

Personality Traits and Conflict Resolution Styles of single and Married Individuals

***Saadia Dildar**

GC University, Lahore

Zanub Ansari

University of Gujrat, Gujrat

Misbah Arshad

University of Gujrat, Gujrat

This study explored the relationship between personality traits and conflict resolution styles of single and married individuals. The sample comprised of 120 participants including 60 single individuals (30 men and 30 women) and 60 married individuals (30 men and 30 women) who were taken from the general community of two cities of Pakistan, Gujrat and Lalamusa. Urdu versions of the Big Five Inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999) and Organizational Conflict Management Inventory (Anis-ul-Haque, 2003) were used for assessment. Data were analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, Multiple Linear Regression, and One-Way ANOVA. Results revealed that significant relationship exists between different personality traits predict the different conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals. Moreover, both unmarried and married individuals vary in the way of managing conflicts. The conflict resolution styles of married individuals are adaptive and healthy as compared to unmarried individuals. Present findings might prove helpful for psychologists/counselors to guide unmarried and married individuals how to manage conflicting situations constructively.

Keywords: Personality Traits, Conflict Resolution Styles, Unmarried and Married Individuals

* Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Saadia Dildar, GC University, Lahore, Zanub Ansari, University of Gujrat, Gujrat and Misbah Arshad, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, zanub.mphil14@gmail.com

Conflicts are part of human life and inevitable in any relationship. Conflict is a normal phenomenon, and it may occur in any situation at any time among individuals when needs, desires, goals, and ideas become discordant. Conflict varies from situation to situation in different relationships among people. But an important aspect of conflict resolution is how conflicts are managed in specific situations. Literature suggests various determinants that revolve around conflicts, riddled with crucial personality traits (Robbins, Judge, & Sanghi, 2008). It has been found that the choice of strategies for conflict resolution varies from individual to individual (Rahim, 1983), and individuals with different personality traits deal in different ways. Everyone thinks feels and behaves in different ways when encountered with the same or similar situation. So, the purpose of this study is to probe relationship between different personality traits and conflict resolution styles in people especially those that are married and unmarried.

Personality

Personality traits are enduring ways of behavior (Robbins et al., 2008). Current theoreticians approve five central personality traits or dimensions recognized as “Big Five” or “Five-Factor Model”. According to this model, five personality traits are openness to experience, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism abbreviate as OCEAN (Robbins et al., 2008; Goldberg, 1993).

Openness to experience is related to an individual's attraction to the latest things, creative fondness (Chamorro-Premuzic, Reimers, Hsu, & Ahmetoglu, 2009), and intelligent stalwartness (Fumham, Swami, Artech, & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2008). High scores on this trait demonstrate sensitivity, inspiration, creativity, and imagination where low scores indicate being accustomed to environments and conformity (Sodiya, Longe, Onashoga, Awodele, & Omotosho, 2007). Conscientiousness represents self-control, being strategic, organized, and planning goals (McCrae & Costa, 2003). High scores on this trait reveal responsibility, organization, and the ability to secure objectives (Robbins & Judge, 2007) conversely; low scores signify disorganization and

distractibility (Messarra, Karkoulian, & El-Kassar, 2016). Extroversion represents socializing, friendliness, and outgoingness (Srivastava, Angelo, & Vallereux, 2008). People with higher extroversion are more likely to take direct actions and use positive thinking when tackling problems (Anis-ul-Haque, 2003) whereas low scores on extroversion mean unfriendliness, being shy and quiet with scanty social interactions and low level of energy (Messarra, Karkoulian, & El-Kassar, 2016). Agreeableness demonstrates the overall concern of individuals for social concord. This trait explicates the interest and benefit of others with accord and cooperation. Highly agreeable individuals are characterized as warm, trustworthy, enjoyable, caring, and reliable (Clarke & Robertson, 2005) whereas low scores on this trait describe being cold, disagreeable, and forceful (Graziano & Tobin, 2009). Neuroticism refers to the tendency to experience distress and negative emotions including worry, hostility, irritability, reduced self-confidence, fear, self-consciousness, anger, feelings of vulnerability, sadness, dissatisfaction, anxiety, shyness, and loneliness (John, Robins, & Pervin, 2008). Low scores on neuroticism indicate being calm and emotionally stable with lower levels of stubborn negative emotions (Dolan, 2006). Weisberg, DeYoung, and Hirsh (2011) reported that on extroversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism personality traits women score higher than men. Whereas, no gender differences were found in openness to experience and conscientiousness personality traits (Costa et al., 2001).

Conflict Resolution

Jones, George, and Belkhdja (2013) define conflict as a disagreement in values, goals, and interests in individuals and groups that have become discordant and obstruct each other to obtain goals. Rahim and Bonoma (1979) distinguished modes of dealing with conflict based on two dimensions, i.e., concern for self (high or low) in which a person aims to satisfy his/her own motives; second, concern for others (high or low) in which a person aims to reduce concerns others have. These two dimensions render five interpersonal conflict management styles, namely, integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising styles.

In the integrating style (collaborating/problem-solving style) individuals have a concern for their own self and others. In this style, individuals interact with each other in a win-win manner (Messarra, Karkoulian, & El-Kassar, 2016) where individuals speak openly, share information, look for a substitute, and explore contradictions to find out prolific solutions, suitable for all (Anis-ul-Haque, 2003). Individuals who use this style may be more confident, accept the values of others, cooperate efficiently, and try to meet the need of every individual involved in conflicting situations. Integrating style leads to creative solutions because it resolves conflicts aligned with problem-solving. This style is found to be beneficial in employing information and skills of different peoples to make solutions and might be suitable for dealing with tactical issues related to long-range planning, policies, and objectives (Afzalur, Garrett, & Buntzman, 1992). However, this style is not suitable when individuals lack skills in problem-solving or when there is a need to take quick decisions (Rahim, 1992).

In the compromising style, people have *moderate concern for others* and themselves. This yields a no-win and no-lose outcome to conflicts. In a compromising style, individuals give and take so that they may attain mutually acceptable goals. This style is suitable when individuals have equal power status and issues are strategic in nature; however greater reliance on this style may be dysfunctional (Anis-ul-Haque, 2003).

In the obliging style (yielding or accommodating style) individuals have a *high concern for others* than themselves. Conflicts resolved through this style end up as lose-win results where the individual neglects his/her needs and fulfills the needs of others. This style is appropriate to use when individuals know others are more important, and saving relationships are more important than merely handling conflicting issues (Anis-ul-Haque, 2003).

In avoiding style individuals have *low concern for others* and themselves. Conflict resolutions yield lose-lose outcomes, where individuals withdraw from such situations. Individuals sidestep conflicting situations believing that there are no positive outcomes (Anis-ul-Haque, 2003). This style of handling conflict is appropriate when

issues are unimportant or confronting with other individuals outweighs the advantage of resolving conflict (Lee, 2008).

In dominating style (competitive or disregarding style) individuals have a *high concern for their own self* than others. Individuals ignore the concerns of others and act in assertive ways to procure their own goals (Messarra, Karkoulian, & El-Kassar, 2016). Conflict resolutions result in win-lose outcomes. Dominating style may be useful when issues are small and insignificant, or when mandatory decisions need to take place quickly (Anis-ul-Haque, 2003). However, this mode of resolving conflict is inappropriate because it evokes anger and aggression towards others (Huan & Yazdanifard, 2012).

Out of the five styles discussed above, integrating and to some degree compromising styles are suitable for managing many strategic matters, and conflicts are deemed as healthy modes of conflict resolution (Dildar & Yasin, 2013). The other styles (obliging, avoiding, and dominating) may be helpful in reducing day to day tactical issues but are generally considered unhealthy modes of conflict resolution.

Many researchers in their areas of study have found personality traits are linked with different conflict resolution styles (Ahmed, Nawaz, Shaukat, & Usman, 2010; Anbaz, 2013; Anis-ul-Haque, 2003; Anwar, Shahzad, & Ijaz-ul-Rehman, 2012; Asgari, Taleghani, & Gilanpour, 2013; Ejaz, Iqbal, & Ara, 2012; Fatima & Saher, 2012; Gharache, Abbasi, & Mansoorinia, 2014; Salimi, Karaminia, & Esmaili, 2011; Wang, 2010) as well as different personality traits predict different conflict resolution styles (Priyadarshini, 2017; Khalid, Fatima, & Khan, 2015; Forrester & Tashchian, 2013). Whereas, Pepin (2005) reported personality traits and conflict styles are inconsistently related to each other; for example in female nurses, no relationship between personality traits and conflict management styles was revealed (Whitworth, 2008). Further, regarding the differences in styles of conflict resolution many researchers reported different findings. In management organizations, women are more likely to use collaborative style to resolve conflicts, and men avoiding style (Brahnam, Margavio, Hignite, Barrier, & Chin, 2005) while; Dildar and Amjad (2017) reported that female managers do not vary from male counterparts in dealing conflicts. Brewer, Mitchell, and Weber (2002)

found that males usually prefer dominating conflict resolution style; and that married males mostly adopt this style to settle interpersonal conflicts (Dildar, Yasin, & Sitwat 2013). Based on this literature clarity on how married men and women use conflict resolution styles compares with unmarried men and women needs further investigation.

Rationale of the Study

There is a need to identify personality traits linked with styles of conflict resolution in unmarried and married individuals to determine if the change in marital status affects conflict resolution and that differences across gender affect the use of conflict resolution styles? The current theoretical knowledge in the area of conflict resolution in marital life will become more transparent with the findings of this research, which will contribute to theoretical and empirical knowledge in this area. So the main objectives of this study are to examine the relationship between different personality traits and conflict resolution styles; to investigate the predicting role of different personality traits for conflict resolution styles; and to ascertain the differences in conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals.

Hypotheses

- There is likely to be a relationship between different personality traits and conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals.
- Personality traits are likely to predict the conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals.
- There are likely to be differences in conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals.

Method

Sample

The sample consisted of 60 unmarried individuals (30 men and 30 women) and 60 married individuals (30 men and 30 women) conveniently taken from the general community of Gujrat and Lalamusa cities, Pakistan. All participants were above 20 years of age and marital

period was at least one year in duration were included, single after marriage living alone, separated, divorced, widowed, and individuals suffering from physical disabilities, psychological illnesses were excluded from this study. Initially, 150 participants were contacted, ten participants did not comply with inclusion criteria, eight participants did not complete questionnaires properly and 12 participants did not return questionnaires leaving 120 participants in all.

Measures

Big Five Inventory (BFI). We used BFI developed by John and Srivastava (1999) to assess five personality traits, which comprised of 44 items with five subscales i.e. Extroversion (8 items), Agreeableness (9 items), Conscientiousness (9 items), Neuroticism (8 items), and Openness (10 items). BFI is a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from “1” Disagree strongly to “5” Agree strongly. The BFI scores range from 1 to 220. High scores on subscales represent more of the personality trait assessed. In this study Urdu version of BFI was used and the overall Cronbach’s alpha reliability was found to be .68 and for subscales .47 (Extroversion), .67 (Agreeableness), .66 (Conscientiousness), .66 (Neuroticism), and .45 (Openness to Experience).

Organizational Conflict Management Inventory (OCMI). We used OCMI designed by Anis-ul-Haque (2003) to assess how participants resolved their conflict with others. It consists of 37 items with five subscales i.e., Integrating (12 items), Compromising (4 items), Obliging (7 items), Avoiding (7 items), and Dominating (7 items) on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from “1” (Never) to “5” (Always). OCMI scores ranged from 1 to 185, where higher scores on a subscale suggested that individuals employed that style of conflict resolution. For this study, OCMI was modified according to the targeted population and Cronbach’s alpha reliability of OCMI was found to be .84 and for subscales .88 (Integrating), .54 (Compromising), .77 (Obliging), .66 (Avoiding), and .62 (Dominating).

Demographic Information Sheet. It includes personal information like age, gender, education, marital status, residential area, family structure, and city name, etc.

Design and Procedure

A cross-section research design was used to examine the relationship between personality traits and conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals. Initially, unmarried and married individuals approached personally and some of them were contacted with help of relatives and colleagues. After that, for seeking participants' formal permission for getting data purpose of this study was briefed to them. After taking permission, questionnaires comprising of instructions, demographic information sheet along with assessment measures given to participants, and they were instructed how to fill questionnaires. Participants were requested to give their responses accurately without leaving any question. For the completion of research protocols about half an hour of each participant was taken.

Ethical Considerations

For this study approval from the Head of Department and from the complete authority of the University was taken. Formal permission from respective authors for use of scales was taken. The formal informed consent form was taken from participants to seek their willingness for voluntary participation. Participants were told that they have the right to leave this research at any time without any penalty. Participants were assured that their identity will not be disclosed to anyone and the information gathered from them was kept confidential and was not meant to be used for any other purpose except this research. Participants were instructed that they have the right to know the findings of this research.

Results

All data were analyzed by using the SPSS-20 version. Reliability analyses were run to see the psychometric properties of the scales used. Pearson product-moment correlation was run to see the relationship between different personality traits and conflict resolution styles (see Table 1); multiple linear regression was run to examine the predicting

role of different personality traits for conflict resolution styles (see Table 2); further one-way ANOVA was run to examine the differences in conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals (see Table 3).

Table 1 revealed that extroversion and openness personality traits have a significant positive relationship with integrating and compromising conflict resolution styles while neuroticism has a significant positive relation with obliging and dominating styles. Similarly, agreeableness and conscientiousness have a positive significant relationship with integrating, obliging, avoiding, and compromising styles but are negatively correlated with dominating style.

Table 2 showed that agreeableness ($\beta = .38, p < .001$), conscientiousness ($\beta = .35, p < .001$), neuroticism ($\beta = .15, p < .05$), and openness to experience ($\beta = .18, p < .05$) significantly positively predicted integrating style; agreeableness ($\beta = .35, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($\beta = .24, p < .05$), and neuroticism ($\beta = .38, p < .001$) significantly positively predicted obliging style; extroversion ($\beta = .24, p < .05$) positively whereas agreeableness ($\beta = -.27, p < .05$) significantly negatively predicted dominating style; conscientiousness ($\beta = .29, p < .05$) significantly positively predicted avoiding style; finally agreeableness ($\beta = .33, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($\beta = .27, p < .05$), and openness to experience ($\beta = .25, p < .01$) personality traits significantly positively predicted compromising conflict resolution style in unmarried and married individuals.

Table 3 indicated that there are significant differences in conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals. Integrating conflict resolution style, $F(3, 119) = 11.67, p < .001$; obliging, $F(3, 119) = 6.96, p < .001$; dominating, $F(3, 119) = 5.22, p < .01$; avoiding, $F(3, 119) = 7.27, p < .001$; and compromising, $F(3, 119) = 5.62, p < .01$.

Table 4 according to post hoc married women preferred a more integrating style than married men, unmarried women, and unmarried men. Similarly, married women preferred a more obliging style than unmarried women, married men, and unmarried men. Whereas, dominating style is most commonly used by unmarried men than married men, unmarried women, and married women. Avoiding conflict

resolution style is mostly used by married women than unmarried women, married men, and unmarried men. Lastly, the compromising style is mostly adopted by married women than married men, unmarried women, and unmarried men.

Discussion

This study was done to examine the relationship between different personality traits and conflict resolution styles and whether personality traits predict conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals. In addition to this, differences in conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals were also explored. The findings of this study were consistent with research done by Asgari et al. (2013). They reported that agreeableness and conscientiousness personality traits have a significant positive relationship with integrating, obliging, avoiding, and compromising conflict resolution style but negatively correlated with dominating style. Similarly, results of the present study were in line with the study conducted by Pakistani researchers Ahmed et al. (2010) who reported that individuals having extroversion and openness to experience personality traits prefer compromising conflict resolution style than avoiding. The results of Anis-ul-Haque's (2003) study were also consistent with this study who found that agreeableness significantly positively related with integrating, obliging, avoiding, and compromising styles of conflict resolution while conscientiousness has a significant positive relation with integrating style. Moreover, the findings of this research were also somewhat similar to that reported by Fatima and Saher (2012).

The results of present study showed that extroversion positively predicted the dominating style; these findings are consistent with the results of Priyadarshini (2017) who reported that extroversion positively predicted the preference for dominating style. The reason may be that extrovert individuals by nature are assertive, use authority and power to resolve a conflict in one's favor. Findings of the present study also indicated that agreeableness positively predicted integrating, obliging, and compromising styles whereas negatively predicted dominating style which are consistent with the study of Priyadarshini (2017) who reported

that agreeableness positively predicted integrating and obliging styles whereas negatively predicted dominating styles while Forrester and Tashchian (2013) reported that agreeableness impact the compromising style which also support the results of present study. Agreeable individuals tend to understand, cooperate, tend to be easily moved, generally sympathetic, trusting, and accepting in interaction with others; due to these characteristics individuals high in agreeableness prefer integrating, obliging, and compromising styles (Priyadarshini, 2017) and rarely choose the dominating style as their personality characteristics being complete opposite of it (Khalid, Fatima, & Khan, 2015).

The results of the present study showed that conscientiousness positively predicted integrating, obliging, avoiding, and compromising styles which are consistent with the findings of Khalid, Fatima, and Khan (2015) they found that conscientiousness positively predicted preference for integrating style. The present study also revealed that neuroticism positively predicted integrating and obliging styles; these findings are inconsistent with the study of Khalid, Fatima, and Khan (2015) they reported that neuroticism negatively predicted preference for integrating, obliging, and compromising conflict resolution styles while Priyadarshini (2017) found that neuroticism positively predicted obliging style but do not predict the integrating style. Results of this study also indicated that openness to experience positively predicted integrating and compromising conflict resolution styles which are in line with the study of Forrester and Tashchian (2013) who reported that openness to experience impacts the integrating and compromising styles.

The new and important aspect of this study was that conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals were examined in the context of Pakistan. This research demonstrated that significant differences exist in conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals; as married individuals deal with the conflicting situation in a constructive way than unmarried. However, previous researches examined the gender differences in the way of managing conflicts in varied samples and reported inconsistent findings. Some researchers found no gender differences in the way of managing conflicts whereas; some researchers reported that gender differences exist in the way of

resolving conflicts (Dildar & Amjad, 2017). Although, there is a dearth of research that particularly examine differences in conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals. So, this study makes an addition and contribution in the existing literature in terms of which conflict resolution styles were preferred by unmarried and married individuals to settle down their conflicts.

Conclusion

In the light of this study, it is concluded that relationship exists as well as different personality traits predict the conflict resolution styles of unmarried and married individuals; both unmarried and married individuals resolve their conflicts in different ways. The conflict resolution styles of married individuals are adaptive and healthy as compared to unmarried ones because, after marriage, married individuals go through different transitions of life they become matured and have more responsibilities. Also, married individuals have a permanent source of social support from their spouses when they face any ups and downs in their life they share their problems to manage them constructively. Whereas, unmarried individuals are negligent, have fewer responsibilities, and least social support as compared to married individuals. That's why when they confront conflicting situations the ways they use for managing such circumstances are unhealthy.

Limitations and Suggestions

Some suggestions should be incorporated in future study. The time duration for research in the future should be expanded as the time period for this study was limited. The sample should be larger and taken from different cities of Pakistan to enhance the generalizability of the study, as the sample of this research was comprised of 120 unmarried and married individuals of Gujrat and Lalamusa cities of Pakistan. Measures used in this study were self-report so all results and inferences are based exclusively on each individual's perception and feelings; therefore this might be a potential limitation of the present study. Further for future researchers, it is suggested that determine whether marital status moderates the relationship between different personality traits and conflict resolution styles.

Implications

This study has some important implications for psychologists/counselors and social workers to better evaluate the needs of individuals. The psychologists/counselors and social workers may better help unmarried and married individuals when they encounter domestic or other types of conflicts. They may facilitate in teaching them better ways to resolve their conflicts constructively keeping in view their marital status and personality traits.

References

- Afzalur, R. M., Garrett, J. E., & Buntzman, G. F. (1992). Ethics of managing interpersonal conflict in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 11*(5), 423-432.
- Ahmed, I., Nawaz, M. M., Shaukat, M. Z., & Usman, A. (2010). Personality does affect conflict handling style: Study of future managers. *International Journal of Trade, Economic and Finance, 1*(3), 268-270.
- Anbaz, K. (2013). The relationship between personality traits and conflict management strategies in physical education managers of Isfahan province. *Advances in Environmental Biology, 7*(8), 1454-1459.
- Anis-ul-Haque. (2003). *Personal attributes and conflict management styles of corporate managers* (Published PhD Thesis). Department of Psychology, University of the Peshawar, Pakistan.
- Anwar, M., Shahzad, K., & Ijaz-ul-Rehman, Q. (2012). Managing conflicts through personality management. *African Journal of Business Management, 6*(10), 3725-3732.
- Asgari, M. H., Taleghani, M., & Gilanpour, F. (2013). Investigation of relationship between personality traits and conflict management styles in guilan province schools managers. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research, 3*(3), 381-386.
- Brahnam, S. D., Margavio, T. M., Hignite, M. A., Barrier, T. B., & Chin, J. M. (2005). A gender-based categorization for conflict resolution.

Journal of Management Development, 24(3), 197-208.

doi:10.1108/02621710510584026

- Brewer, N., Mitchell, P., & Weber, N. (2002). Gender role, organizational status, and conflict management styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13(1), 78-94.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Reimers, S., Hsu, A., & Ahmetoglu, G. (2009). Who art thou? Personality predictors of artistic preferences in a large UK sample: The importance of openness. *British Journal of Psychology*, 100(1), 501-516.
- Clarke, S., & Robertson, I. T. (2005). A meta-analytic review of the Big Five personality factors and accident involvement in occupational and nonoccupational settings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(1), 355-376.
- Costa, P. T. Jr., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 322-331.
- Dildar, S., & Amjad, N. (2017). Gender differences in conflict resolution styles in different roles: A systematic review. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 15(2), 37-41.
- Dildar, S., Yasin, S., & Sitwat, A. (2013). Intimate enemies: Marital conflicts and conflict resolution styles in dissatisfied married couples. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(10), 1433-1439. doi:10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.15.10.11581
- Dolan, S. L. (2006). *Stress, self-esteem, health and work*. Palgrave: Macmillan.
- Ejaz, S. S., Iqbal, F., & Ara, A. (2012). Relationship among personality traits and conflict handling styles of call center representatives and appraisal of existing service model. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 4(4), 27-36.
- Fatima, I., & Saher, K. (2012). *Conflict management styles in relation to personality and religiosity* (Unpublished M.Phil Thesis). Institute of Applied Psychology, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

- Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *116*(3), 429-456. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.116.3.429
- Forrester, W. R., & Tashchian, A. (2013). Effects of personality on conflict resolution in student teams: A structural equation modeling approach. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, *10*(1), 39-46.
- Fumham, A., Swami, V., Arteché, A., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2008). Cognitive ability, learning approaches and personality correlates of general knowledge. *Educational Psychology*, *28*(2), 427-437.
- Gharache, A. M. A., Abbasi, A., & Mansoorinia, R. (2014). Investigating the relationship among personality factors of principals and their choice of conflict management styles in the public schools. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, *4*(2), 379-391.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, *48*(1), 26-34.
- Graziano, W. G., & Tobin, R. M. (2009). *Agreeableness*. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (p. 46–61). The Guilford Press.
- Havenga, W. (2008). Gender and age differences in conflict management within small business. *South Africa Journal of Human Resource Management*, *6*(1), 22-28.
- Huan, L. J., & Yazdanifard, R. (2012). The difference of conflict management styles and conflict resolution in workplace. *Business and Entrepreneurship Journal*, *1*(1), 141-155.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, (Vol. 2, pp. 102-138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Jones, G., George, J., & Belkhdja, O. (2013). *Contemporary management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Khalid, S., Fatima, I., & Khan, W. (2015). Personality traits and conflict management in bankers. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, *25*(2), 165-182.

- Lee, K. L. (2008). An examination between the relationships of conflict management styles and employees' satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 3(9), 11-25.
- Lippa, R. A. (2010). Gender differences in personality and interests: When, where, and why? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4, 1098–1110.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2003). *Personality in adulthood: A five factor theory perspective*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Messarra, L. C., Karkoulian, S., & El-Kassar, A. N. (2016). Conflict resolution styles and personality: The moderating effect of generation X and Y in a non-Western context. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65(6), 792-810. doi:10.1108/IJPPM-01-2016-0014
- Pepin, J. (2005). *An investigation of whether coping mechanisms mediate the relationship between personality traits and conflict management styles* (Published Dissertation), Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.
- Priyadarshini, S. (2017). Effect of personality on conflict resolution styles. *International Journal of Management & Social Sciences*, 7(2), 196-207.
- Rahim, M. A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Journal of Academic Management*, 26(2), 368-376. doi.org/10.2307/255985
- Rahim, M. A. (1992). *Managing Conflict in Organizations*. Praeger: Westport, CT.
- Rahim, M. A., & Bonoma, T. V. (1979). Managing organizational conflict: A model for diagnosis and intervention. *Psychology Reports*, 44(3), 1323-1344.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2007). *Organizational Behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Sanghi, S. (2008). *Organizational Behavioral*. Pearson Education: India.
- Salimi, S. H., Karaminia, R., & Esmaili, A. A. (2011). Personality traits, management styles and conflict management in a military unit. *Iranian Journal of Military Medicine*, 13(1), 11-16.

- Sodiya, A. S., Longe, H. O., Onashoga, S. A., Awodele, O., & Omotosho, L. O. (2007). An improved assessment of personality traits in software engineering. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*, 2(1), 163-177.
- Srivastava, S., Angelo, K. M., & Vallereux, S. R. (2008). Extraversio and positive affect: A day reconstruction study of person environment transactions. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(1), 1613-1618.
- Tidd, S. T., & Friedman, R. A. (2002). Conflict style and coping with role conflict: An extension of the uncertainty model of work stress. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13(3), 236-257.
- Wang, X. (2010). *The relationship between the five-factor personality and conflict management styles in a manufacturing setting* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Phoenix, Arizona.
- Weisberg, Y. J., DeYoung, C. G., & Hirsh, J. B. (2011). Gender differences in personality across the ten aspects of the Big Five. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, 1-11.
doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00178
- Whitworth, B. S. (2008). Is there a relationship between personality type and preferred conflict handling styles? An exploratory study of registered nurses in Southern Mississippi. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 16(8), 921-932.

Received January 3rd, 2019

Revisions Received January 7th, 2021

Table 1

Correlation Between Personality Traits and Conflict Resolution Styles of Unmarried and Married Individuals (N=120)

Variables	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1.Ex	.35***	.37***	-.19*	.31***	.27**	.05	.08	.01	.18*	28.62	4.43
2.Ag		.62***	-.23**	.13	.58***	.38***	-.31***	.26**	.46***	36.00	5.70
3.Cn			-.37***	.23**	.56***	.29***	-.26**	.28**	.45***	33.97	5.70
4.Nr				-.07	-.08	.22**	.19*	.04	-.04	21.65	5.89
5.Ope					.29***	.13	.02	.03	.32***	34.27	4.95
6.Int						.59***	-.24**	.38***	.63***	48.67	8.53
7.Obg							-.09	.30***	.41***	24.25	5.80
8.Dom								-.06	-.13	16.56	5.24
9.Avo									.28***	23.67	5.31
10.Com										14.95	3.16

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, Ex=Extroversion, Ag=Agreeableness, Cn=Conscientiousness, Nr=Neuroticism, Ope=Openness to Experience, Int=Integrating, Obg=Obliging, Dom=Dominating, Avo=Avoiding, Com=Compromising

Table 2

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis through Enter Method Predicting Conflict Resolution Styles of Unmarried and Married Individuals (N=120).

Predictors	Integrating			Obliging			Dominating			Avoiding			Compromising		
	B	SE	β	B	SE	β	B	SE	β	B	SE	β	B	SE	β
Ex	.03	.15	-.01	.15	.12	-.12	.28	.11	.24**	.14	.12	-.12	.06	.06	-.08
Ag	.59	.13	.38***	.36	.10	.35***	.25	.10	.27**	.15	.11	.16	.18	.05	.33***
Cn	.52	.14	.35***	.24	.11	.24*	.13	.11	-.14	.27	.11	.29**	.15	.06	.27**
Nr	.22	.11	.15*	.37	.08	.38***	.11	.08	.12	.14	.08	.16	.07	.04	.14
Ope	.31	.13	.18**	.11	.09	.09	.02	.09	.02	.01	.10	-.01	.16	.05	.25**
ΔR^2	46***			29***			16***			13**			33***		
F	9.45			9.53			4.52			3.38			11.49		

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, Ex=Extroversion, Ag=Agreeableness, Cn=Conscientiousness, Nr=Neuroticism, Ope=Openness to Experience

Table 3

One-Way ANOVA for Comparison of Conflict Resolution Styles of Unmarried and Married Individuals (N=120)

Variables	Married Men (n=30)	Married Women (n=30)	Unmarried Men (n=30)	Unmarried Women (n=30)	F (3, 116)	p
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)		
Integrating	49.63 (7.10)	53.43 (5.19)	42.13 (10.67)	49.50 (6.20)	11.67	.00
Obliging	22.33 (5.96)	27.06 (4.88)	21.76 (5.70)	25.86 (5.01)	6.96	.00
Dominating	15.86 (4.41)	15.26 (4.78)	19.66 (5.63)	15.46 (5.04)	5.22	.00
Avoiding	23.13 (5.25)	26.96 (5.56)	21.16 (4.60)	23.43 (4.20)	7.17	.00
Compromising	15.33 (2.52)	16.53 (2.67)	13.46 (3.77)	14.50 (2.86)	5.62	.00

Note. ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4

Post Hoc Analysis for Comparison of Conflict Resolution Styles of Unmarried and Married Individuals (N=120)

Variables	Groups	Mean Differences	p	
Integrating	Married-Male	Unmarried-Male	7.50	.00
	Married-Female	Unmarried-Male	11.3	.00
	Unmarried-Male	Unmarried-Female	-7.36	.00

<hr/>				
Obliging				
	Married-Male	Married-Female	-4.73	.00
	Married-Female	Unmarried-Male	5.3	.00
	Unmarried-Male	Unmarried-Female	-4.1	.02
Dominating				
		Unmarried-Male	-3.8	.02
	Married-Male	Unmarried-Male	-4.4	.00
	Married-Female	Unmarried-Female	4.20	.00
Avoiding				
	Married-Male	Married-Female	-3.83	.01
	Married-Female	Unmarried-Male	5.8	.00
	Married-Female	Unmarried-Female	3.53	.03
Compromising				
	Married-Female	Unmarried-Male	3.06	.00
	Married-Female	Unmarried-Female	2.03	.04
<hr/>				

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$