Unwillingness To Communicate At The Level Of Students’ Interpersonal Skills And Emotional Intelligence
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Abstract: The aim of this study is to explore today’s unwillingness of students to communicate among themselves in the context of emotional intelligence and interpersonal skills. Our research was conducted on a sample of 387 students in Slovakia. The issue of communication tendencies is multifactorially conditioned – the factors such as personality, education, emotional intelligence or social environment play a role here. Due to the multifactoriality of the issues dealt with, the study is focused on emotional intelligence and interpersonal skills. The outcome of this study is a demonstration of the correlations between the selected attributes of students’ emotional intelligence and interpersonal skills. Linear regression confirms a certain degree of prediction concerning unwillingness to communicate in terms of the following four factors: dominance, submissiveness, emotionality and sociability.
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1 INTRODUCTION
The tendency to stay away from oral communication represents a communication phenomenon characteristic of the young generation (Pearson, Child, De Greeff, Semlak & Burnett, 2011). People may decide freely whether they will communicate or not based on the situation in which they find themselves (Burgoon, 1975; McCroskey & Richmond, 1991). Young people facing unpleasant communication may avoid or confront it. Zhao (2018) maintain that the willingness and ability to communicate among university students is directly determined by their achievements and emotional intelligence. Unwillingness to communicate can quite often be found in academic settings as well, especially in education, knowledge-testing, and discussion processes. In her research, Zhao (2018) points out that emotions, along with intelligence, determine our willingness or unwillingness to communicate with teachers and friends. Alavinia and Allkhani (2014) discuss the not-very-much-explored-yet area of the young population in the context of their unwillingness to communicate. This issue has been dealt with along the similar lines by Bar-On (1997) and McCroskey (2009), the latter confirming, on a sample of 200 Iranian students, significant statistical correlations between the ability to communicate and emotional intelligence. The role of identity between people and in groups influences their communication behavior (Miczo, 2004; Burgoon, 2009). Tok (2015) indicates considerable differences concerning foreign language students’ unwillingness to communicate. As a result of a certain group’s anxiety and unpleasant feelings, this certain group tends to differentiate and separate itself from other students in terms of communication. In the course of their research on unwillingness to communicate, authors such as Freiernuth and Jarrell (2006),
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people in terms of the conceptualization of a man’s personality is also confirmed by Hopwood, Ansel, Pincus, Wright, Lukowitsky and Roche (2011). Problems not only in communication but also beyond it were described by Gurtman (2009) and Kordsmeyer and Penke (2019) stressing the importance of an interpersonal construct in communication, and of willingness to communicate. Weber, Vance, Harrison and Jekins (2018) opt for the IAS construct in their research through which they find out considerable differences between males and females on an interpersonal scale. Hayden, Müllauer and Andreas (2017) note that unwillingness to communicate forms a strong association and anxiety in interpersonal relations. In many cases, McCroskey and Baer (1985), Burgoon (2009), Oz (2014) consider unwillingness to communicate from the viewpoint of time. Communication-related unwillingness and anxiety may often lead to either short-term or long-term communication breakdowns. The time spent with people in a certain group relieves the first signs of stress and encourages people’s will to communicate. In their studies, Leung (2007), Tianjian (2010), and Yu, Li and Gou (2011), view time as one of the possible factors of communication breakdowns, which, in the long run, represents a tendency to slip into the modern issue known as ghosting. The foundations of the ghosting phenomenon were laid down by LeFebvre (2017), Freedman, Powell, Le and Williams (2018), LeFebvre, Allen, Rasner, Gastad, Wilms and Parrish (2019). They believe ghosting to be a certain technique, a way of breaking down communication without any signs, warnings or notices. As far as unwillingness to communicate is concerned, ghosting has a tendency to turn into short-term unwillingness to communicate. On the other hand, long-term ghosting may be considered to be complete disappearance from the life of another man, not only with respect to communication, but also when it comes to personal meetings. In our study we will adhere to short-term communication breakdowns in the form of the young generation’s unwillingness to communicate. Auter (2007), Tayebi, Manesh, Khalili and Nezhad (2019) indicate how interactions among young people in various countries can easily be turned into their unwillingness to communicate, in some cases even into a complete or short-term communication breakdown.

2 METHODOLOGY

The issue of communication is multidimensionally determined. Therefore, we focused our research on students’ interpersonal skills and emotional intelligence. The modern digital age influences young people’s interpersonal skills and emotional intelligence not only in society per se, but also in academic settings. The presented research article aims at identifying the correlations between the factors of the variables mentioned hereinabove. Prior to conducting an analysis, the items of each methodology were transformed following their positive or negative polarization. In order to carry out our research we decided to apply the original Burgoon - Unwillingness to Communicate Scale methodology, the TEIQUE-SF methodology to judge emotional intelligence, as well as the IAS - Interpersonal Adjective Scales. As early as 2009, Burgoon identified unwillingness to communicate through interviews (20 questionnaire items on a sample of 222 students). These items were composed of two factors: Approach Avoidance and Reward. Sheldon (2008), Burgoon (2009) and Burgoon and Hale (2009) and describe the Approach Avoidance factor as a level and degree of anxiety and concerns relating to interpersonal meetings. The original Burgoon’s methodology (1972; 1976), though slightly modified or supplemented with other methodologies (Sheldon, 2008; Kalyar, Pathan, Channa, Lohar & Muhammad, 2019), has been used by various authors to date. Emotional intelligence was judged using the TEIQUE-SF Petrides (2009) methodology, consisting of the following 4 factors: well-being, self-control, emotionality and sociability. The items were judged on a scale from 1 for ‘completely agree’ to 7 for ‘completely disagree’. An interpersonal scale of personality traits was first introduced by Wiggins (1991) and was construed based on the knowledge of interpersonal relations - Interpersonal Check List - ICL (Leary, 1957). The methodology construction comprises 8 interpersonal characteristics being defined by Wiggins (1979) as follows:

- Assured-Dominant
- Unassured-Submissive
- Arrogant-Calculating
- Unassuming-Ingenuous
- Cold-hearted
- Warm-Agreeable
- Aloof-Introverted
- Gregarious-Extraverted

A reduced version of the IAS methodology composed of 24 items judged on a scale of from 1 for ‘This trait characterizes me best’ to 8 for ‘This trait does not characterize me at all’ was used in our research. The research sample subjects were high school and college students in the Slovak Republic. The research was conducted online in February and March. Method of data collection: intentional selection. Composition of respondents: a total of 387 respondents out of which 190 (49.1 %) males and 197 (50.9 %) females ranging between 15 and 31 years of age. Average age of respondents: 21.57, with S. D. 3.03.

3 RESULTS

Based on the validity of the central limit theorem, parametric tests were applied. The possibilities of applying parametric tests to a large research and study samples have also been acknowledged by Ghasemi and Zahediasl (2012), and Halekoh and Højsgaard (2014).

Table 1 Correlations between the factors of emotional intelligence and unwillingness to communicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EI/Approach Avoidance</th>
<th>Approach Avoidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: EI - Emotional Intelligence, p≤0.05

Table 1 indicates individual correlations between the emotional
intelligence factors (Well-being, Self-control, Emotionality, Sociability) and the factor of unwillingness to communicate - Approach Avoidance. All the emotional intelligence factors (Well-being, Self-control, Emotionality, Sociability) correlate negatively with the Approach Avoidance factor of unwillingness to communicate. Based on our results, we can claim that if the determinants of emotional intelligence increase evenly, the Approach Avoidance factor decreases. The emotional intelligence factors are linked together by the cohesive communication ability (Kaeten & Kelly, 2008; Liu & Jackson, 2008), namely to cope with emotions aroused by negative incentives or impulses, or by stressful and hostile conditions. The strategy of unwillingness to communicate is utilized to a lesser degree by individuals with higher emotional intelligence, which is also confirmed by a research of emotional intelligence predictions behavior, as pointed out by Coronas and Blasco (2017). The positive effect of the young generation’s emotions and emotional intelligence on unwillingness to communicate was stressed in Alavinia and Alikhani (2014), Ketabdar, Yazdani and Yarahmadi (2014) researches as well.

Table 2 Correlations between the factors of interpersonal skills and unwillingness to communicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IAS/Approach Avoidance</th>
<th>Approach Avoidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold-hearted</td>
<td>Pearson Corr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: IAS - Interpersonal Adjective Scales, p≤0.05

Table 2 shows the correlations between the IAS factors of interpersonal skills and the Approach Avoidance factor of unwillingness to communicate. We identified several significant positive as well as negative correlations between the individual variables. The Dominance factor correlates negatively with the factor of unwillingness to communicate. The stronger the respondents are in self-assertiveness, dominance and in controlling others, the lesser their level and degree of anxiety and concerns about interpersonal meetings are, they may even seek them out in the form of confrontations. This assertion is confirmed by Waldherr and Muck (2011), emphasizing the dominance and self-assertiveness approach in terms of willingness to communicate. Xie, Huang and Watkins (2012), Özgan (2014) indicate the frequency of a dominant strategy and unwillingness to communicate between younger and older family members and teachers, where the main prevailing factors were respect and the position of dominance. Castells (2007) encounters faith with which the young generation of "socially dominant participants" communicate, hence deducing a certain ability to be dominant among others in society. Of interest here is the fact that how young people approach communication depends, to a significant extent, on the kind of personality they have, in our case a personality superior to others in the given group. The Arrogance factor correlates negatively with the factor of unwillingness to communicate. The more arrogant the respondents are, being prone to personal egoism, the lesser their level of anxiety and concerns about interpersonal meetings is. Coskun, Ozdenici and Ok (2015) attribute this assertion to a change in the people’s social ecosystem in which they find themselves at the time. The Arrogance construct results in insufficient social communication having a negative impact on the people’s willingness to communicate between a teacher and a student (Aydin, 2017). Concerns about communication and their unwillingness to communicate is determined by Neves (2018) as a communication participant’s perception of negative attitudes, which, later on, leads to arrogance, ignorance and negative attitudes to communication itself. Introverts correlate positively with the factor of unwillingness to communicate. The more introverted the respondents are, concentrating on their own inner life, being thoughtful and wishing to stay aloof from other people, the greater their level of anxiety and concerns about interpersonal meetings is. This, confirmed by Sheldon (2008), may result from the modern age being digitalized and from introverts reduced to expressing themselves emotionally from the safety of their comfort zone using the Internet – this more and more also applying to communication with a teacher, as such communication delays the quickness of a response or a clash with a negative emotion. This trend is as frequent among young people as the flu, the fact which obstructs the enhancement of communication and communication skills (Yu, Li & Gou, 2011). However, Hasan and Yulianti (2018) view this fact positively. In their opinion, introverts are better at improving their receptive skills and at inspiring others in their group, at reading and comprehending words and any communication at all. Submissive individuals correlate positively with the factor of unwillingness to communicate. The more willing the respondents are to submit to a dominant person, to leave such a person to decide, and to comply with everything that such a person wishes to do, the greater the degree of their anxiety and concerns about interpersonal meetings is. With their researches, Matsuoka and Evans (2005), Burgoon and Koper (2006), prove a high level of the Submissive factor in respect of communication between young people and students in a class, this being determined by their social status in a formal group. Willingness to submit to others around them by way of unwillingness to communicate was also confirmed by Peng (2012). The degree of young people’s anxiety in trying to comply with everything that others wish to do is closely linked to the authority and unwillingness to communicate in the culture of Chinese students (Fadilah, 2018). The more responsive to incentives from the outside the respondents are, the more their thinking is directed towards
people around them, and the more they need to be surrounded by a large number of people, the lesser their level of anxiety and concerns about interpersonal meetings is. A high level of extraversion is a precondition for people to be successful, being more able to cope with pressure in communication, this eliminating their uncertainty and doubts (Alemi, Tajeddin & Mesbah, 2013). Based on Mahdi (2014)'s observations, students-extraverts at universities have a higher level of willingness to communicate in activities through which they break down communication barriers, the fact which our results in Table 2 serve to prove too.

Table 3 Correlations between the factors of interpersonal skills and emotional intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IAS/EI</th>
<th>Emotional Intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold-hearted</td>
<td>Pearson Corr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: EI - Emotional Intelligence, IAS - Interpersonal Adjective Scales, p≤0.05

Table 3 shows individual correlations of factors between interpersonal skills and emotional intelligence. As stated above, communication forms the basis for the communication process, of which a part is emotions and interpersonal skills. According to Ayedoun (2019), improving the conversation means and strategies is related to students’ potential and their tendency to engage themselves in interactive tasks. However, they can manage a teaching class well even without engaging themselves whatsoever, i.e. without self-violation. The interpersonal scale of personality traits along with emotional intelligence determine the direction of the entire communication process among people. The significance of Table 3 has also been acknowledged by Baker, Clark-Gordon and Mayers (2019), who on a sample of 240 university students identified that emotional reactions of students and their personal characteristics in the context of communication are important determinants of the communication process. With regard to the aim of this research, Table 3 contains presented correlations of a summation index of emotional intelligence and individual factors of interpersonal skills. Emotional intelligence is the decisive factor for students to be successful. Interpersonal skills are a construct of emotional intelligence, their go-togetherness relates to the communication process in a social interaction. Higher emotional intelligence enhances self-assurance and social skills, which underlines a matching correlation between the Dominance, Ingenuousness, Warm and Extraversion factors (Sekhri, Sandhu & Sachdev, 2017). The Dominance factor is related to unwillingness to communicate (Table 2). A research carried out on a sample of 357 students confirms that emotional intelligence enhances the ability of empathy and of a man’s social interaction, as a result of which students have fewer interpersonal problems (Ghiabi & Besharat, 2011). Emotional intelligence includes the ability to understand and manage emotions forming the basis for interpersonal relations. Students with a higher level of emotional intelligence have better skills at social interactions. Interpersonal skills having a positive influence on the quality of a social interaction are thus increased (Khodabakhsh & Besharat, 2011). A research carried out on a sample of 485 students supports these results. A higher level of emotional intelligence and social skills reduces the risk of students’ social problems in the context of communication (Salavera, Usán & Teruel, 2019). The Submissiveness factor correlates negatively with emotional intelligence. Submissive individuals have lower emotional intelligence, and at the same time, a higher tendency toward unwillingness to communicate. Grove, Smith, Crowell, Williams and Jordan (2017) emphasize submissiveness as a positive factor for reducing negative emotions in people with cardiovascular diseases. The inclusion of submissiveness in communication eliminates negative reaction and has a tendency to resolve conflicts in a calmer manner (Turan, 2015). The Ingenuous factor correlates positively with emotional intelligence. The more ingenuous people are, the higher their emotional intelligence is. Brown (2018) is the first coming to mind who agrees with our result concerning students, adding that the more ingenuous students are, the more flexible and immediate their communication is. Leme, Fernandes, Jovarini, Achkar and Del Prette (2016) present ingenuousness as the right direction for children and students in coping with crises and stressful situations, which our results prove as well. The Warm factor also correlates positively with emotional intelligence. The more sincere, kind-hearted and warmer the respondents are, the stronger their outward emotions are. Warm-heartedness invokes in people a higher level of friendship and builds up stronger relations between people (Smith, Glazer, Ruiz & Gallo, 2004). Soenens, Vansteenkiste, Luyckx and Goossens (2006) recognize an emotional link with warm-heartedness as bringing a positive development of life and interactions with people. The more outwardly funnier, friendlier, not being happy on their own the respondents are, the higher their emotional intelligence is. The positive effect of the Extravert factor on people’s emotions has also been acknowledged by Sharma (2015). Extraverts correspond with positive emotions and a positive approach to overcoming obstacles in everyday situations (Corr & Matthews, 2009).

Table 4 Frequency of occurrence of reasons for unwillingness to communicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Table 4 shows the frequency of occurrence of reasons for unwillingness to communicate. The highest frequency of occurrence was for the reason of lack of time, followed by the reason of conflict. The percent of occurrence of each reason is also shown in the table.
Not being interested in communication 70 18.09
Not being interested in communication with a specific person 60 15.50
Stalking 28 7.24
Opposing interests 24 6.20
Unpleasant person or communication 14 3.62
Vulgar language and aggression 13 3.36
Avoiding people 6 1.55

Notes: Own Calculation in IBM SPSS 25

Table 4 shows the most frequent reasons increasing unwillingness to communicate. The greatest frequency is observed due to the following reasons: conflict, a lack of time, not being interested in communication. At a negative level, the conflict resolution strategy may be understood as unwillingness to communicate, at a positive level as intensification of the communication activity. Conflict is the prevailing factor being represented in the process of communication (Zucker, 2012). As far as the young generation’s lack of time is concerned, according to Urists, Dong and Day (2009) it is alarming that digitalization along with unwillingness to communicate lead young people to make excuses giving a lack of time as the reason, and to not being interested in the lives of others because of their own personal issues. According to Pempek, Yermolayeva and Calvert (2009), a lack of time may be a sign of laziness and of unwillingness to embark on a personal talk and communication itself. Not being interested in communicating with (talking to) a specific person is proof of personality issues within the person itself or with respect to somebody else. Frenzel, Goetz, Lüdtke, Pekrun and Sutton (2009) explain students’ emotional barriers easily and in a negative way breaking down communication with a formerly close person. Segrin, Woszidlo, Givertz, Bauer and Murphy (2012) opt for the opinion that not being interested in communication and a lack of time are mainly formed in adolescence, growing into further negative character traits of a personality’s emotional intelligence in adulthood. Table 5 Correlations between the reasons for unwillingness to communicate and the factors of interpersonal skills

Table 5 Correlations between the reasons for unwillingness to communicate and the factors of interpersonal skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Eta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>66.617</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>7.402</td>
<td>3.442</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>810.799</td>
<td>377.000</td>
<td>2.151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>877.416</td>
<td>386.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold-hearted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>58.495</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>6.499</td>
<td>3.080</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>795.428</td>
<td>377.000</td>
<td>2.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>853.923</td>
<td>386.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ETA Correlation Coefficient in SPSS 25, Sig≤0.05

Table 5 only shows statistically significant correlations. The respondents giving their general lack of interest in communication as the most frequent reason in their answers are more arrogant and cold-hearted. The results of similar researches prove the correlations between arrogance and dismissive behavior (Milyavskiy, Kruglanski, Chernikova & Schori-Eyal, 2017). Dismissive behavior relates to dismissive communication, avoiding personal contact, as well as putting others down. Students’ antisocial behavior has a negative influence on academic engagement and students’ achievements (McEachern & Snyder, 2012). Antisocial behavior may be deemed to be arrogance and a lack of emotions (cold-heartedness). Students’ unwillingness to communicate may be predicted through the results of multiple linear regression. The significant factors are the factors of interpersonal skills (Dominance and Submissiveness) and the emotional intelligence factors (Emotionality and Sociability). These factors account for 56% variance regarding unwillingness to communicate. The residues were judged by means of the residues normal probability plot and Cook’s Distance, where nothing that would challenge the assumptions concerning the use of linear regression model was observed.

Table 6 Regression model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.749a</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a Predictors: (Constant), Sociability, Emotionality, Submissive, Dominant

Table 7 Regression coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.422</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.176</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td>-5.512</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>11.105</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
<td>-4.911</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>-3.202</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: b Dependent Variable - Approach Avoidance

Table 6 and Table 7 regression model points out the possibility of predicting unwillingness to communicate. Dominance, emotionality and sociability reduce unwillingness to communicate. On the other hand, submissiveness increases unwillingness to communicate. This behavior predicts negative and positive regulation of emotions (Liable, Carlo, Panfile, Eye & Parker, 2010) and the importance of emotions for regulation and change of the communication climate (Salama & Aboukoura, 2018). A group of three variables represents a social cognitive construct of people’s language which has a tendency to increase emotional experience in society, thus strengthening language and communication (Lindquist, Satpute & Gendron, 2016). It is submissiveness that dysregulates emotions with respect to anxieties and concerns relating to unwillingness to communicate, which has been acknowledged by Konrad (2016). To this end, based on our research we can confirm that the role of emotions such as dominance, emotionality and sociability reduces unwillingness to communicate and helps young people to regulate and tolerate distress (Bardeen, Tull, Dixon-Gordon, Stevens & Gratz, 2015).

3.1 Research Restrictions and Limits
We see as the research restrictions and limits to be the size of our research sample and the structure thereof, being focused solely on Slovak students. Due to the limits of the questionnaire method, the results do not have to reflect
accurately the actual abilities of students in terms of the
selected interpersonal, emotional and communication abilities. Unwillingness to communicate may also be explained by other
variables not explored here, for instance the issue of ghosting
within the given variables. From the methodological point of
view, in the future we wish to carry out an analysis of this issue
through the CFA-MIMIC confirmatory factor analysis.

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Studying differential categories of communication in society
requires a great deal of scientific knowledge and research. For
a social life it is necessary to draw our attention to
determinants entering the communication process. Personality, emotional intelligence and interpersonal skills are
key determinants underlying people’s communication
tendencies (Burgoon & Burgoon, 2010; Avtgis, 2009). Unwillingness to communicate and a tendency to break down
communication occur in the corporate and domestic
environments, as well as in academic settings. It poses
a serious problem, putting social relations at risk (Miczo,
2004), which can be observed in various areas. Table 1 points
out individual correlations between emotional intelligence and the Approach Avoidance factor, based on which we conclude
that the emotional factor of students’ intelligence, above all the
sociability factor, regulates, to a significant extent, the ability
and willingness to communicate (Alavinia & Alikhani, 2014).

Table 2 shows correlations between the IAS factors and unwillingness to communicate, in particular strongly negative
dominance and strongly positive submissiveness. Dominance is the opposite of submissiveness, which proves the diversity
of our large research sample in terms of personality and communication (Castells, 2007; Fedilah, 2018). Table 3 again
shows a strongly positive IAS Dominance factor as well as
strongly negative submissiveness with emotional intelligence.
Tiedens and Fragale (2003) note that it is this non-verbal
behavior that functions as a communication variable through people’s mimic and postures. The frequency of occurrence of reasons for young people’s unwillingness to communicate
indicates 3 main variables (conflict, a lack of time, not being
interested in communication). These determinants are
consistently related to burnout syndrome. Shankland, Kotsou,
Vallet, Bouteyere, Dantzzer and Leys (2018) point out that
students’ optimism decreases significantly as a result of
eyeryday problems leading to burnout due to a lack of time,
which may cause conflicts. Dismissive behavior of students in
Table 5 is presented by the IAS Arrogant and Cold-hearted
factors, where we observed the most frequent students’
preferences. Such behavior can be considered antisocial and
unadaptable within the academic environment and in terms of
communication. Darling-Hammond (2017) draw our attention
to antisocial behavior at schools and as an improvement they
suggest supporting critical thinking and personalizing relations
so that students could have a feeling of not being marginal
and could be engaged more in the community of young people,
and, furthermore, various educational opportunities that they
would benefit from along with applying their knowledge in the
real world. With the regression model we point out the need
for increased regulation of negative and personality traits
preventing the will of students from communicating among
themselves. This emotional diversity may indicate a low level
of motivation, insufficient teaching strategies or sources of
cognitive knowledge of the surroundings, and a student’s
perception of his/her personality by a group of peers (Pekrun,
Goetz, Titz & Petty, 2002).

Putting the results into practice may be of help:

- in recruiting young people, the recruitment which is
  based on initial communication in the form of
  interviews,
- as a precondition for admissions to high schools and
  colleges/universities, focusing on interpersonal skills,
- in modifying college/university curricula,
- in forming working teams,
- as recommendations to university lecturers - creation
  of formal authorities,
- as a precondition for identifying possible interpersonal
  conflicts in the educational process,
- in testing communication skills and tendencies in
  specific occupational positions,
- in developing communication skills.

This research was supported by a grant GaPU 42/2019 (Grant
Agency of University of Presov).
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