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Abstract
This study aimed to identify the relationship between personality and team conflict. This study employed a sectional approach in collecting data. Data were collected from one of the company in Melaka, Malaysia namely LTK Sdn Bhd. This study collected a sample of 100 full time employees using simple random probability sampling technique. A multicultural experience questionnaire with a likert-scale rating 1-5 was used. The data was processed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 20.0 for window. To ensure reliability and validity the questionnaire was checked by Cronbach’s alpha and principal components analysis. The correlation analysis shows that personality has positive and significant association with relationship conflict except openness of personality. Neuroticism of personality was found to have a positive and significant association with task conflict while other dimensions of personality were found to have positive but non-significant with task conflicts. Similarly this study found that neuroticism and agreeableness only is significant and positively associated with process conflict. Implication and suggestion for future research are discussed.
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1. Introduction

Personality and team conflict has been gaining much attention in recent years. The differences of the personality in someone that might create conflict become a very important and critical problem that all the organization need to look around. It seems handful of researches were done in relation to personality and conflict. Personality is a particular combination of behaviour, thinking, emotion and attitude (Holzman, n.d). It also responds to a situation form a person to a person in particular situation. This shows that in different kind of behavior, emotion and attitude can make someone create conflict while in organization or working in a team or group. This proves by Addesso (2009) that different in personality, cognitive style and communication style can make someone create conflict. Differences in personality mean that their thinking are not same resulting potential conflicts and irritation among the workers.
Eddy (2011), found that if someone with dysfunctional types of personalities involve in a team could cause conflict. Differences in personality dimension relates with team conflict (Antonioni, 1998 and Bono et al 2002). However, other researcher Lawrence (2011) has found that different personalities are the cause of the conflict. Most of the finding on preview researcher show that the relationship between personality and team conflict that will make conflict happen or not based on different personalities and this will support my research studies. Some of the researchers like Antonioni (1998) and Bono et al (2002) used big five personality to examine the relationship between personality with team conflict (relationship, task and interpersonal conflict) will linked or not. The result is five factor of personality have a positive relationship with integrating style and also related to the conflict at the individual level. According to Shamsul (2013), conflict still persists in Malaysian organisation due to the diverse personality working under one roof. This is because the inherent contradictions that shapes the social dynamics of Malaysian society.

Individually, the studies about the relationship between personality and team conflict have been research extensively over the years. For instance, studies have shown that different in personality will effect or influence the relationship between team conflict (Antonioni, 1998; Jensen et al, 2003; Simons & Peterson, 2000). These conflict types are relationship, task and process conflict. Relationship conflict is concerned about the personal issues, while task and process conflict concerned with word related issues, what should do and how goal will achieve (Jehn, 1995). An example of relationship between personality and team conflict have been research that extraversion, conscientiousness, openness, agreeableness and neuroticism have a positive relationship with integrating style (Antonioni, 1998). Bono and he team found that the effect of individuals personality in their conflict perception (Bono et al, 2002). Furthermore, the combinations of these two concepts have not been investigated simultaneously.

The aim of the research study may be summarized by the following three research objective:

- To examine the relationship between big five personality factors and relationship conflict.
- To examine the relationship between big five personality factors and task conflict.
- To examine the relationship between big five personality factors and process conflict.

This paper is organised as follows: first part is discussed above. Second part is the theoretical framework and research hypothesis development. Third part discusses the research design and methodology, data collection procedures and process. Fourth part presents the results and discussion. Final part is conclusion and recommendation, and implication for further research.

2. Literature Review

Personality will happen in team become conflict because of the fight between individual goals, loss of sight in their family affairs, socially, economically, financially will make them always fall in conflict. According to Allport (1961), personality is dynamic organisation inside a person that creates characteristic patterns of behaviors, thinking and feelings. Zafar & Meenakshi, (2012) argued that personality can make one person behaviour consistent from one time to another, and different from other person behaviour will manifest in comparable situations.

Personality also can consider as important category of individual different based on the judged depending on her/his personality. According to Wright & Taylor (1970), personality refer to those who are relatively stable and enduring aspects of the individual which different him from other person, and at the same time, form the basis of our predictions concerning his future behaviour. Wright and Taylor studies are more same with Child that expected that individual will behave in a reasonably consistent manner and different occasions. According to Peterson (1992), personality is a construct that has a number of attributes. Peterson(1992) also
mention that personality have 4 feature. The first feature that person bring personality into situation and take them away with them when they leave. The second feature is psychological attributes that refer to a person actions, thinking and feelings and not to material things such as possessions or status. Next is a characteristic where a combination of individual characteristics wills crates a unique psychological signature. Lastly is functional or dysfunctional mean that characteristic can make us succeed in any situation and also will bring us fail to success.

According to Sigmund Freud cited in (Boundless, n.d.), espoused a psychodynamic view of human personality that implication the id, ego, and superego as the main determination of individual variance in personality. Personality also can determine as combination of behaviour, thinking, feeling and emotion that comprise an individual human being. Personality also will influence personal expectation, self-perception, value and also attitude. Personalities are a set of psychological traits that organized and relatively enduring in an individual and influence his/her interaction, adaptation, the intrapsychic, physical and social environmental (Larsen & Buss, 2005, p. 5).

Review of key theories

Big Five Personality factors are found congruence with self-rating, rating by peer and rating by psychological staff. The Big Five Factor includes

1. Extraversion (sociability and enthusiasm)
2. Agreeableness (friendliness and kindness)
3. Conscientiousness (organization and work ethic)
4. Neuroticism (emotion and moodiness)
5. Openness (imagination and insight)

Extraversion refers people who are sociability, expressive and enthusiasm, but also who tend to be excellent (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Extraversions people tend to active participate in group decision, which should boost the constructive resolution of team conflict (Mohammed & Angell, 2004). However, competition among extraversion is high, which will likely resist the ability of teams to solving team conflict in nice approach (Moynihan & Peterson, 2001). Agreeableness relates with interpersonnal interactions and refers to the trend of co-operative, trusting and benevolent (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Team agreeableness cannot be affecting the relationship between team conflict and team performance because when agreeableness is high, teammates rarely perceive that conflict happen (Graziano, Jensen & Hair, 1996). Conscientiousness prefers to people who are organized and trustworthy, but also who incline to achievement oriented and resolute (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Conscientiousness related to employees performance of the individual level more strongly than any other big five personality because of the many settings, conscientiousness people will seek the accomplishment of job tasks in a consistent and dedicated plan (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Neuroticism tends to experience negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety or depression. Neuroticism is also can refers to emotional stability because neuroticism refer to emotional and moodiness. Antoinioni (1998) found that emotional stability people involve other people in resolving disagreement and not likely to use conflict resolving style that will lead to unsuccessful outcome like obliging and avoiding. Team that have high level of emotional stability will tend to have peaceful environment (Reilly, Lynn & Aronson, 2002). Openness refers to the trend to be open-minded person, imagination and inquisitive person (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Moberg (2001) describe that open minded people tend to face compromise yet in conflict situation. Other than this, Flynn (2005) found that open minded people have energetic attitude toward majority of members than individuals.

Theory X and Theory Y

According to McGregor’s cited (Boundless, n.d.), Theory X and Theory Y are theories of human motivation. Theory X manager tends to micro-manages and Theory Y manager are more to believe in empowering employees. In McGregor’s Theory X, workers are only motivated by
money, punishment and position. The Theory X assumes that workers generally avoids increasing responsibility and seeks to be directed resulting managers to involve in micromanagement. This kind of workers need to be constantly watched and instructed what to do. Theory X also results in authoritarian management style over team and gives them some collaboration or participation in decision making. Example in Theory X, manager is more incentives if using tangible reward. Because they assume that their authority is resented and regulation is creating to enforce compliance. Theory Y is more to empower employees that emphasizes staff self-discipline and do their job themselves. If working in a team in this Theory Y, member is active and supportive in work and fined the way to work it rewarding. Team member will also seek opportunity to improve and self-respect. Examples for Theory Y manager is manager build communication trust and belief in staff member's good intentions.

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

Myers-Briggs type Indicator is to make the theory of psychological types describe by C. G. Jung understandable and useful in people's lives (Myers & Briggs Foundation, n.d.). According them the aim of MBTI is to make insights of type theory accessible to individuals and group. Based on CPP (2009), MBTI has helped millions of people worldwide gain insights about themselves and how they interact with other by improving their communication skills, learn and work. CPP (2009) also stated that MBTI make Carl Jung’s theory of psychological type both understandable and highly practical by helping individuals identifying their personality preferences by grouping these into four areas: Extraversion (E) - Introversion (I), Sensing (S) – Intuition (N), Thinking (T) – Feeling (F) and Judging (J) – Perceiving (P).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Preference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion (E)</td>
<td>Interacting with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion (I)</td>
<td>Thinking things trough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing (S)</td>
<td>Perceiving tangible facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition (N)</td>
<td>Perceiving new possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking (T)</td>
<td>Making decision using objective logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling (F)</td>
<td>Making decision using subjective values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging (J)</td>
<td>An organised lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiving (P)</td>
<td>A flexible lifestyle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type A and Type B Personality

Personality type can be defined as the classification of individuals based on their behaviour pattern (Joy, 2012). Many of the researcher found that typology of personalities carried out different part of the world, but Carl Jung, whose theories gave a rise to the idea of psychological types of personalities. Friedman and Rosenman during 1950s came out with a theory that classified people into three categories: Type A, Type B and Type AB personalities (Joy, 2012). Type A and Type B describe two unique sections of people who are polar opposite of each other in terms of attitude, thinking and understanding. Where by Type AB, constitute people who do not fall into these two categories.

Type A describes individuals as ambitious, rigidly organized can be sensitive, truthful, always want to help another people and also obsessed with time management (Pandit, 2012). People on Type A are high-achieving, they will push themselves and they hate things delays and ambivalence (Pandit, 2012). Friedman (1996) suggests that Type A behaviour is divide in to three major indication: free- floating hostility, time urgency and short-tempered, and also competitive drive. Many of the researchers found that Type A people are impatient and time urgency, aggressive, free- floating hostility and also have highly competitive (Pandit, 2012; Baxamusa, 2011; Joy, 2012; Zielinski, 2013). According to Whitbourne & Whitbourne (2010), Type A personality refer to someone who is hard- driving, competitive and impatient where by people will feel hostility because of their behaviour and time urgency. Most of the young people
scored high in hostility were likely to have health problems in their midlife year (Baxamusa, 2011). Barefoot et al. (1983), concluded that hostility was the toxic factor in the Type A behaviour pattern.

Type B people are opposite with Type A people. Type B people are patient to large extent, easy going and take things slowly and steadily not like Type A (Joy, 2012). Zielinski (2013) describes Type B people more relaxed and dislike Type A people will push themselves to achieve goal. Type B people generally live at a lower stress level and work steadily, enjoy achievement without any stress when they fail to achieve it (Baxamusa, 2011). Type B people also like to socialize and be in the company of both known and unknown people (Joy, 2012).

2.4 Conceptual Framework

![Conceptual Framework](image)

Figure 1 – Conceptual Framework of personality and team conflict

3. Research Design and Methodology

Subjects

A total of 118 questionnaires were distributed and a total of 115 questionnaires were returned (response rate 97%). However, some of these returned questionnaires were excluded from the sample as some staff was new who joined recently and those who returned the survey forms without fully completing it. This means the study only used 100 completed questionnaires, where 54 respondents were male (54%) and 46 respondents of the sample of 100 were female (46%). 73% of the respondents have a bachelor's degree, 19% of staff have completed diploma followed by 1% of respondents completed foundation and 1% of respondents have completed master's degree. 56% of staff are single and 43% of staff are married while 1% of staff were divorced. 30% of staff (respondents) were aged between 26-30 years, followed by 33% of staff were aged from 21-25 years and 30% of staff were more than 30 years old. Only 2% of staff was below 20 years.

Procedure

The researchers independently contacted the respondents or staff using a random probability sample based on the approximate numbers of staff working in the chosen organisation (approximately 400 staff). The staff names were written in a piece of paper and put into a large box and out of every four staff 1 staff was chosen. These staffs were informed by HR and line managers whether they would like to participate in the survey. If they agreed, then the survey questionnaire was given to them and briefs them about the survey and its purposes.
Additionally, permission from the organisation was obtained to meet the employees during break hours and also during the work hours with the help of line managers. A time period of 4 hours were spent for three weeks in data collection process. The completed questionnaires were collected by the researchers and a follow up were made on the following week during the same hours during their work and lunch hours.

Measures

The questionnaire’s content was administered through various sources which relates with the suitability of instruments (Goldberg et al 2006). Further –more, these instruments have been extensively used in examining the relationship between personality and management of conflict, employee performance and satisfaction. Questionnaire is designed to gather data to measure statistical, correlation, relationship and causality. It consists of 3 part A, B and C.

Part-A: The part contains 24 question of personality to measure the personality of individuals by using Five Factor Personality such as openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism.

Part-B: Contain 9 questions to measure the team conflict by using relationship conflict, task conflict and process conflict.

Part-C: This part included general information question about the gender, age, level of education, nationality and marital status.

However, five point scale from 1-5 was applied to answering questionnaire to give respondent to choose that they consider like them with circle strongly agree or strongly disagree. This questionnaire is using simple word that researcher want to make sure that every respondent can understand all question when complete the questionnaire.

4. Results and Discussion

Scale Reliability

The Coefficient range of Cronbach’s alpha is from 0 to 1 that used to describe the reliability of factor extracted from the questions that have two possible answers. The higher the score, the more reliable the scale is. Nunnaly (1978) has indicated that 0.7 is acceptable reliability coefficient. If the data is more to 1.0 it indicates that question has high reliability. Cronbach's alpha consider >0.9 is excelled, >0.8 is good, >0.7 are acceptable like Nunnaly (1978) indicated, >0.6 is questionable, >0.5 is poor and if <0.5 are unacceptable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Reliability Statistics for the whole scale

In this study the Cronbach’s Alpha in Table 2 of all question under personality and team conflict is 0.843 suggesting that this scale is good. For this study, the Cronbach’s alpha scale for openness (0.758), extraversion (0.775), neuroticism (0.771), relationship conflict (0.719), task conflict (0.724) suggesting that the entire item in the scale are reliable. In Cronbach's alpha scale, agreeableness (0.654) and process conflict (0.623) suggesting that all the items in this scale are questionable. In Cronbach’s alpha scale, conscientiousness (0.586) suggesting that the entire item in this scale are questionable. However as the whole scale is more than 0.848, and as this figure is close to 0.6, we decided to retain the item as shown in the Table 3.
Sample Adequacy Test

Factor analysis been conducts based on the variable between personality and team conflict. According to UCLA (2014), factor analysis is technique that requires a large sample size. UCLA (2014) advise that the amount of using large and small sample size, 50 cases is very poor, 100 is poor, 200 is fair, 300 is good, 500 is very good and 1000 or more is excellent.

Table 4:KMO and Bartlett’s Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</th>
<th>Approx. Chi-Square</th>
<th>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Adequacy Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 questions from the survey questionnaire describe the relationship between personality and team conflict. To avoid from using the same dependent variable, principle component analysis been used to reduce data because large number of question will make the study more complicated. In factor analysis, principle components analysis is the best choice to reduce unnecessary data. The risk of reducing number of question will also reflects major proportion on information carried in the data. The KMO values should be greater than 0.5 if the sample is adequate (Field, 2005). In this study KMO was 0.701 meaning that sample is adequate for factor analysis (Field, 2005). Based on UCLA (2014), the measure varies in KMO is between 0 and 1, and values closer to 1 are better. Any KMO values that is lower than 0.6 is unacceptable.

KMO and Bartett’s test, which are basic standard, used for run the principal components analysis. In principle components analysis test, significant (p<0.001) been suggested. The communalities of this study that all is more than 0.5 mean that is perfectly adequate. That makes clear that sample size of 100 as used in this study is good for factor solution because all the communalities are more than 0.5.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 5-Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4060</td>
<td>.52451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.6275</td>
<td>.49810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4240</td>
<td>.55725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.5780</td>
<td>.50922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.9860</td>
<td>.63326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Conflict</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1130</td>
<td>.59055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Conflict</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.2131</td>
<td>.61718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Conflict</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.2333</td>
<td>.55785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Table 5 shows that overall mean of conscientiousness is 3.63 with SD of 0.49810 indicating that most of the respondent are moderately organized, concern about timing and meeting deadlines. The second highest mean score is attributed to agreeableness (M=3.578, SD=0.50922). This shows that most of the respondents are reluctant to argue or disagree with conflicting ideas or avoid any conflicts when opinion differences arise among the team member. The third highest mean score is attributed extroversion (M=3.424, SD=0.55725) followed by openness (M=3.406, SD=0.52451). In terms of team conflict, process conflict has the highest mean value (M=3.2333, SD=0.55785) showing that process conflict occurs much more often than any other type of team conflicts. The second most often experienced team conflict among the respondents is task conflict (M=3.2131, SD=0.61718) followed by relationship conflict (M=3.113, SD=0.591)

Correlations

Correlation analysis was done on all constructs to determine Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient with 2-tailed significant test. Correlation also had been use to determine the relationship between independent and dependent variable. Independent variable such as openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism were dependent variable is relationship conflict, process conflict and task conflict. The table below shows the correlations between personality variable and team conflict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation with Team Conflicts</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.320*</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.248*</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.241*</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.251*</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

With reference to the above Table 6, the result shows that conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism has a positive and significant relation with the value of the correlation coefficient of ‘relationship conflict’ where R= 0.320, 0.248, 0.241, 0.251 respectively. It is also found that the correlation coefficient values of personality with relationship conflict is significant (where P<0.05), except openness that have significant P>0.05. The table also shows that personality has positive relationship with relationship conflict where by all the correlation value is positive. The table above also showing that conscientiousness is highly correlated with relationship conflicts (r=0.320, p<0.01), followed by extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism that have correlate significant (r=0.258, 0.241 & 0.251, p<0.05).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Value R</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.249*</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlations are significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

With reference to the above table, the result shows that neuroticism has significant and positive relation with the value of the correlation coefficient of task conflict, where R= 0.249. Rest of the personality variables is not significantly associated with task conflict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Value R</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.211*</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.232*</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlations are significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

With reference to the above table, the result shows that agreeableness and neuroticism has a positive and significant relation with the value of the correlation of coefficient of process conflict, where R= 0.211 and 0.232. It is also found that the correlation coefficient values of personality with process conflict is significant and positive (where P<0.05). We do not find any significant association of personality variables such as openness, conscientiousness and extroversion with process conflict (P>0.05). The neuroticism has the highest correlation value with a correlation coefficient of 0.232.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

The main purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between personality and team conflicts. The following conclusions were made.

The conscientiousness is the most often displayed personality characteristics among the respondents. Therefore it is important to ensure everyone in the team emphasis on meeting deadlines, well organized and planned everything before proceeds. Similarly conscientiousness is associated with relationship conflict. However conscientiousness is not associated with any other team conflicts.

All the personality attributes are significant and positively associated with relationship conflicts except openness. Also agreeableness and naturism personality is significant and positively associated with task conflict. Also agreeableness and neuroticism is positively associated with process conflict. This means rest of the personality types are not associated with the process or task conflict.

The significant findings of this study bout relationship between personality and team conflict has implications for individuals behaviour in a team that different in personality will determine the conflict based on their emotion or moodiness. Conflict happens when personalities clash and when team member perceive interference from one another. When (Neuman& Baron, 2001).

Future research

To further investigate the relationship between personality and team conflict, performing a longitudinal study will be necessary. The temporal effect of this conflict could provide valuable insight in the relationship between personality and team conflict. Especially since the results of team conflict was not as expected. Furthermore, the personality traits (conscientiousness, neuroticism, agreeableness, extraversion and openness to experience) may also be of influence and it would be interesting to research the relation between personality and team conflict. It is important to increase the sample size and include more respondents to generalize the findings.
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