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ABSTRACT

Conflicts are one of the indispensable parts of organizations life, which if not managed well can create negative impact at workplace. This study examines the relationship between psychological type as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and conflict style as determined by the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict MODE Instrument (MODE). This study is largely based on secondary data as well as analysis of primary data. It includes primary data collection and usage of quantitative research tools. All appropriate descriptive statistics were run on the data. In addition a Chi-square analysis was done to test the hypotheses under study.

This study showed no statistically significant relationship between subjects’ preference for extraversion or introversion and the conflict styles preference of competing, collaborating, avoiding or accommodating. However this study did find a statistically significant relationship between preferences for thinking or feeling and the strength of preference for avoiding. Comparing individual scores on these measures may provide information that can be helpful to anyone who wishes to have a clearer understanding of self and others, to reduce misunderstandings between people which are based on preferences in approach to conflict and create greater choice to deal with such conflicts.
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1. Introduction

“Conflict” is inevitable when there is a human factor. Conflict management has received increasing attention in the organizational literature during the last two decades because of a shift in attitudes toward conflict in organizations. Conflict has been defined by Rahim in 1992 as an “interactive process manifested in incompatibility, disagreement, or dissonance within or between social entities” (as cited in Antonioni, 1998, p.336). Volkema and Bergmann (1995, p. 8) defined conflict as “a disagreement or controversy in interests, values, goals or ideas”. Thomas (1992) suggested many researchers define conflict by the amount of interdependence between the parties involved, how much disagreement is perceived and the interaction taking place. The traditional view of conflict as dysfunctional has changed to functional view that sees conflict as a reality of organizational life. Conflict exists throughout environments of all kinds. People coming from different viewpoints and experiences, and having different perceptions, are not going to agree all the time. Thus, Conflict just seems to be a fact of life. In many cases, effective conflict resolution skills can make the difference between positive and negative outcomes. However, if conflict is not handled effectively, the
results can be damaging. Teamwork breaks down. Talent is wasted as people disengage from their work. But conflict handling largely depends upon the Personality types.

There are various Personality tests like 16 PF, Big Five Factor, MBTI etc. which are developed and many researchers are studying the relation of personality type and what is preferred conflict handling style of students (future managers). Personality traits are one of the most important determinants of conflict management styles. Though there are various personality measurement models available, but Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is one of the most widely studied and discussed model by researchers. In MBTI, all preferences are equally valuable and each type brings an important point of view when people interact. A mixture of types is best for a work group or team because many views are represented. MBTI type indicates a person’s preference but not his or her ability or character. Personality type is used as a way of understanding yourself and for assisting you in taking decision. The most important aspect of the Myers-Briggs type theory is that every type has value. Although each type approaches situations differently, and another person’s approach may not be what you would choose, each way can be effective. Psychological type is a personality theory developed by Carl G. Jung to explain how normal, healthy people differ. Jung determined that people had natural tendencies to use their minds differently and act upon these tendencies. He developed three dimensions of normal behavior types. These consisted of introversion/extroversion (how people prefer to focus their attention and derive their energy); sensing/intuition (how people prefer to take in information from the world); and thinking/feeling (how people prefer to make decisions). Combinations of these three dimensions resulted in eight different patterns of normal behavior types. Isabel Briggs Myers and her mother, Katherine C. Briggs, developed the ideas of Jung and this development added a fourth dimension. This dimension deals with how people prefer to deal with the outer world. It is the judging/perceiving scale. Consequently, each type in the Myers-Briggs model includes four dynamic preference scales that include introversion/extroversion (I-E), sensing/intuition (S-N), thinking/feeling (T-F) and judging/perceiving (J-P). Combinations of the four preference styles lead to the 16 different psychological types (Briggs Myers, 1998). Myers and Briggs developed an instrument, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) as a tool for identifying the different psychological types.

Many benefits such as increasing of work time, ability to control one’s behavior in conflict situations, enhancing of interpersonal communication skills, reduction of suspensions, improving of climate, prevention of violence, reduction of detentions and improving the ability to respect different perspectives are achieved as a result of conflict management. Therefore, it is important to know our conflict style so that one can manage it but the way we handle conflict largely depends upon the psychological type of an individual. This study examines the relationship between psychological type as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and conflict style as determined by the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict MODE Instrument (MODE).

1.2 Statement of problem

Now days Generation Y faces a lot of challenges in inter as well as intra personal relationship due to changing mindset, competition, environmental factors and many more. Thus, there is a need to understand and identify these challenges in order to handle it appropriately. This research is step further in understanding the relation between a personality and its style of conflict resolution. The purpose of this study is to determine whether there is a relationship between psychological types, as measured by the MBTI, and preferred conflict style, as measured by the MODE in post graduate students of Greater noida region. Since 1990,
studies conducted by Johnson (1997), Marion (1995), and Percival, Smitheram and Kelly (1992) suggest that people with different psychological types do indeed report preferences for different approaches to dealing with conflict.

This information can be used as an aid in developing conflict resolution and anger management, as a tool for personal development in creating greater choice when faced with conflict.

2. Review of literature/theatrical background of the study

2.1 Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

Carl Jung, 1923 published Philological Types, lighting a fuse that has burned now for more than eighty years. The fuse has never extinguished, though the popularity of Jung’s theory have sparked and finished occasionally. The largest fire started from type theory came from Isabelle Myers in 1962, with the publication of the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory, or MBTI: a relatively short, self-evaluation in the form of statements from which a participant chooses from a pair of either/or options. The preferences indicated from combined results place the test-takers personality along a series of four bipolar scales that correspond to Jung’s personality types: Extraversion/Introversion, Sensation/Intuition, Thoughts/Feelings, and Judgement/Perception. The ultimate result of an administration of the MBTI is a four-letter code identifying one of sixteen possible personality types and a personality profile identifying and explaining a multitude of characteristics and traits commonly associated with persons of that type. In order to make the theory of Jung's psychological types understandable and useful in people's lives, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) has been developed (Myers and McCaulley, 1985).

Psychological type as measured by the MBTI has been used in many applications. It has been used in counseling and psychotherapy in helping therapists establish rapport with their clients as well as to help them to understand how their clients may deal with stress, their communication preferences and to discriminate between behaviors that may be preferred for one type but not another (Briggs Myers et al., 1998). It has been effective in working with couples with low to moderate distress and with couples looking to better understand their relationship (Jones and Sherman, 1997; Williams and Tappan, 1995). In education, type theory can be useful in understanding the processes involved in teaching and learning. In career counseling, the MBTI has been a useful tool in helping people find work that is fulfilling to them. It is also an aid to help one understand the process of looking for a job, specifically, the exploring and decision making as well as the actions based on those decisions (Briggs Myers, 1998; Briggs Myers et al., 1998). Type has been shown to have many uses for employee development in organizations. It provides a lens in which to examine organizational functioning as well as culture and other organizational structures.

2.2 Dimension of MBTI

1. Introversion vs. Extraversion (focus of attention)

People who prefer extroversion attend to the outside world; giving and receiving their energy there by interacting with people and the environment. They are likely to prefer to communicate and work out ideas by talking. They prefer to learn through doing and talking it
through with others. They tend to have a wide variety of interests and to take the initiative in work and in relationships. They tend to be sociable and express themselves well. People who prefer introversion focus their energies on their inner world of ideas and experiences. They get their energy from their inner world through reflection. They tend to prefer communication through writing and to work out ideas through reflection. This is also their preferred way to learn. People who prefer introversion tend to be private. They will take the initiative in things that are very important to them.

2. Sensing vs. Intuition (taking in information)

Those that prefer sensing like to take in information that is concrete and tangible. They prefer to think about the present and in terms of facts and specifics. They tend to like a step by step building block approach towards conclusions and rely on experience. They also understand theory best through practical application. Terms that may describe them may include factual, realistic, practical or down-to-earth. People who prefer intuition like to look at the big picture and often miss the details. They focus on the connections and relationships amongst the facts. They tend to be good at seeing patterns and continually look for new possibilities. They rely on inspiration and often move to a conclusion based on a hunch. They are imaginative and creative and prefer to orient themselves to the future rather than the present. Terms that may describe them may include ingenious, inspired or dreamer.

3. Thinking vs. Feeling (making decisions)

Those who prefer thinking tend to like to look at the logic behind an idea or action. They tend to remove themselves from the situation to look at it objectively. They love to analyze or critique something so that the problem can be solved. They are reasonable and value fairness, as in equality. They are often considered “tough-minded”. Terms that can be used to describe thinkers include objective, detached and firm-minded. People who prefer feeling like to look at things in terms of the human factor. They will put themselves in the shoes of another person before arriving at a decision that may impact that person. They strive for harmony and are often considered “tenderhearted”. They also value fairness, but in terms of the individual. Other terms that may describe feelers include humane, subjective or involved.

4. Judging vs. Perceiving (orientation toward outer world)

People who prefer judging like to live in an orderly, structured way. They like to have control over their lives, make decisions, have closure and go on to the next thing. They tend to like schedules and are avid planners. They feel good about getting things done and avoiding last minute stress. Terms that may describe those preferring judging include planned, decided and controlled. Those who prefer the perceiving process like to live in a flexible, spontaneous manner. They seek to experience and understand life. Tight schedules and detailed plans can feel stifling to these people. They tend to wait until the last minute to make decisions in case of the arrival of last minute information. They often thrive on last minute pressure. Terms that may describe those preferring perception include flexible, adaptive and spontaneous (Briggs Myers, 1998; Kroeger and Thuesen, 1988).

Application of MBTI
The MBTI is a useful tool for identifying aspects of one’s personality, which can further help in career planning and development of post-graduate students. The more a person has understanding of his temperament and motivations, the better decisions one can take.

2.3 Conflict - Thomas-Kilmann conflict MODE instrument

According to Thomas (1992) he came across The Managerial Grid by Blake and Mouton, 1964, in the late 1960s. This publication described five different approaches to conflict that appeared to describe the basic choices one has when faced with conflict better than anything up until that time. He worked to separate the conflict styles from the managerial styles Blake and Mouton described and placed them into a taxonomy based on the two scales Blake and Mouton depicted in their work: a scale on assertiveness (attempting to satisfy self interests) and a scale on cooperativeness (attempting to satisfy other’s interests). The interaction of these two scales yields the five MODES. The conflict styles that were tickled out by Thomas were: competing (high on assertiveness and low on cooperativeness), collaborating (high on both assertiveness and cooperativeness), compromising (medium on both assertiveness and cooperativeness), avoiding (low on both assertiveness and cooperativeness) and accommodating (low on assertiveness and high on cooperativeness).

Thomas (Kilmann and Thomas, 1977) noted that in the three instruments available at the time (Blake-Mouton, Lawrence Lorsch and Hall), 80% of variance on specific items and over 90% of variance on the mode scores could be attributed to social desirability biases. It was also observed that how one perceived a quality as socially good or bad influenced that persons reported conflict-handling preference. The self-reported scores on the more socially desirable modes would be elevated. Because of these problems, the Thomas and Kilmann decided to give special attention to minimizing the social desirability factor and thereby more validly measure the five modes. Success in achieving low social desirability affects were reported by Kilmann and Thomas (1977) and Womack (1988). Researchers have not agreed on what the modes or styles were actually described. They have been interpreted as behaviors, orientations or strategies. Thomas indicated that he believed the modes were best thought of as strategic intentions of someone who was an attempt to satisfy their own interests as well as the interests of another (Thomas, 1992). Nonetheless, several studies have linked the intentions with behaviors and there have been mixed results. There are other models that are based on the Blake and Mouton two-dimensional model such as the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI) and the Hall Conflict Management Survey. Thomas (1992) asserts that other models place the modes into other dimensions than intentions such as values or desires and were therefore set up to attempt to explain or predict the occurrence of the different modes. The MODE separates the dimensions so that causes for the modes can be investigated apart from the dimensions themselves. The purpose of this study is to determine if personality type as measured by the MBTI can explain or predict the conflict styles preferred. It is then desirable to use a model of conflict style that makes it easier to look at the modes apart from the dimensions.

2.3.1 Approaches of conflict

The mode of competing is both assertive and uncooperative pursuing of personal concerns without concern for the interests of others. It is a power-oriented style geared to winning. Accommodating is on the opposite end of the assertiveness and cooperativeness scale. It is unassertive and cooperative and may result in self-sacrifice to the point of neglect of personal concerns for the interests of another. Avoiding is both unassertive and uncooperative. The concerns of the individual as well as the concerns of others are not addressed immediately,
choosing instead to postpone action or response or withdraw from the situation. Collaborating is both assertive and cooperative. Instead of avoiding, collaborating attempts to find a solution that satisfies all parties involved. It is the most time-consuming of the MODEs as it requires identifying the underlying issues of all the parties and finding a creative solution that meets the needs of everyone. Compromising is intermediate on both scales of assertiveness and cooperation. Individuals work toward agreement that involves each giving up something and gaining something in return. It is not as in-depth as collaboration and does not completely satisfy the needs of both parties. It addresses the issue more than avoiding and gives up less than accommodating. The end result is each party getting part of what they want.

1. Competing

The mode of competing is beneficial when quick decisive action is necessary or when it is necessary for protection against people who take advantage of those who do not like to compete. Yet, individuals scoring very high on competing may be missing out on important information because people are reluctant to disagree or risk looking incompetent around them. Individuals scoring very low on competing may be losing effectiveness because others may take over and indecisiveness may cause others to be resentful.

2. Collaborating

The mode of collaborating is useful when working out hard feelings in interpersonal relationships, to gain insights from those with differing perspectives, to learn or to find a solution that involves concerns that are too vital to be compromised on. However, individuals scoring high on collaborating may be taking more time than is feasible for a particular issue. Others may not wish to put their energies into finding this type of solution. Scoring low may reflect a difficulty in seeing the opportunities for mutual satisfaction and result in others being uncommitted to decisions and policies.

3. Compromising

The mode of compromising is useful when the goals are moderately important but not requiring the assertiveness of competing or the time of collaboration. Compromising is useful for temporary solutions or as an emergency solution or backup plan if collaboration or competing fail. Individuals scoring high may have a tendency to lose sight of larger issues such as values, principles and long range goals and/or may see conflict as a game of sorts due to the bargaining involved. Individuals scoring low may have difficulty in making concessions or may feel incompetent or embarrassed in bargaining situations.

4. Avoiding

The mode of avoiding can be useful when the issue is small, is the responsibility of someone else, when people need to calm down or when more damage will be done by addressing the issue than not. Individuals scoring high may leave decisions to be done by default. Others may not know what to expect because of lack of input. Individuals scoring low may not be tactful in addressing issues, which may be in part a result of feeling overwhelmed.

5. Accommodating

The mode of accommodating may be useful when the issue is much more important to the other person, when the other person is right, when it is important to preserve harmony or
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when competing is more damaging than beneficial. Individuals scoring high may tend to defer to the concerns of others so much so that it may result in a lack of respect, influence and recognition and may give the appearance of being undisciplined. Individuals scoring low may have difficulty in creating harmony and building good will. They may give the appearance of being unreasonable, ruthless and/or intolerant (Thomas and Kilmann, 1974).

2.4 Applications of the MODE

The properties and relationships of the MODE have been investigated by a number of dissertations and it is a widely used instrument in empirical studies of conflict style. Studies have been done using college students as well as business managers and administrators in education, health care, religion and technical fields. It can also been used with the organizational factors of position, power, experience and control.

2.4.1 Studies correlating psychological type (myers-briggs) and conflict styles (Thomas-Kilmann)

In a recent study of the interpersonal dynamics of confrontation (conflict) versus support in a laboratory setting, Kilmann and Taylor (1974) found that the Jungian dimensions were exceedingly useful in predicting and explaining the effects of individual personality differences on these interpersonal dynamics.

The studies using the MBTI and the MODE have found relationships that support the construct validity of the four MBTI scales. Type theory dictates that the E-I and T-F scales would most influence preferences toward handling of conflict. Jung (1990) described the T-F scale as opposing rational ways of putting meaning to perceptions. The thinking function is characterized by objectivity as well as being detached and impersonal. This tendency would be reflected in an impersonal approach to conflict. The most impersonal mode would be competing, followed by avoiding. On the other hand, those who prefer feeling would most likely choose a style that is personal and interpersonal; accommodating. As those who prefer introversion prefer their inner world rather than the stimulation of the outer world, it follows that they would prefer avoiding, whereas those who prefer extraversion and the stimulation of the outer world would choose a more external means of dealing with conflict such as competition or collaboration (Johnson, 1997). Prior to 1990 three studies (Chanin and Schneer, 1984; Kilmann and Thomas, 1975; Mills, Robey, and Smith, 1985) correlated the four dimensions of the MBTI with the five styles of the MODE. In all three studies it was found that those who preferred thinking tended to prefer to be competitive and those who preferred feeling to accommodate. Kilmann and Thomas (1975) and Mills et al. (1985) found those who preferred extraversion preferred to use competition or collaboration and those who preferred introversion preferred accommodation or avoidance. There were no significant correlations between the S-N preferences and any of the MODE preferences or the J-P preferences and any of the MODE preferences. These studies looked at the dimensions separately and therefore did not consider the effects of their interaction. (Percival et al., 1992). In 1995, Marion used the MBTI and the MODE to find a relationship between personality type and preferred conflict management style in community college administrators and supported the earlier findings that people who prefer feeling tended to be less assertive and prefer cooperativeness.

3. Research Hypotheses
There is a relationship between psychological types as measured by the MBTI and the way in which each psychological type prefers to deal with conflict as measured by the MODE.

To test the general research hypothesis, the following hypotheses were to be tested in this study. These hypotheses are constructed based on the findings of previous studies.

Hypothesis 1- The scales of I-E and T-F are likely to have the strongest correlation to conflict-handling styles, particularly the I and F preferences.

Hypothesis 2- Based on most research that indicates little/no significant finding on the S-N scale, it is hypothesized that there will be no statistically significant relationship between S-N scales, J-P scales and any of the conflict-handling modes.

Hypothesis 3- There will be no statistically significant gender difference within MBTI type and conflict mode preference

4. Research methodology

4.1 Description of Instruments

4.1.1 MBTI personality type

The Myers Briggs Type Indicator is a self-administering questionnaire in forced-choice format. There were two research forms of the MBTI: Form F (166 items, published in 1971) and Form J (290 items) that include additional questions to individualize reports. Form G (94 self-scored items and 126 computer scored items published in 1976) was the standard form used until recently. Form M, a 93 item self-scorable instrument was published in 1998 and is now the standard form. (Briggs Myers et al., 1998; CPP Product Catalog 2000; Cummings III, 1995; McCaulley, 1990). Form M (self-scorable) is used in this study. Only 20 items have been chosen from 93 items of Form M, which are applicable to students. Jungian theory assumes within any one scale that two distinct types of people with opposing preferences exist and can be measured. Myers used the points or preference scores only to determine type. Variations in the scores are important in determining strength of preference (McCaulley, 1990).

4.2 The Thomas-Kilmann Conflict MODE

The Thomas-Kilmann Conflict MODE (Management of Difference Exercise) Instrument (1974) consists of 30 sets of paired items, with each item describing one of the conflict styles. An individual’s score for each style is the number of times that style is chosen. The scores range from 0 (very low use) to 12 (very high use). In competing, low scores range from 0 to 3, medium scores from 4 to 7 and high scores 8 and above, in collaborating, low scores fall from 0 to 5, medium from 6 to 9 and high from 9 to 12, in compromising, low scores fall from 0 to 4, medium scores from 5 to 8 and high from 9 to 12, in avoiding, low scores fall from 0 to 4, medium scores from 5 to 7 and high scores from 8 to 12 and in accommodating, low scores fall from 0 to 3, medium scores from 3 to 6 and high scores from 6 to 12. Also, validity and reliability scores appear more favorable for the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict MODE Instrument than most others.

4.3 Description of subjects and sample selection
The subjects for this study consisted of 61 students pursuing their MBA (first year) from Army Institute of Management and Technology, Greater Noida in the age bracket of 21-24. Out of 61 students, 37 are male and rests (24) are female.

4.4 Data Collection - research design

To test the hypotheses the data included the four-letter type and raw scores from the MBTI (Form M) the modes and raw scores from the MODE. The MBTI whole type (all four letters) was to be run with the five Thomas-Kilmann conflict-handling styles to derive preference strengths which were to be rank ordered as well as divided into the categories of high, medium or low as determined by the MODE instrument (Thomas and Kilmann, 1974). The research design is descriptive in nature.

4.5 Data analysis

All appropriate descriptive statistics were run on the data. In addition a Chi-square analysis was done to test the hypotheses under study. The Chi-square analysis is in keeping the statistical analysis used by Marion (1995) and Percival et al. (1992)

5. Analysis and interpretation

Hypothesis 1 states that preferences on the I-E and the T-F scales are likely to have the strongest correlation with conflict-handling styles, particularly the I and F preferences. This study showed no statistically significant relationship between subjects preference for extraversion or introversion and the conflict styles preference of competing, collaborating, avoiding or accommodating. There was a tendency of introversion towards compromising. Pearson chi-square 4.634, p=.099 (See Table 1).

The relationship between the actual count and the expected count is tested by Pearson chi-square. The level of statistical significance is p = .05. A tendency is indicated when p = .05 < .01. Table 1 shows 36 (59%) of the subjects indicated a preference for extraversion and 25 (41%) of the subjects indicated a preference for introversion. A total of 6 subjects selected Compromising as a high preference. The expected count for those with a preference for extraversion who have a high preference for Compromising would be 3.54 (6 x .59%). Similarly, a total of 15 subjects selected Compromising as a low preference yielding an expected count for those with a preference for extraversion who have a low preference for Compromising of 15 x 59%.

Of the 25 who prefer introversion 4 (16%) preferred the conflict style of Compromising whereas 2 out of 36 (5.6%) of those preferring extraversion indicated a preference for Compromising. The expected response for those preferring introversion with a preference for Compromising is 2.5 (25 x 9.8%). The expected response for those preferring extraversion and indicating a preference for Compromising is 3.5 (36 x 9.8%).

Although this finding is not statistically significant (p = .09) it indicates there is a tendency for more of those preferring introversion to favor Compromising than expected. There is also a tendency for fewer of those preferring extraversion to favor Compromising than expected.
Cross Tabulation of MBTI Scale of Extraversion and Introversion with the MODE Conflict-Handling Style of Compromising.

**Table 1: Extroversion/Introversion * Compromising Cross tabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Compromising</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion/Introversion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Extroversion/Introversion</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Compromising</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Extroversion/Introversion</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Compromising</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Extroversion/Introversion</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Compromising</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Chi-square tests of extroversion introversion with compromising**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.634a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>4.868</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.46.

This study did find a statistically significant relationship between preferences for thinking or feeling and the strength of preference for avoiding. Pearson chi-square 8.390, p = .015 (See Table 4). Of the 38 subjects who indicated a preference for feeling, 6 (15.8%) indicated a low preference for avoiding while the expected response would be 5(38 x 13.1%). 12 (31.6%) of those with a preference for feeling showed a strong preference for avoiding, the expected response is 17.4 (38 x 45.9) For those preferring thinking the opposite is indicated in this study. Of the 23 who prefer thinking, 16 (69.6%) showed a strong preference for avoiding. The expected count for those who prefer thinking and a strong preference for avoiding is 10.5 (23 x 45.9%). Cross tabulations of MBTI Scale of Thinking and Feeling with the MODE Conflict-Handling Style of Avoiding.
Table 3: Thinking/ feeling * avoiding cross tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thinking/ Feeling</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Avoiding</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Thinking/ Feeling</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Avoiding</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Thinking/ Feeling</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Avoiding</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Thinking/ Feeling</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Avoiding</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Chi-square tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.390a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>8.577</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those preferring thinking, only 2 (8.7%) indicated a low preference for avoiding compared with an expected response of 3 (23 x 13.1%). The results of this study thus show that significantly more of those preferring thinking favored avoiding than expected. Significantly fewer of those preferring feeling favored avoiding than expected. Significantly more of those preferring feeling indicated a low preference for avoiding than expected and significantly fewer of those preferring thinking showed a low preference for avoiding than expected. There were no statistically significant findings for the conflict-handling modes of competing, collaborating, compromising or accommodating and the preference for thinking or feeling. In this study there were no statistically significant relationships between the S-N scales, J-P scales and any of the conflict-handling modes. Hypothesis 2 is therefore supported. Hypothesis 3 states that there will be no statistically significant gender differences within MBTI type and conflict mode preferences. It was determined after the statistical analysis that there was not statistical significant relationship of MBTI and MODE with gender. Hence Hypothesis 3 is supported.

5.1 Conclusions

This study supports the hypothesis that there is a relationship between psychological types as measured by the MBTI and the way in which each psychological type prefers to deal with conflict as measured by the MODE.
The MBTI dimensions of thinking and feeling are shown to have the most significant part in this relationship. Those that prefer thinking were shown to have a statistically significant preference for avoiding. The opposite is also true. Those that prefer feeling were shown to have statistically significant low preferences for avoiding.

The results of this study also showed there is a tendency for more of those preferring introversion to favor Compromising than expected. There is also a tendency for fewer of those preferring extraversion to favor Compromising than expected. The study also showed that gender has no relationship with the psychological type and the conflict handling style.
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