



2. Relation between Personality and Conflict Resolution Style; Does Generation affect

Deepa Ayachit

*Research Scholar,
Mansarovar Global University.*

Dr. Aditya Upadhyay

*Research Guide,
Mansarovar Global University.*

ABSTRACT:

Conflict in the workplace creates a challenge for many present-day managers. This paper aims to explore the effect of generations on the relationship between personality and conflict resolution styles. Five-factor model of personality traits is used to measure personality, while conflict styles are measured using two basic dimensions: concern for self and concern for others. Based on resulted finding study observed that generations affect the relationship between specific personality traits and conflict resolution styles. The age of individuals contributes to the strength or the weakness of the various relationships between personality and conflict resolution styles. The study recommended that for a deeper understanding of the relationship, it is advisable to use both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. Therefore, the understanding of what influences an individual's choice regarding his/her choice of conflict resolution styles is of great use to supervisors in general and human resource managers in particular. The study will assist in developing training programs that help employees acquire the appropriate skills necessary to control their impulses in a conflict situation. Training should comprise conflict resolution and communication skills that could help bridge the gap between generations. Effectively managing generational conflict in the workplace can positively contribute to the level and frequency of future conflicts, which in turn, can lead to favorable organizational outcomes.

KEYWORDS:

Conflict resolution, Conflict, Personality, Generation

Introduction:

Conflicts are likely to arise between individuals or groups because of differences in values, expectations, needs, workplace practices, and personalities, which, in turn, could produce conflicting actions and preferences. Thus, conflict creates a challenge for many managers,

an issue very common in today's workplace. However, poorly managing such conflicts in the workplace can have adverse effects on the level and frequency of future conflicts and can negatively affect productivity, job performance (Trudel and Reio, 2011), and organizational commitment (Thomas et al., 2005). Workplace conflict has also been shown to have a positive relationship with absenteeism and employee sickness (Giebels and Janssen, 2005). On the other hand, properly managing such conflicts has been shown to decrease stress, improve long-term relationships, and reduce emotional defensiveness (DeChurch et al., 2007). Nevertheless, the conflict management style that the individual chooses to adopt may largely influence the outcome of the conflict. The conflict resolution styles favored by individuals in a certain situation depend on factors such as personality (Anwar et al., 2012), emotional involvement, and the prevailing circumstances. When choosing which conflict management style to adopt, researchers sometimes suggest a contingency approach.

This approach recognizes that many conflicts happen without warning, and, as such, a reactive approach is inescapable (Zia and Syed, 2013). Critics of this perspective argue that some individuals are not adaptable enough to alternate conflict management styles. Their personalities factor in and largely dictate one style over another. According to Carlson (2010), genetics and environmental factors are both equally important in personality formation. Personality has been shown to be instrumental in conflict management styles to different extents, having an impact on "how employees interpret their organizational environment, and hence shaping the behaviors in light of those interpretations" (Hong and Kaur, 2008). However, no research has been conducted with regards to generational effects on the relationship between personality and conflict management styles. Previous research proposes that intergenerational differences happen as a result of people developing their social identities around technological developments and other important social events (Lyons and Kuron, 2014).

Literature Review:

Conflict:

According to Jones et al. (2013) conflict define as the discord that arises when the goals, interests, or values of different individuals or groups are incompatible, and those individuals or groups block or thwart one another's attempts to achieve their objectives. Organizational conflict may befall parties because of contradictory emotions about a certain issue, limited resources, incompatible ideologies, different values, lack of communication, and workplace practices, etc. Such conflicts are likely to occur between individuals or groups since each have their own beliefs, attitudes, and values. Nevertheless, if a conflict is properly managed, it can lead to both personal and organizational benefits (Silverthorne, 2005). Otherwise, it can negatively affect organizational outcomes such as productivity, absenteeism, commitment, and job performance (Trudel and Reio, 2011). Still, managing these conflicts is no easy process; a wide range of organizational actions must be taken, including understanding positions, communicating, and problem solving as well as dealing with emotions.

Previous studies propose the conceptual models for classifying interpersonal conflict management styles (Behfar et al., 2008; Thomas, 1976). However, Rahim (1992) developed

a conceptualized classification into two basic dimensions: concern for self and concern for others (this classification will be the basis for our research). The first dimension, concern for self, describes the degree (high or low) to which a person aims to satisfy his/her own motives. The second, concern for others, describes the degree (high or low) to which a person aims to satisfy others' concerns. Combining these two dimensions renders five interpersonal conflict management styles: Collaborating style, also known as collaborating style, is characterized by great concern for both one's own and the other party's goals. Both parties carry out a win-win interaction; they solve the problem by clarifying differences, maximizing joint gains, ultimately reaching a mutually acceptable solution.

While some consider it to be the most constructive conflict management style, others feel it is misleading because it is time and energy consuming, and therefore unsuitable when solving low-priority conflicts (Shetach, 2009). Rahim (1992) considers this style potentially inappropriate in situations when immediate decisions need to be made or when the concerned parties lack problem solving skills. Competing style, also known as accommodating style, is characterized by low concern for one's own goals and high concern for others' where individuals may neglect their own needs to satisfy the other party's – a sacrifice to maintain the relationship. This style holds a self-sacrifice element, and can therefore be dubbed a lose-win situation. Dominating style, also known as competing style, is characterized by high concern for one's own goals and low concern for others' where individuals use power to complete their objective and ignore others' interests and needs. Individuals in management positions are likely to use the power their position affords them. If they hold no such power, they are likely to "yield" power by bluffing or involving a superior (Rahim, 1992). The outcome of this style is win-lose; only one person comes out of it as a winner.

Avoiding style is characterized by low concern for both self and others. In this style, an individual acknowledges the existence of a conflict, but suppresses or withdraws from it failing to satisfy both his/her own needs and the other's needs and giving the impression of an "unconcerned attitude" (Rahim, 1992). It is considered a lose-lose situation. Compromising style is characterized by intermediate concern for both one's own and others' goals. It involves using give-and-take strategies to reach a happy medium (middle ground position). Unlike Collaborating style, in this style, the problem is not explored fully and neither party's needs are fully satisfied; both have given something up in exchange for something from the other. The object of the conflict is rationed to reach a solution that provides incomplete satisfaction for both parties' concerns. A compromising person is more willing to forgo his/her needs than a dominating person, but less than an Competing person.

Personality:

Personal features primarily define and forecast human conduct. These personal characteristics also designate different individualities, which can contribute to implications about behavioral consequences (Liao and Lee, 2009). There are several scholars who believe that personality is fundamentally unchangeable. According to Boyce et al. (2013), the assumption that personality is fixed is problematic for several reasons. The chief reason is that this belief condenses the interest in personality to practical economists and policy makers. It would not be a valuable target or specific aim for micro- or macro-level intercession. Ferrer-i-Carbonell (2005) states that even though personality is an imperative

interpreter of a person, it might only be attention-grabbing if it is a phenomenon that actually changes. The personality as a form of non-cognitive skill, which may have essential penalties for the economic decisions that people make and the upshots that they achieve. On the other hand, Almlund et al. (2011) avow that the traits of personality react to parental actions, level of education, and policy intrusions. This makes personality change a possibility even throughout adulthood.

Traditionally an individual's personality is fairly permanent and enduring. At the outset, personality was thought to be stable especially after the age of 30 in which it has been described to be "set like plaster" (Costa and McCrae, 1988). Additional studies claim that personality is actually "set like soft plaster" since it does change, although in a slow pace after the age of 30 (Srivastava et al., 2003). According to Robbins et al. (2008), personality traits are an accepted means for elucidating people's behavior. Current theoreticians approve of the five central personality dimensions, repeatedly referred to as the "Big Five" or "five-factor model," composed of a few qualities used to describe individuals (Durupinar et al., 2009).

The five-factor model of personality suggests that there are five factors to an individual's personality. The Big Five personality traits, also referred to with the acronym OCEAN, are openness to experience, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (Robbins et al., 2008). Openness to experiences is the personality attribute that is stalwartly related to the intelligence facet (Fumham et al., 2008). It demonstrates to which extent a person has artistic affinity, and it is merely associated to one's attractions to new things (Chamorro Premuzic et al., 2009). Individuals who are highly open to experience are creative, imaginative, inspired, and sensitive. Individuals low on openness to experience are conformists and tend to be more at ease with familiar surroundings (Sodiya et al., 2007). Pertaining to the second dimension of the five-factor model, conscientiousness is a propensity to exhibit strength of mind, behave devotedly, and show self-control. Conscientiousness designates that individuals are highly motivated and goal oriented (Judge and Ilies, 2002). Highly conscientious people are responsible and organized, and therefore are more likely to attain their objectives (Robbins and Judge, 2007). Individuals who are low in conscientiousness are plainly disorganized and easily distracted.

Extroversion relates to an allied to a person's easiness with external relationships and situations (Laney, 2002). Extroverted people, generally, enjoy socializing with others and tend to be more positive, energetic, friendly, and outgoing (Srivastava et al., 2008). Nonetheless, introverts are typically shy, quiet, and distant as they possess lower energy levels and social interactions than extroverts. Regarding the fourth element of the five-factor model, the agreeableness trait displays people's general concern for social concord. It shows how much an individual is apt to behave in harmony with the interests of others. Highly agreeable people are pleasant, kind, trusting, and warm. They are usually willing to compromise with others and are more reliable (Clarke and Robertson, 2005). Individuals low in agreeableness are time and again forceful, disagreeable, and cold (Graziano and Tobin, 2009). The fifth dimension of the five-factor model, neuroticism is the proclivity to experience adverse feelings, such as anger, nervousness, or despair, especially in threatening situations and loss (Lahey, 2009). People high in neuroticism are more likely to be depressed, worried, and anxious. Thus, the people who mark low in neuroticism tend to be emotionally stable and calm. They do not show evidence of obstinate negative emotions (Dolan, 2006).

Personality and Conflict Management Styles:

Pepin (2005) affirms that the findings of these studies have been inconsistent, where some found a weak relationship between personality and style of conflict, while others found a strong relationship between them. Several researchers have, for decades, intended to expose the nature of the relationship between personality and conflict style (Anwar et al., 2012). Research by Wang (2010) found a correlation between the five-factor model and conflict management styles. His study showed a positive relationship between Collaborating conflict style and openness to experience, but a negative one between Collaborating style and neuroticism. In addition, the Competing conflict style was positively associated with neuroticism, but negatively with extroversion. Furthermore, the avoiding conflict style was positively correlated to neuroticism but negatively correlated to extroversion. Wang (2010), correspondingly, established the existence of a positive correlation between the compromising style and agreeableness, and a negative correlation between the dominating style and agreeableness.

Ejaz et al. (2012) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between the different conflict resolution styles and personality traits. Their study comprised call center representatives in Pakistan and revealed significant connotations among the diverse conflict resolution styles and the Big Five traits. On the other hand, Whitworth (2008) found no association between preferred conflict resolution styles and personality factors among female nurses in Southern Mississippi. Thus, the results displayed that both the Collaborating and Competing conflict styles were positively correlated to openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, while the compromising and dominating conflict styles, were positively linked to openness and extroversion. Additionally, the avoiding style was positively associated with neuroticism.

Generations:

According to Saleh (2008), generation X developed skepticism and independence, which helped them succeed in an entrepreneurial setting. They are considered to have a great work ethic and unflinching loyalty when it comes to their workplace. Thus, the people ranging in age from 35 to 50 called as generation X, was the first generation to really have to deal with the dramatic shift in workplace paradigms brought about by the technological revolution. This generation has witnessed many crises in its time. Also known as Millennials, generation Y ranges in age from 15 to 34 years. These millennials were born into an already hi-tech environment. Their time experienced its fair share of violence, particularly with regards to terrorist attacks (Mukundan et al., 2013). These generation are considered special, sheltered, confident, team oriented, conventional, pressured, and achieving (Howe and Strauss, 2000). In addition to being “high maintenance and high risk” can also be “high output” (Fraone et al., 2008).

Gender and Conflict Styles:

Earlier studies of conflict styles often included relatively few female. Holt and DeVore (2005) note that even Rahim's (1983) relatively large national sample of 1219 subjects contained only 50 female. Interest in gender differences has grown as female have become an increasing proportion of the workforce over the last three decades and as more female

have entered academia. Female's numbers at executive and top executive levels have also grown steadily, although they continue to be underrepresented at those levels (Appelbaum et al., 2003). While there have now been many studies testing for gender differences in organizational settings, results have been contradictory (Holt and DeVore, 2005; Putnam and Poole, 1987). As noted earlier, most of these studies used relatively small convenience samples. To test for underlying trends in those studies, Holt and DeVore (2005) conducted a recent meta-analysis of self-report data on conflict styles from 36 studies of organization members. The Chusmir and Mills (1989) study, which included male and female managers at three levels, found no significant gender effect after controlling for organization level. However, their data show some covariation between gender and organization level which could explain that finding. Some studies have found smaller gender differences among managers than non-managers (Korabik et al., 1993) or have found smaller differences among more experienced managers (Sorenson et al., 1995), suggesting that male and female conflict styles may converge at higher levels.

Research Methodology:

Several previous research studies explored the relationships between the Big Five personality traits and the different conflict management styles, which led to identifying some significant associations among them. This study, however, intends to take things further by investigating a possible moderator of the various relationships. Thus, the main research question of this paper is the generations X and Y affect the relationship between each of the Big Five personality traits and the five conflict management styles. Therefore, the main characteristic of the dominating conflict style is the use of power to achieve results. Since the characteristics of both generations X and Y do not comprise power use, the relationship between the personality traits and the dominating style is supposedly independent on generations.

Data Analysis and Results:

Out of total 305 respondents' data in this research, there were 165 male and 140 female participants who had completed. Our study is exploratory rather than hypothesis testing. There is considerable uncertainty involving the effects of organization-level and gender on personality and conflict styles. Likewise, there is no predominant theoretical framework from which to deduce hypotheses. This research aims to identify the effect of generations X and Y, as separate cohorts, on the relationship between personality and conflict resolution styles of managers.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Conflict Management Styles

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Extraversion	305	11.00	18.00	13.0000	2.76605
Agreeableness	305	13.00	22.00	18.8000	3.44077
Conscientiousness	305	17.00	25.00	20.4000	2.58545
Neuroticism	305	23.00	33.00	29.4000	3.62319
Openness	305	12.00	16.00	14.2000	1.47462

Table 2: Correlation Matrix

		Competing	Collaborating	Compromising	Avoiding	Accomodating
Extraversion	Pearson Correlation	.179	.269	-.005	.216	-.426**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.402	.000	.000	.000
	N	305	305	305	305	305
Agreeableness	Pearson Correlation	-.154	.034	-.379**	-.242	.496**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.002	.000	.000
	N	305	305	305	305	305
Conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation	.226	-.128	-.056	.044	-.099
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.004	.534	.000
	N	305	305	305	305	305
Neuroticism	Pearson Correlation	-.277	-.028	.035	-.111	.283*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	305	305	305	305	305
Openness	Pearson Correlation	-.054	.294*	-.039	-.176	.002
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.402	.000	.000	.000
	N	305	305	305	305	305

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Analysis:

Table 3 reflect the summary of the regression analysis of the various personality factors as the predictor variables and the competing conflict handling styles as the outcome variable. The adjusted R square of 0.760 reflects that personality variables accounted for 76 % of variance in the use of competing style. Extraversion and Neuroticism were positively while conscientiousness and openness to experience were negatively related to dominating. Thus, the results support two of the five hypotheses for competing.

Table 3: Predicting Competing Conflict Management Style

Predictor Variables	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
Extraversion	.373(a)	10.321	.000	.648	.873(a)	.762	.760
Conscientiousness	-.223(a)	-6.231	.000	-.457			
Neuroticism	.088(a)	2.184	.031	.177			
Openness to experience	-.063(a)	-.826	.410	-.068			

The analysis shown in table 4 reflect the summary of the regression analysis of the various personality factors as the predictor variables and the Collaborating conflict handling styles as the outcome variable.

The adjusted R square of 0.638 reflects that personality variables accounted for 63.8 % of variance in the use of the Collaborating style. Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism had a positive slope while conscientiousness had a negative slope. Thus, the results support two of the five hypotheses for Collaborating.

Table 4: Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Collaborating Conflict Management Style

Predictor Variables	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
Extraversion	.135(a)	2.721	.007	.219	.800(a)	.640	.638
Agreeableness	.383(a)	4.364	.000	.339			
Conscientiousness	-.141(a)	-2.606	.010	-.210			
Neuroticism	.293(a)	4.877	.000	.373			

In the first analysis shown in Table 5, personality factors were entered simultaneously as the predictor variables and the compromising conflict handling styles as the outcome variable. The adjusted R square of 0.862 indicates that 86% of the variance in the scores of compromising can be attributed to the predictor variables i.e big five personality factors. Agreeableness, Neuroticism and Openness to experience had a positive slope while extraversion had a negative slope. Thus, the results support three of the five hypotheses for compromising.

Table 5: Predicting Compromising Conflict Management Style

Predictor Variables	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
Extraversion	-.132(a)	-2.981	.003	-.239	.929(a)	.863	.862
Agreeableness	.080(a)	2.687	.008	.216			
Neuroticism	.185(a)	2.289	.023	.186			
Openness to experience	.026(a)	.757	.450	.062			

Table 6 reflect the summary of the regression analysis of the various personality factors as the predictor variables and the avoiding conflict handling styles as the outcome variable. The adjusted R square of 0.125 reflects that personality variables accounted for only 12 % of variance in the use of dominating style.

Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Openness to experience were negatively while and Neuroticism was negatively related to avoiding. Thus the results support three of the five hypotheses for avoiding.

Table 6: Predicting Avoiding Conflict Management Style

Predictor Variables	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
Extraversion	-.316(a)	-3.628	.000	-.287	.362(a)	.131	.125
Conscientiousness	-.048(a)	-.623	.534	-.051			
Neuroticism	.334(a)	4.586	.000	.354			
Openness to experience	-.799(a)	-6.181	.000	-.454			

The analysis shown in Table 7 reflects the summary of the regression analysis of the various personality factors as the predictor variables and the Accommodating conflict handling styles as the outcome variable. The adjusted R square of 0.552 reflects that personality variables accounted for 55.2 % of the variance in the use of the Accommodating style. Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism had a positive slope while conscientiousness had a negative slope. Thus, the results support two of the five hypotheses for accommodation.

Table 7: Predicting Accommodating Conflict Management Style

Predictor Variables	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
Extraversion	.064(a)	1.137	.257	.093	.745(a)	.555	.552
Agreeableness	.249(a)	2.449	.016	.198			
Conscientiousness	-.050(a)	-.819	.414	-.067			
Neuroticism	.200(a)	2.846	.005	.229			

Study Findings:

Findings suggested that the generation X tends to suppress from conflict more than generation Y as these individuals are usually more responsible (conscientiousness), more at ease with their surroundings (extroversion), and more likely to behave in harmony with others' interests (agreeableness). Because of this, it is expected that generations X and Y have effect on the relationship between conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness, and the avoiding conflict style, and that the strength of this relationship is greater for generation X than for generation Y.

Unlike the common characteristics between conscientiousness, extroversion, and agreeableness, and the avoiding conflict style, such commonalities cannot be pinpointed for the two remaining personality traits, openness, and neuroticism.

The outcomes from secondary study show that there are no significant relationships exist between the dominating style and the Big Five personality traits. This is in line with neither the study of Wang (2010), who found that the dominating style and agreeableness have a significant negative relationship nor the study of Ejaz et al. (2012) who found that dominating style is positively related to openness and extroversion. The Collaborating conflict style, however, is positively correlated to openness, conscientiousness, extroversion, and agreeableness (Ejaz et al., 2012) and negatively correlated to neuroticism. Similarly, the avoiding conflict style is significantly related to openness, extroversion and agreeableness. In addition to this, the Competing conflict style is negatively correlated to conscientiousness but positively correlated to neuroticism.

Additionally, the Collaborating conflict style is characterized by a large concern for both one's own and the other party's objectives. Unlike generation Y, generation X is known for joining gains and ultimately reaching an acceptable solution. This, in turn, will result in easiness to deal with external relationships and situations. For this reason, it is theorized that generations X and Y have an effect on the relationship between extroversion and the Collaborating style, and that the strength of this relationship is greater for generation X than for generation Y. Furthermore, a main characteristic of the Competing conflict style is a low concern for one's own goals. Both generations X and Y are concerned for their objectives and do not neglect their desires. For that reason, the association between the personality factors and the Competing style is expected to be independent on X and Y.

In addition, a fundamental characteristic of the compromising conflict is reaching middle ground position where give-and-take strategies are applied to satisfy both one's own and others' objectives. Contrasting to generation Y, generation X seems to be more willing to compromise as they show self-control and behave devotedly, known features of being conscientious. Unlike the common characteristics between conscientiousness and the compromising conflict style, such similarities cannot be found for the remaining personality traits, openness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism.

Discussion:

The results indicated no effect of generations between the dominating conflict resolution style and the Big Five personality traits. This seems in line with the characteristics of generations X and Y, which do not comprise the use of power to complete any objectives. This is true especially for generation Y who prefer to work in teams instead of dominantly leading as they are more team oriented. Moreover, the results showed no effect of generations X and Y between the Competing conflict resolution style and the Big Five personality traits. Thus, both generations do not sacrifice their own needs or goals to satisfy others.

On the contrary, individuals of generation Y believe in empowerment, are achievement oriented, and acquire career-driven personalities. They are also considered self-centered enough not to abide by other people's desires. On the other hand, results revealed that generations X and Y effect the relationship between the Collaborating conflict style and extraversion. However, X had a greater effect than Y. Individuals of generation X are most likely to prefer an Collaborating style for conflict resolution since it is the most constructive among the conflict styles and may lead to joint gains for both parties.

Generation X is known for joining gains and eventually reaching a suitable solution. They also acquire a great concern for their own as well as another party's best interest. They are flexible and usually more loyal than generation Y. All of these characteristics ease their dealings in relationships and situations, a description of being extroverted. Generation Y individuals, nonetheless, like to work their own way and tend to leave when something better comes along. Additionally, generations X and Y moderated the relationship between compromising conflict style and conscientiousness. Conversely, X had a larger effect than Y. This stems from the independent and reliable character of generation X, who are more devoted and responsible, two of the characteristics of the compromising resolution style. Individuals of generation X are more willing to give up something in exchange for something else, unlike individuals of generation Y, who are regarded as more selfish and sheltered. Contrasting to generation Y, individuals who belong to generation X seem to be more willing to compromise as they show self-control and behave dutifully, known features of being conscientious. Finally, generations X and Y have the relationship between the avoiding style and conscientiousness, extroversion, and agreeableness, X having a greater effect than Y. Individuals of generation X aim to achieve and plan behavior rather than react spontaneously, and they are more willing to withdraw in order to find a solution. They are more adrift and pleasant. Individuals of generation Y, however, are willing to take more risks. Their attitudes are influenced by today's increased violence and numerous hollow reality shows. Unlike generation Y, generation X tends to suppress from conflict more than generation Y, as these individuals are usually more responsible (conscientiousness), more at ease with their surroundings (extroversion), and more likely to behave in harmony with others' interests (agreeableness).

Conclusion:

Research examined the relationship between personality and conflict management styles have found varying results ranging from weak to strong relationships. The understanding of what influences an individual's choice of which management style he/she chooses is of great use for managers in general and human resource managers in particular. This study showed that the inconsistency could be the result of some factors that moderate this relationship. The age of individuals contributes to the strength or the weakness of the various relationships between personality and conflict resolution styles. Findings suggest that generations X and Y do not moderate the relationships among the personality traits and the dominating and Competing conflict styles. They do, however, have varying effects on the relationships between specific personality traits and the Collaborating, avoiding, and compromising styles. It is recommended that future research examine such a relationship in other sectors and cultures for generalizability. Since generation Z will soon be entering the job market, further studies should include this cohort when investigating the relationships. Finally, for a deeper understanding of the relationship, it is advisable to use both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods.

Thus, they are highly networked and are in constant search of instant gratification. They are contentious to the systems of hierarchy widely accepted by generation X, and rather, expect more of a mentoring role from their supervisors. They would not mind leaving their employer if they find a better opportunity elsewhere for themselves. They expect to be included in intellectual talk and in management decisions They respect positions and titles, and want a good relationship with their boss.

References:

1. Anwar, M., Shahzad, K. and Ijaz-ul-Rehman, Q. (2012), "Managing conflicts through personality management", *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 6 No. 10, pp. 3725-3732.
2. Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Reimers, S., Hsu, A. and Ahmetoglu, G. (2009), "Who art thou? Personality predictors of artistic preferences in a large UK sample: the importance of openness", *British Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 100 No. 1, pp. 501-516.
3. Costa, P.T. Jr and McCrae, R.R. (1992), *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual*, Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL.
4. DeChurch, L.A., Hamilton, K.L. and Haas, C. (2007), "Effects of conflict management strategies on perceptions of intragroup conflict", *Group Dynamics*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 66-78.
5. Ejaz, S.S., Iqbal, F. and Ara, A. (2012), "Relationship among personality traits and conflict resolution styles of call center representatives and appraisal of existing service model", *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 27-36.
6. Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. (2005), "Income and well-being: an empirical analysis of the comparison income effect", *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 89 No. 1, pp. 997-1019.
7. Fumham, A., Swami, V., Arteche, A. and Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2008), "Cognitive ability, learning approaches and personality correlates of general knowledge", *Educational Psychology*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 427-437.
8. Giebels, E. and Janssen, O. (2005), "Conflict stress and reduced well-being at work: the buffering effect of third-party help", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 137-155.
9. Goldberg, L.R. (1993), "The structure of phenotypic personality-traits", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 48 No. 1, pp. 26-34.
10. Liao, C. and Lee, C. (2009), "An empirical study of employee job involvement and personality traits: the case of Taiwan", *International Journal of Economics and Management*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 22-36.
11. McCrae, R.R. and Costa, P.T. (1987), "Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 81-90.
12. Mukundan, S., Dhanya, M. and Saraswathyamma, K.P. (2013), "A study on the conflict resolution styles of Generation Y students in indian context", *International Journal of Global Business*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 81-90.
13. Pepin, J. (2005), "An investigation of whether coping mechanisms mediate the relationship between personality traits and conflict management styles", *Dissertations and Theses Database No. AAT MR06973*, St Mary's University.
14. Rahim, M.A. (1983), "A measure of styles of resolution conflict", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 368-376.
15. Silverthorne, C.P. (2005), *Organizational Psychology in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, New York University Press, New York, NY.
16. Shetach, A. (2009), "The four-dimensions model: a tool for effective conflict management", *International Studies of Management & Organization*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 82-106.
17. Srivastava, S., Angelo, K.M. and Vallereux, S.R. (2008), "Extraversion and positive affect: a day reconstruction study of person-environment transactions", *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 1613-1618.

Relation between Personality and Conflict Resolution Style; Does Generation affect

18. Thomas, J.L., Bliese, P.D. and Jex, S.M. (2005), "Interpersonal conflict and organizational commitment: examining two levels of supervisory support as multilevel moderators", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 35, pp. 2375-2398.
19. Trudel, J. and Reio, T.G. Jr (2011), "Managing workplace incivility: the role of conflict management styles – antecedent or antidote?", *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 395-423.