptom of difficulty in concentration. 132 respondents were identified in the Group II, which represents the presence of the symptom and 143 respondents were assigned to Group I which represents the absence of the symptom.

TABLE 3.2(b)

Canonical Discriminant Function

EIGEN VALUE	CANONICAL CORRELATION	WILK'S LAMBDA	CHI SQUARE	df	Sig.
0.0946	0.2940	0.9135	24.323	8	0.002

The eigen value is 0.0946, the canonical correlation is 0.2940, which gives Wilk's Lambda equal to 0.9135, which is close to 1 implies that the group means are similar. The chi-square (24.323) was found to be significant at 0.002 level. In other words, there are 99.8% probability of occurance of this symptom (difficulty in concentrating) due to different dimensions of internalization of conflict and 0.2% probability of occurance of this symptom due to other factors.

TABLE 3.2(c)

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Functions Coefficients

PREDICTORS	COEFFICIENTS
JP/WC	0.57497
UWS	- 0.21583
WGS	- 0.38915
T	0.56761
WC	- 0.04631
RS	0.49347
II	0.08282
RC	0.05019

The group centroid (0.31902) for Group I was found to be higher than group centroid for Group II (-0.29448). The JP/WC (0.57497), T (0.56761), RS (0.49347), were found to be associated with discriminated the presence of the symptom of difficulty in concentrating. The group centroid (-0.29448) for Group II was found to be associated with UWS (-0.21583), WGS (-0.38915) and RS (-0.04631). The group means for the Group II, which represents the presence of the symptom was also found to be higher than the group means for Group I in case of JP/WC, T, Rs, whereas the group means for the Group I was either found to be equal or higher than the Group II for other predictors.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS ON GROUPS DEFINED BY SYMPTOM 'ANTICIPATING THE WORST'

TABLE 3.3(a)

Number of Respondents in Terms of Presence & Absence of Symptom

	GROUP I (SYMPTOM ABSENT)	GROUP II (SYMPTOM PRESENT)	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
NO. OF RESPON-DENTS	190	85	275

The Table 3.3(a) shows the distribution of a sample of 275, on the basis of presence or absence of the symptom of anticipating the worst. 85 respondents were identified to be in Group II i.e., 'symptom present' and 190 respondents were identified to be in Group I i.e., 'symptom absent'.

TABLE 3.3(b)

Canonical Discriminant Function

EIGEN VALUE	CANONICAL CORRELATION	WILK'S LAMBDA	CHI SQUARE	df	Sig.
0.0521	0.2225	0.9505	13.655	8	0.0912

The eigen value is 0.0521. The canonical correlation is 0.2225 and the Wilk's Lambda is 0.9505. The Wilk's Lambda is converted to chi-square (13.655) that shows the significance at 0.09 level, when df is 8. In other words, the probability of occurance of this symptom due to internalization of conflict was found to be 91%. 9% chances of occurance of this symptom might be due to other factors.

TABLE 3.3(c)

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Functions Coefficient

PREDICTORS	COEFFICIENT
JP/WC	0.56817
UWS	- 0.17468
WGS	0.54946
T	- 0.16571
WC	- 0.27235
RS	0.36859
II	0.49573
RC	- 0.27714

The group centroid for Group II (0.33992), which shows the presence of the symptom is higher, than the group centroid for Group I (0.15207), showing the absence of the symptom.

The canonical discriminant coefficient which indicate that the internalization of conflict predictors, JP/WC, WGS, RC and II, maximally discriminate the presence of the symptom. Out of these, the RS and II were not found to discriminate between the two groups much.

The predictors, UWC, T, WC, RC were found to be associated with the group representing absence of the symptom. Since, the coefficient for these predictors were not found to be high, their identification with any of the two groups was not distinct.

The group means for the Group II, which represents the presence of the symptom was also found to be higher than the Group I, which represents the absence of the symptoms for all the eight predictors. This emphasizes the contribution to this particular symptom from these eight predictors.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS ON GROUPS DEFINED BY SYMPTOM OF 'TREMBLING'

TABLE 3.4(a)

Number of Respondents in Terms of Presence & Absence of Symptom

	GROUP I (SYMPTOM ABSENT)	GROUP II (SYMPTOM PRESENT)	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
NO. OF RESPON-DENTS	255	20	275

The table 3.4(a) shows the distribution of a sample of 275 on the basis of presence or absence of the symptom of 'trembling' when internalization of conflict takes place. 20 respondents said that they do have the symptom (Group II) whereas 255 respondents were identified to be in Group I, having not felt the symptom.

TABLE 3.4(b)

Canonical Discriminant Function

EIGEN VALUE	CANONICAL CORRELATION	WILK'S LAMBDA	CHI SQUARE	df	Sig.
0.0525	0.2234	0.9501	13.772	8	0.0879

The eigen value is 0.0525, the canonical correlation is 0.2234 is converted to Lambda which is equal to 0.9501. This

value is further converted to chi-square (13.772) shows that it is significant only in case of 92%. There are 8% of chances that the symptoms might have occured by chance or due to some other reason.

TABLE 3.4(c)

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficient

PREDICTORS	COEFFICIENTS
JP/WC	0.40440
UWS	- 0.70723
WGS	- 0.70251
T	0.64028
WC	- 0.56936
RS	0.33044
II	0.26038
RC	0.61494

The group centroid for Group II, shows that the presence of symptom is higher (0.81541) than the group centroid for Group I (-0.06395) i.e. absence of the symptom.

The table 3.4(c) showing the standardized canonical discriminant coefficient indicates that the factors of internalization of conflict such as JP/WC (0.40440), T (0.64028), RC (0.61494) discriminate the presence of symptom of trembling maximally, then followed by RS (0.33044), II (0.26038).

On the otherhand, the internalization of conflict due to UWS (0.70723), WGS (0.70251), WC (0.56936) was found to be falling in the group representing absence of this symptom of trembling.

The group means for the Group II, which represents the presence of the symptom was also found to be higher than the group means for Group I in case of JP/WC, T, and Rc. However, the group means for Group I was higher than the group means for Group II in case of UWS, WGS, and WC.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS ON GROUPS DEFINED BY 'NIGHTMARES'

TABLE 3.5(a)

Number of Respondents in Terms of Presence & Absence of Symptom

	GROUP I (SYMPTOM ABSENT	GROUP II (SYMPTOM PRESENT	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
NO. OF RESPON-DENTS	207	68	275

On the basis of absence or presence of this symptom (nightmare), 207 respondents were identified with Group I, which represents absence of getting nightmares and 68 respondents were found to be in Group II characterised by the presence of the symptom of getting nightmares.

TABLE 3.5(b)

Canonical Discriminant Function

EIGEN VALUE	CANONICAL CORRELATION	WILK'S LAMBDA	CHI SQUARE	df	Sig.
0.0644	0.2460	0.9395	16.789	8	0.03

The table 3.5(b) shows the eigen value is 0.0644, the canonical correlation was found to be (0.2460) which on converting to Wilk's Lambda (0.9395). The chi-square (16.789) was found to be significant at 0.03 level, it can be said that the occurance of nightmares in the sample may be due to internalization of conflict in 97% of occasions, whereas 3% of probability is there that this symptom would have occured due to other factors or by chance.

TABLE 3.5(c)

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Functions Coefficients

PREDICTORS	COEFFICIENTS
JP/WC	- 0.33179
UWS	- 0.08465
WGS	- 0.31979
T	0.96978
WC	0.37616
RS	0.33048
II	- 0.23590
RC	0.24558

The group centroid for Group II (0.44116) is higher than group centroid for Group I (-0.14492).

The above given table 3.1(c) shows that the T (0.96978), WC (0.37616), RS (0.33048), RC (0.24558) discriminate the presence of the symptom in respective order. The JP/WC (-0.33179), UWS (-0.08465), WGS (-0.31979), II (-0.23590) were found to be falling in the group representing the absence of the symptom.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS ON GROUPS DEFINED BY THE SYMPTOM OF 'WORRY'

TABLE 3.6(a)

Number of Respondents in Terms of Presence & Absence of Symptom

	GROUP I (SYMPTOM ABSENT)	GROUP II (SYMPTOM PRESENT)	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
No. of Respon-dents	119	156	275

The table 3.6 (a) shows the distribution of a sample of 275 respondents. It was found that 119 were identified with the Group I, which represents the absence of the symptom and 156 identified with the Group II, which represents the presence of the symptom that means, this symptom was present in as many 156 respondents whereas, this symptom was absent in 119 respondents.

TABLE 3.6(b)

Canonical Discriminant Function

EIGEN VALUE	CANONICAL CORRELATION	WILK'S LAMBDA	CHI SQUARE	df	Sig
0.623	0.2422	0.9413	16.268	8	0.0387

The eigen value is 0.623, the canonical correlation is 0.2422 and the Wilk's Lambda is 0.9413. The Lambda is transfered to chi-square, i.e., 16.268, which is significant at 0.03 level. There are 97% chances that the symptom of worry would have been found to occur due to internalization of conflict, and 3% of probability of occurance of this symptom may be due to other factors or chance.

TABLE 3.6(c)

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficient

PREDICTORS	COEFFICIENTS
JP/WC	0.56399
UWS	- 0.1447
WGS	- 0.07043
T	0.5518
WC	0.16167
RS	- 0.36236
II	0.42455
RC	- 0.01768

The JP/WC, T, show a strong tendency in contributing to this particular symptom. The group centroid for Group I was found to be high (-0.28483) in relation to the group centroid II (0.21728). The group means for the Group II, was again found to be higher than the group means for Group I in case of all the predictors.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS ON GROUPS DEFINED BY THE 'PESSIMISTIC THOUGHTS'

TABLE 3.7(a)

Number of Respondents in Terms of Presence & Absence of Symptom

	GROUP I (SYMPTOM ABSENT)	GROUP II (SYMPTOM PRESENT)	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
NO. OF RESPON-DENTS	197	78	275

Out of 275 respondents, 78 respondents were found to be in Group II which represents the presence of symptom and 197 respondents were found to be in Group I, that represents the absence of symptom.

TABLE 3.7(b)

Canonical Discriminant Function

EIGEN VALUE	CANONICAL CORRELATION	WILK'S LAMBDA	CHI SQUARE	df	Sig.
0.0975	0.2981	0.9111	25.031	8	0.001

The eigen value (0.0975), the Wilk's Lambda (0.9111). The chi-square (25.03) was found to be significant at 0.01 level. Thus, the chances of occurance of symptom like 'pessimistic thoughts' was 99% due to internalization of conflict and 1% probability was that, this symptom would have occured due to any other factor.

TABLE 3.7(c)

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Functions Coefficients

PREDICTORS	COEFFICIENTS
JP/WC	- 0.0076
UWS	- 0.23296
WGS	- 0.32907
T	0.61613
WC	- 0.23631
RS	0.44854
II	0.67588
RC	0.18060

The group centroid for Group II was found to be higher (0.49448) than the group centroid for Group I (-0.19578).

The JP/WC, UWS, WGS, WC were found to be associated with the Group I i.e. absence of the symptom (-0.00767, -0.23296, 0.32907, -0.23631) respectively. The T, WC, II, and RC (0.61613, 0.44854, 0.67588, 0.18060) respectively were found to be associated with the Group II which represents the presence of the symptom. The group means for the Group II, was found to be higher than the group means for Group I in case of all the predictors.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS ON GROUPS DEFINED BY THE 'SYMPTOM OF NUMBNESS IN THE BRAIN'

TABLE 3.8(a)

Number of Respondents in Terms of Presence & Absence of Symptom

	GROUP I (SYMPTOM ABSENT)	GROUP II (SYMPTOM PRESENT)	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
NO. OF RESPON-DENTS	242	33	275

For the Group II, which shows the presence of the symptom (numbness in the brain), 33 respondents were identified with this group and 242 respondents were identified with the Group I which represents the absence of the symptom.

TABLE 3.8(b)

Canonical Discriminant Function

EIGEN VALUE	CANONICAL CORRELATION	WILK'S LAMBDA	CHI SQUARE	df	Sig.
0.0559	0.2301	0.947	14.638	8	0.06

The canonical correlation was found to be (0.2301). The Wilk's Lambda (0.947) on converting to chi-square (14.638) was found to be significant at 0.06 level. This symptom was found to have occured in case of 94% of occasions due to internalization of conflict and the probability of occurance of this symptom due to other factors were found to be 6%.

TABLE 3.8(c)

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

PREDICTORS	COEFFICIENTS
JP/WC	0.86924
UWS	0.13835
WGS	- 0.49826
T	0.34476
WC	- 0.01187
RS	- 0.09335
II	0.44067
RC	0.13164

The group centroid for Group II which represents the presence of symptom (0.63807) was found to be higher than the Group I (-0.08701) which represents the absence of the symptom.

The JP/WC, were found to be associated with the presence of the symptom (0.86924) respectively. The WGS, II, were found to be associated with the Group showing the absence of the symptom (-0.49826, -0.44067) respectively.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS ON GROUPS DEFINED BY 'DISSATISFACTION WITH SELF'

TABLE 3.9(a)

Number of Respondents in Terms of Presence & Absence of Symptom

	GROUP I (SYMPTOM ABSENT)	GROUP II (SYMPTOM PRESENT)	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
NO. OF RESPON-DENTS	195	80	275

From the above given table we can make out that the 80 respondents were found to be in Group II, showing the presence of symptom and 195 were found to be in Group I, showing absence of symptom.

TABLE 3.9(b)

Canonical Discriminant Function

EIGEN VALUE	CANONICAL CORRELATION	WILK'S LAMBDA	CHI SQUARE	df	Sig.
0.0612	0.2402	0.9423	15.98	8	0.04

The canonical correlation, which shows the degree of association between discriminant scores and the group was found to be 0.2402. The Wilk's Lambda (0.9423). The chi-square (15.98) was found to be significant at (0.04) level. In other words, there are 96% chances of occurance of this symptom due to internalization of conflict and 4% chances that this symptom (dissatisfaction with self) would have occured due to some other factors.

TABLE 3.9(c)

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

PREDICTORS	COEFFICIENTS
JP/WC	0.66405
UWS	- 0.20736
WGS	- 0.42803
T	0.26383
WC	0.12574
RS	0.28311
II	- 0.46923
RC	0.60286

The group centroid for Group II (0.38488) was found to be higher for the group representing the presence of symptom than the group centroid for Group I (-0.15790).

From the table given above it can be infered that the JP/WC (0.66405), RC (0.60286) are associated maximally discriminate the two groups, representing the presence and absence of the symptom. However, WGS and II respectively were found to be associated with the absence of this symptom. The group means for the Group II, which represents the presence of the symptom had been found to be higher than the group means for Group I in case of all the predictors except II.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS ON GROUPS DEFINED BY 'SYMPTOM OF LIFE BECOMING HOPELESS'

TABLE 3.10(a)

Number of Respondents in Terms of Presence & Absence of Symptom

	GROUP I (SYMPTOM ABSENT)	GROUP II (SYMPTOM PRESENT)	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
NO. OF RESPON-DENTS	254	21	275

Out of 275 respondents, 254 respondents were assigned to Group I which represents the absence of the symptom and 21 respondents were assigned to the Group II, which represents the presence of the symptom.

TABLE 3.10(b)

Canonical Discriminant Function

EIGEN VALUE	CANONICAL CORRELATION	WILK'S LAMBDA	CHI SQUARE	df	Sig.
0.0741	0.2627	0.9310	19.236	8	0.01

The canonical correlation 0.2627 on converting, gives Wilk's Lambda equal to 0.9310. The chi-square (19.236) was found to be significant at 0.01 level. In other words, the symptom of 'life becoming hopeless' occured at 99% of occasions due to internalization of conflict and at 1% of occasions due to some other factor.

TABLE 3.10(c)

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Functions Coefficients

PREDICTORS	COEFFICIENTS
JP/WC	0.67219
UWS	- 0.79294
WGS	- 0.31655
T	0.40836
WC	0.14102
RS	0.74445
II	- 0.06233
RC	0.02874

The group centroid for Group II (0.94345) was found to be extremely high in comparison to the group centroid for Group I (-0.07800).

JP/WC (0.67219), T (0.40836), RS (0.74445), were found to be greatly associated with the presence of the symptom, UWS (-0.79294), and was found to be associated better with the absence of the symptom.

Since, from the sample in question, only two personality types emerged most prominently i.e. ESTJ and ISTJ. The rest of the personality types were found to be occasionally present among the managers. Hence, to find out, as to what extent the managers of these two personality types (ESTJ and ISTJ) differed on various dimensions of internalization of conflict and the three styles of conflict management styles, t-test were run.

The following tables describe the given relationship in detail.

TABLE 3.11

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF ESTJ AND ISTJ FOR I.C.S. (AS A WHOLE) (N = 234)

PERSONALITY PROFILE	ΣX	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	15828	129.73	20.3	122	9.41**
ISTJ	17233	153.86	18.9	112	

**$p < .01$

The above table (table 3.11) shows a significant difference in internalization of conflict between the two personality types of the managers, i.e. ESTJ (Extraverted-Sensing-Thinking Judging) type and ISTJ (Introvert-Sensing-Thinking Judging). The t-value is observed to be highly significant, which shows that the internalization of conflict among the ISTJs' and ESTJs' is not similar. Seeing, the mean values, it can be inferred that the ISTJs internalize the conflict more than those of the ESTJs.

TABLE 3.12

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF ESTJs AND ISTJ FOR JP/WC DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

PERSONALITY PROFILE	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	352	2.98	2.2	122	2.48**
ISTJ	426	3.8	2.84	112	

**$p < .01$

The table 3.12 shows a significant difference between the ESTJ and ISTJ managers was observed when the internalization of conflict due to JP/WC (Job Prospect and Working Condition) was studied. The t (2.48) shows that these two personality types internalize the conflict differently. The ISTJ managers internalize high level of conflict, whereas the ESTJ managers internalize the conflict less in comparison to the ISTJs, when the internalization of conflict is due to JP/WC.

TABLE 3.13

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF ESTJ AND ISTJ FOR UWC OF I.C.S.

PERSONALITY PROFILE	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	354	2.9	2.24	122	2.8 **
ISTJ	429	3.8	2.64	112	

**$p < .01$

The t (2.8) value shows a significant difference between the ESTJ and ISTJ managers in regard to the internalization of conflict due to Unexpected Working Conditions. The managers of ISTJ personality type were found to be again high on internalization of conflict than the managers of ESTJ personality types (TABLE 3.13).

TABLE 3.14

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF ESTJ AND ISTJ FOR WGS DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

PERSONALITY PROFILE	$\leq X$	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	348	2.85	1.892	122	3.63**
ISTJ	432	3.85	2.28	112	

**$p < .01$

As in case of previous dimensions, this dimension also shows that ESTJ type managers internalize low level of conflict (x 2.85) in comparison to the ISTJ type managers (x = 3.85). Again a significant difference was observed between the two personality types, when the internalization of conflict due to the work group situation was considered to be one of the dimensions (TABLE 3.14).

TABLE 3.15

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF ESTJ AND ISTJ FOR T DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

PERSONALITY PROFILE	$\leqslant X$	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	357	2.926	2.3	122	1.83*
ISTJ	386	3.446	2.14	112	

*$p < .05$

The above table (TABLE 3.15) shows that the internalization of conflict due to threat (T), was found to be high for the managers of ESTJ personality type in comparison to the managers of ISTJ personality type. The t was found to be significant which shows that there is a significant difference between the ESTJ and ISTJ type of personality, when the internalization of conflict is due to Threat.

TABLE 3.16

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF ESTJ AND ISTJ FOR WC DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

PERSONALITY PROFILE	$\leqslant X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	329	2.69	2.32	122	1.707*
ISTJ	357	3.187	2.14	112	

*$p < .05$

The t (1.707) shows that a significant difference exists between the managers of two personality types on the dimension of WC, i.e. work coordination which is one of the factors of internalization of conflict. It was observed that like other dimensions, the ISTJs stood high on this dimension too, in comparison to the ESTJs (TABLE 3.16).

TABLE 3.17

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF ESTJ AND ISTJ FOR RS DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

PERSONALITY PROFILE	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	586	4.803	1.5	122	1.27
ISTJ	578	5.16	2.6	112	

NOT SIGNIFICANT

The above table (TABLE 3.17) shows that both the personality types do not show any significant difference on the sixth dimension of the internalization of conflict scale i.e. (RS). Managers of these two personality types seem to be affected highly as it could be well made out by the mean values of the scores internalization of conflict by these two types of personality of the managers.

TABLE 3.18

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF ESTJ AND ISTJ FOR II DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

PERSONALITY PROFILE	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	534	4.37	4.81	122	1.403
ISTJ	530	4.73	4.01	112	

NOT SIGNIFICANT

The internalization of conflict due to II, i.e., individual inefficiency too shows that the managers of ISTJ and ESTJ personality type internalize high level of conflict and no significant difference was observed between the managers of these two personality types.

TABLE 3.19

t VALUE OF MEANS OF ESTJ AND ISTJ FOR RC DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

PERSONALITY PROFILE	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	514	4.213	2.26	122	1.303
ISTJ	519	4.63	2.64	112	

NOT SIGNIFICANT

The above table (TABLE 3.19) shows, that the managers of these two personality types ESTJ and ISTJ, both get affected by this dimension i.e. recognition. The internalization of conflict was found to be high for both the personality types. Thus, the t shows no significant difference in the internalization of conflict due to RC, i.e., recognition which is one of the dimension of the internalization of conflict.

Till now, we tested the significance of difference between the means of the two personality types for the dimensions of internalization of conflict. Now, we move to see the results of the t tests run to check the significance of difference between the means of the two personality types for the style of conflict management adopted.

TABLE 3.20

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF ESTJ AND ISTJ FOR SO STYLE OF CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

PERSONALITY PROFILE	$\leq \bar{X}$	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	294.73	2.415	1.13	122	1.17
ISTJ	291.25	2.6	1.11	112	

NOT SIGNIFICANT

The Table 3.20 shows, there is no significant difference between the two personality types in case of opting for solution oriented style of conflict management.

Both the personality profiles were found to be adopting for the solution-oriented style of conflict management similarly.

TABLE 3.21

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF ESTJ AND ISTJ FOR C STYLE OF CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

PERSONALITY PROFILE	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	305.94	2.75	1.017	122	2.59**
ISTJ	295.53	2.42	0.93	112	

**p < .01

The Table 3.21 shows a significant difference between the ESTJ and ISTJ personality profiles, in adopting control style of conflict management.

The ESTJs were found to be opting for this style of conflict management more often than the ISTJs.

TABLE 3.22

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF ESTJ AND ISTJ FOR NC STYLE OF CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

PERSONALITY PROFILE	EX	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
ESTJ	299.01	2.49	0.91	122	1.41
ISTJ	302.24	2.69	1.03	112	

NOT SIGNIFICANT

The Table 3.22 shows a significant difference in adoption of the control style of conflict management too. The ISTJs were found to be opting for the non-confrontational style of conflict management more often than their counterparts with ESTJ personality profile.

To study the extent of relationship between the four Indices of Personality type (EI, SN, TF and JP) and the eight dimensions of Internalization of conflict, Pearsons Product Moment Correlations were computed.

The next table gives the detailed picture of these correlations.

TABLE 3.23

PEARSONS' PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION (r) VALUES BETWEEN THE DIMENSIONS OF I.C.S. AND THE INDICES OF PERSONALITY TYPES (N=275)

DIMENSIONS OF ICS	INDICES OF PERSONALITY TYPES			
	EI	SN	TF	JP
JP/WC	0.1083	-0.0548	0.0857	0.0455
UWS	0.0720	-0.0555	0.0856	-0.009
WGS	0.0547	0.1085	0.0401	0.0291
T	0.0519	-0.1283*	0.1709**	0.0344
WC	-0.0614	-0.1423**	-0.0284	-0.1141*
Rs	0.0601	-0.090	0.1108*	-0.0631
II	-0.0098	-0.1312*	0.0458	-0.0613
Rc	0.0646	0.0524	0.0997	0.0597
TOTAL	0.0541	-0.076	0.0958	-0.0182

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

The above given table (table 3.23) does not show many significant correlations between the dimensions of internalization of conflict and the Indices of Myers Briggs Type Indicator. A mixed picture is obtained in these relationships.

The EI index shows no significant relationship with any dimension of internalization of conflict scale. However, except for WC and II all the remaining rs are found to be positively related though not significant.

The rf between the SN index and the dimension of internalization of conflict show three negative and significant relationships. These three rs are between SN and T (-0.1283), SN and WC (-0.1423) and SN and II (-0.1312). The rest of the rs are also found to be negative except with that of WGS (0.1085) and Rc (0.0524), which are not significant.

With TF, the rs are found to be positive except for WC. With T and RS the correlation coefficients are found to be significant (0.1709) and (0.1108). The rest of the values are found to be positive but not significant. r between JP and WC the (-0.1141) is found to be significant. The rest of the rs are found to be not significant.

Pearson's product moment correlations were computed to see the extent of relationship between the internalization of conflict and the styles of conflict management. In other words, the correlations between the internalization due to eight dimensions were studied with the three styles of conflict management.

The following table shows the details of these Product Moment Correlations.

TABLE 3.24

PEARSON'S PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS (rs) VALUE BETWEEN THE DIMENSIONS OF I.C.S. AND THE CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES (N=275)

DIMENSIONS OF I.C.S.	CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES		
	SO	NC	C
JP/WC	0.0867	0.1814**	0.0419
UWS	0.0188	0.1687**	0.0146
WGS	0.0836	0.1807**	0.072
T	0.1045	0.2055**	0.0319
WC	0.0940	0.1359**	0.1075
Rs	0.0053	0.2001**	-0.0347
II	0.081	0.1115*	0.1784
RC	0.0762	0.1470**	0.1198
TOTAL	0.0974	0.2291**	0.0947

*$p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

This shows, that whatever, may be the reason behind the internalization of conflict the most popularly opted style of conflict management is non-confrontational style of management.

The above table (table 3.24) shows the Pearson's product moment correlations (rs) between the dimensions of internalization of conflict and the styles of conflict management. The only prominent style of conflict management was observed to be non-confrontational style of conflict management. Though, the positive correlation with all the dimensions except for one i.e. between RS and C which show a negative correlation, depicts that the three styles are adopted at one or the other instance. However, only the (rs) between the various dimensions of internalization of conflict and the non-confrontational style of conflict management were found to be positive and significant.

TABLE 3.25

PEARSON'S PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION (r) VALUES BETWEEN THE INDICES OF MBTI AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES (N = 275)

	CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES		
INDICES OF MBTI	SO	NC	C
EI	-0.0866	0.1476**	0.0125
SN	-0.023	-0.2061**	0.0395
TF	0.026	0.1661**	0.0018
JP	-0.041	-0.0313	0.0873

*p < .05 ** p < .01

The table 3.25 shows that the product moment correlation coefficients are significant for three indices, i.e., EI, SN and TF. The r for EI and NC (0.1476) and TF and NC (0.1661) are found to be positive and significant and the r for SN and NC (-0.2061) was found to be negative and significant.

To test the significance of difference between the clear extraverts (CE) and clear introverts (CI) on various dimensions of internalization of conflict, t tests were done.

The clear extraverts and clear introverts were segregated on the basis of the criteria given by Isabel Myers. These cut-off points are treated as approximations not as precise division points. The interpretation and the cut-off points have been discussed in detail in the chapter on Methodology.

TABLE 3.26

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF CLEAR EXTRAVERTS AND CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR TOTAL I.C.S.

CLEAR E & I	ΣX	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	5049	112.22	17.12	45	3.57**
CI	6111	112.6	10.21	50	

**$p < .01$

The t (3.57) shows a significant difference between the clear extraverts and clear introverts as far as the internalization of conflict is concerned.

The mean values show the clear introverts tend to internalize conflict more than the clear extroverts.

TABLE 3.27

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF CLEAR EXTRAVERTS AND CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR JP/WC DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

CLEAR E & I	$\leqslant X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	600	13.33	3.00	45	2.78**
CI	716	14.32	2.8	50	

**$p < .01$

A significant difference was observed between clear extraverts and clear introverts on the dimension of Job prospects/Working condition. This shows that the clear extraverts would internalize low level of conflict than the clear introverts. The t value 2.78 shows the difference is significant.

TABLE 3.28

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF CLEAR EXTRAVERTS & CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR THE UWS DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

CLEAR E & I	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	564	12.53	5.04	45	0.82
CI	595	11.9	1.12	50	

NOT SIGNIFICANT

No significant difference was observed between the clear extraverts and clear introverts as far as the internalization of conflict due to the Unexpected Work Situation was concerned.

The mean values show that the individuals of clear extraverts and clear introverts both stand close on this dimension of internalization of conflict (TABLE 3.28).

TABLE 3.29

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF CLEAR EXTRAVERTS AND CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR WGS DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

CLEAR E & I	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	727	16.15	4.00	45	1.742*
CI	740	15	2.01	50	

*$p < .05$

The (TABLE 3.29) internalization of conflict due to work group situation (WGS) is observed to be significantly different in case of clear extroverts and clear introverts, i.e., t (1.74).

However, unlike other dimensions the extraverts seem to be internalizing high level of conflict in comparison to the clear introverts.

TABLE 3.30
t VALUE FOR MEANS OF CLEAR EXTRAVERTS AND CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR T DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

CLEAR E & I	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	400	8.8	3.1	45	5.5**
CI	290	5.96	1.88	50	

**$p < .01$

The t = 5.5 shows a significant difference between clear extraverts and clear introverts for the internalization of conflict due to threat.

It was unexpected, like the previous dimension (WGS), that the clear extraverts showed a higher level of internalization of conflict than the clear introverts.

TABLE 3.31
t VALUE FOR MEANS OF CLEAR EXTRAVERTS AND CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR WC DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

CLEAR E & I	$\leqslant X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	1127	25.04	8.46	45	1.28
CI	1163	23.26	4.38	50	

NOT SIGNIFICANT

No significant difference was observed in internalization of conflict due to Working Condition (WC), between the clear extraverts and clear introverts (TABLE 3.31). Both the types were found to be similarly internalizing the conflict due to this particular dimension.

TABLE 3.32

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF CLEAR EXTRAVERTS AND CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR RS DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

CLEAR E & I	ΣX	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	411	9.133	3.23	45	2.532**
CI	368	7.36	2.53	50	

**$p < .01$

The t between clear extroverts and clear introverts show a significant difference on the sixth dimension of internalization of conflict i.e. resources (TABLE 3.32).

On the basis of means obtained, it can be interpreted that again the clear extroverts showed a high level of internalization when compared with the clear introverts.

TABLE 3.33

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF CLEAR EXTRAVERTS AND CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR THE II DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

CLEAR E & I	$\leq X$	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	534	10.62	4.8	45	0.63
CI	561	11.22	4.1	50	

NOT SIGNIFICANT

The (TABLE 3.33), shows that there was no significant difference observed between the clear extraverts and clear introverts for the seventh dimension of internalization of conflict i.e. the individual inefficiency.

Both the clear extroverts and clear introverts show similar level of internalization of conflict as far as the individual inefficiency was concerned.

TABLE3.34

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF THE CLEAR EXTRAVERTS AND CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR THE RC DIMENSION OF I.C.S.

CLEAR E & I	$\leq X$	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	584	12.97	4.11	45	1.904**
CI	720	14.4	3.12	50	

**$p < .01$

A significant difference was observed between the clear extroverts and clear introverts for the recognition dimension of internalization of conflict (t = 1.904).

Hence, on this dimension, i.e., RC, the internalization of conflict was found to be high for clear introverts than far clear extroverts (TABLE 3.34).

TABLE 3.35

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF CLEAR EXTRAVERTS AND CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR SO STYLE OF CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

CLEAR E & I	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	141.64	3.147	0.83	45	3.13**
CI	126.5	2.53	0.82	50	

**$p < .01$

In managing conflict, the solution oriented style was seen to be opted more frequently by clear extraverts in comparison to the clear introverts. A significant difference was observed between the clear extraverts and clear introvert in opting for this style of conflict management was concerned (TABLE 3.35).

TABLE 3.36

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF CLEAR EXTRAVERTS AND CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR NC STYLE OF CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

CLEAR E & I	ΣX	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	97.6	2.168	2.2	45	0.89
CI	85.34	1.706	2.9	50	

NOT SIGNIFICANT

The t (0.89) does not show any significant difference between the clear extraverts and clear introverts for the non-confrontational style of conflict management. According, to the Table 4.36, both, the clear extraverts and clear introverts are found to be opting for this style of conflict management, similarly.

TABLE 3.37
t VALUE FOR MEANS OF CLEAR EXTRAVERTS AND CLEAR INTROVERTS FOR C STYLE OF CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

CLEAR E & I	$\leq X$	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	t
CE	130	2.88	1.31	45	3.410**
CI	97.49	1.949	0.933	50	

**$p < .01$

The table 3.37 shows, that in opting for the third style of conflict management (Control) a significant difference was observed between clear extraverts and clear introverts. the clear extraverts opted for this style of conflict management more often than the clear introverts.

The t tests were run to test the significance of difference for the means between high and low level of internalization of conflict, for each index of MBTI. The high, and low level groups of internalization of conflict by the respondents, were made on the basis of quartiles.

TABLE 3.38

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF HIGH AND LOW LEVEL OF INTERNALIZATION OF CONFLICT FOR EI INDEX OF MBTI

LEVEL OF INTERNALIZATION OF CONFLICTS	ΣX	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
High	5152	103.04	21.12	50	1.697*
Low	3946	96	17.36	41	

*$p < .05$

The above table (3.38) shows that there is a significant difference between the high and low level of internalization for the extraversion - introversion index (EI) of MBTI.

The mean values show that the individuals with the high level of internalization of conflict stand high on the EI index in comparision to the individuals with low level of internalization.

TABLE 3.39

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF HIGH AND LOW LEVEL OF INTERNALIZATION OF CONFLICT FOR SN

LEVEL OF INTERNALIZATION OF CONFLICTS	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
High	4060	81.24	6.06	50	1.776*
Low	3535	86.2	17.26	41	

*$p < .05$

The t value (1.776) shows that the individuals with high and low level of internalization of conflict differ significantly. On this index (SN) of MBTI too.

Unlike the previous index EI, in the case of SN, the individuals with low level of internalization stand high on this index of MBTI, in comparison to the individuals with high level of internalization.

TABLE 3.40

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF HIGH AND LOW LEVEL OF INTERNALIZATION OF CONFLICT FOR TF INDEX OF MBTI

LEVEL OF INTERNALIZATION OF CONFLICTS	$\leq X$	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	t
High	3700	74	16.38	50	1.911*
Low	28233.5	69.11	7.11	41	

*$p < .05$

The table (3.40) shows that there is a significant difference between the high and low level of internalization of conflict in terms of TF index ($t = 1.911$).

The mean values for the two levels of internalization show that the individuals with high level of internalization reflect due to TF function prominently in comparison to the individuals with low level of internalization.

TABLE 3.41

t VALUE FOR MEANS OF HIGH AND LOW LEVEL OF INTERNALIZATION OF CONFLICT FOR JP

LEVEL OF INTERNALIZATION OF CONFLICTS	$\leq X$	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	t
High	3378	67.56	17.15	50	0.59
Low	2867	69.92	19.93	41	

NOT SIGNIFICANT

The t value (0.59) does not show any significant difference between high and low level of internalization of conflict for the Judging and Perceiving type (JP) index of MBTI. The individuals with either high or low level of internalization of conflict, both were found to be equally standing on this index.