

Impact of Big Five Model on Leadership Initiation in Critical Business Environment Among Marketing Executives

Mohammad Saleh MIRALAM¹, Nasir ALI², Vikram JEET³

Received: August 01, 2020 Revised: September 20, 2020 Accepted: October 05, 2020

Abstract

The present research intends to examine the relationship between the Big Five personality traits and leadership initiations among the marketing executives in Delhi NCR (INDIA), and seeks to uncover the predictors of leadership initiations within personality traits. The data are collected through online survey method using different social media platforms. A sample of 233 (male =136 and female =97) marketing executive's responses were included. The data collected with the help of self-reported Big Five model inventory and leadership initiation test. The collected data were analyzed statistically by using descriptive statistics, correlation, and stepwise multiple regression analysis. The results revealed that the age of respondents inversely correlated with leadership initiation. Neuroticism revealed significant inverse correlation with leadership initiation, whereas significant positive correlations were found between extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and leadership initiations, while openness to experience revealed insignificant positive correlation with leadership initiation. Extraversion and conscientiousness appeared as the most dominant personality traits among marketing executives, irrespective of gender, that positively influenced leadership initiation and appeared as the predictor of leadership initiation. In male executives extraversion and age emerged as the predictors of leadership behavior, while in female executives extraversion and openness to experience personality traits appeared as the predictors of leadership initiation.

Keywords: Big Five Model, Personality Traits, Leadership Initiation, Marketing Executive

JEL Classification Code: M10, M12, M59

1. Introduction

Leadership is described as the art of inspiring and encouraging individuals toward achieving a distinctive goal. A leader is a person within the group that holds the combination of personality characteristics and leadership skills to form others' need to follow his/her direction.

Leadership is the ability combined with intelligent decisions that influenced his/her team members to remain with him for a long period to realize the organizational goals. Researchers and thinkers defined leadership in many ways, projecting a cause and effect-based definitions of leadership relation of leader and followers. For Hemphill and Coons (1957), "Leadership is the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal". For Bass (1990) "leadership is an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of members. Leadership occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group. Any member of the group can exhibit some amount of leadership". Whereas, Jaques and Clement, (1994) explain that "Leadership is a process in which one person sets the purpose or direction for one or more other persons and gets them to move along together with him or her and with each other in that direction with competence and full commitment". According to Cohen (1990), "Leadership is the art of influencing others to their maximum performance to accomplish any task, objective or project".

¹First Author. Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, College of Business, University of Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Email: mmiralam@uj.edu.sa

²Corresponding Author. Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, College of Business, University of Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia [Postal Address: Building no. 2651, Unit No 19, Al Moallafin Street, Al Azizia District, Jeddah, 23342, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia] Email: nashah@uj.edu.sa

³Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, College of Business, University of Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Email: vjram@uj.edu.sa

1.1. Leadership Initiatives

The significance of leadership initiatives remains vibrant in the fast pace of global change and development. An initiative is the beginning of something, with the desire that it will continue. It can also state approximately initiative as a personal quality. A character with the initiative is inspired to do things. A leader is taking the initiative; he is willing to get things accomplished on his own. Leadership initiative needs the courage to face challenges and take the risk, willing to take up responsibilities and put their reputation on stake. It requires courage to take initiative. Therefore, leadership initiative behavior means, an individual must have the required skills and abilities to take initiative and responsibilities in assigning their tasks to achieve challenging goals of the organization.

A personal initiative is a proactive approach featured as the self-starting and constant nature of dealing with the task complexities of the organizational goals (Frese et al., 1996; Frese et al., 1997), which in contrast of passive nature of the behavior that follows the instruction of superior and even not developing a plan and taking initiative to deal with difficulties in future. Taking initiative refers to the capability to identify something that requires to be accomplished and deciding to do it on their free will without the direction of someone else telling you to do it. This is to be done on their strength with an aspiration to make things superior to they were earlier or recommend new procedures of doing things in a better approach to get the desired outcome. Frese and Fay (2001) stated that taking initiative in the “work behavior characterized by its self-starting nature, its proactive approach, and by being persistent in overcoming difficulties that arise in pursuit of a goal”. When these characteristics join with leadership becomes a leadership initiative. This is very important for group leaders taking a risk and accepting the challenge to achieve desired results.

One of the significant research outcomes of Frese et al., (2000) stated that the employees with the high initiative skills indeed eradicate the task complexity and have better control over their workplace. Personal initiative is the type of proactive behavior that attracted maximum attention. Frese and Fay (2001) signify initiative skills as the behavioral syndrome with three characteristics and these are generally co-occurring behavior. The first is referred to as “self-starting behavior” in which the employee takes initiative and starts something on his/her discretion without any direction, despite or anticipated to do something. For this reason, the employee requires to take the initiative and set his/her target. Frees and Fay believe an action as self-starting when an employee chooses a path that is unusual or new as compared to a path that is usual and apparent. This is defined in terms of the psychological distance and it is argued that when the psychological distance is large it is indicative of personal initiative, while a small psychological distance is not indicative of personal initiative. Followers of manager advice come up with new suggestions that are not self-starting on

the other hand an employee who deviates from the laid procedures demonstrates personal initiative when suggesting new procedures for work.

1.2. Personality Traits

There is a simple way to describe personality as the individual differences based on personal characteristics as a pattern of thinking, feeling, learning, attitude, behavior, etc., and each individual differs from others in terms of single characteristic or number of mental, physical, or behavioral characteristics. The term personality describes the traits of a person that shows consistency in different situations. Allport (1961) explained: “Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his characteristics behavior and thought”. Weinberg and Gould (1999) defined personality as “the characteristics or blend of characteristics that make a person unique.” Personality factors have constantly related to numerous work-related features. Researchers, academicians, and psychologists believed and examined that the five facets of personality referred to as the Big Five personality traits – extroversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism. They are useful to understand the individual behavior. Although, there was a redundant view that came into limelight on various traits of personality and consensus developed to the five-factor theory appeared to describe the indispensable traits that serve to form the personality.

Substantial proof has shown the growth of the Big Five personality trait theory in the literature for several years such as Fiske (1949); Smith (1967), and McCrae and Costa (1987). The broad category of personality factors is known as the Big Five model of personality, although there was no consensus on the levels of each facet of personality. John and Srivastava (1999) viewed that personality characterizes the widest range of constructs where each facet recapitulates several different attributes of personality. It also viewed that personality trait has a significant impact on individual behavior (Zalal et al., 2019).

1.3. Big Five Model of Personality

Extraversion replicates a bouncy approach and embraces the traits as excitability, sociability, friendliness, talkativeness, movement, dominant, enthusiastic, energetic, outspoken, assertiveness, and positive thought and expresses a high degree of emotion. The openness trait feature of personality expresses the depth, insight, wisdom, girth of, and individual’s practical life. People with high openness, have a great interest and curiosity to experience new things. Agreeableness is one of the personality traits that include the features as altruism, kindness, trust, pro-social behavior, affection, and modesty. Conscientiousness reveals socially approved desire control that smooth the progress of the task and goal-directed behavior, like thinking before

acting, planning, organizing, and following norms and rules, prioritizing tasks. Neuroticism is an attribute of personality characterized by sadness, emotional instability, moodiness, fearful, temperamental, feeling anxious, tense, and nervous (Power & Pluess, 2015; John & Srivastava, 1999).

2. Literature Review

A divergent behavior of employees has been noticed in numerous research findings on the leadership initiations. These behavioral differences may reflect the analogy of the attributes an individual hold. Therefore, an employee's skills, traits, and abilities considered as essential attributes in the performance (Denisi and Griffin, 2011) where, persistent individual behavioral patterns and social interactions (Burger, 2013), considered as the inherent qualities of leadership (Ozbag, 2016). To examine the individual behavior, many researchers assessed individuals on the Big Five personality traits to analyze their personality (Langford et al., 2017) and evaluated to predict the leadership behavior (Judge et al., 2002). But there is the least consensus among the researchers on the required set of behaviors for effective leadership. A debatable concern is highlighted in available literature about the influences of individual personality on the performance, and leadership development over time (Lievens et al., 2009; Judge & Zapata, 2015). Numerous conceptual and experimental research attempts have been linking the Big Five personality traits with leadership (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Derue et al., 2011), exploring the explanatory relationship (Judge et al., 2002), rather than descriptive relationship (Langford et al., 2017). Eacott (2019) clarifies that there is nothing experimental that directly matches leadership, but it is an epistemic construct that can be inferred through analysis. Ruth (2020) conducted a study on leadership patterns of initiatives and interactions based on Norwegian case and find 13 types of initiatives and their distribution patterns across the institutions. The analysis revealed different initiatives accounted for an expansion of problem space and leadership issues, power and authority appeared in the interactions.

The psychological factors such as confidence, social orientation, openness, and openness influence leadership behavior (Popper & Mayseless, 2007). Individual characteristics like openness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability have a significant response on the leadership domain (Stewart et al., 2008), and the differences in the degrees of personality traits affect the individual leadership development processes (Kail, 2007). Other than the Big Five personality factors, Hogan et al. (2010), and Hogan and Warrenfeltz (2003) highlighted self-control, self-confidence psychological, mindedness, and rationality as important factors for leadership development. In the continuation, McElvany and Hastings (2014) examined young leaders of USA to assess the relevance of Big Five personality traits on leadership behavior, Harms et al. (2011) investigated the impression of subclinical personality traits

on the leadership physiognomies of military school cadets in the USA. The taxonomy of the Big Five personality models on leadership behavior can highlight in the following research finding. Based on the meta-analysis, Bono and Judge (2004) explored the influences of personality Big Five factor model on the transactional and transformational leadership. Arora and Rangnekar (2016) linked the Big Five personality dimensions with the individual career commitment in Indian organizations contexts and reported significantly positive influence on career planning.

Extraversion has been emerged and acknowledged as the domineering characteristic for the emergence of social leadership (Costa & McCrae, 1988; Watson & Clark 1997), representing high-level activeness and liveness (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Northouse, 2013; Naydenova et al., 2012) and perceived as leader like (Hogan et al., 1994). Further, it appeared as the relevant and coherent determinant of leadership (Crant & Bateman, 2000; Bono & Judge, 2004). Openness conferred as an important source for creativity (Sosik et al., 1998), and enhances the sense of subjective well-being (Han, 2020). Individuals tend to be more curious to learn new things, insightful of the thoughts, and accept the changes useful for effective and successful leadership (Northouse, 2013; Naydenova et al., 2012). In the core personality of leaders' agreeableness has also been recognized as important characteristics (Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Raymark et al., 1997) to predict the transformational leadership and for effective decision-making (Johnson & Hill, 2009), where transformational leadership induces the high intrinsic motivation level in the employees (Nguyen et al., 2019). Conscientiousness in terms of initiative and persistence related to the work assignments enhances leadership effectiveness (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). The leaders holding high conscientiousness tend to be more hard-working and organized to achieve organizational goals effectively (Northouse, 2013; Naydenova et al., 2012; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000), also conscientiousness signified as the strong predictor in individual's career identity (Arora & Rangnekar, 2016). Personality traits viz. conscientiousness and extraversion significantly correlated with leadership, while neuroticism showed significant inverse relationship and openness-to-experience and agreeableness had a weak positive correlation with authentic leadership (Baptiste, 2018).

3. Research Objectives

The objectives of the study are to explore the magnitude of the personality traits and leadership initiation among the marketing executives in Delhi NCR and uncover the relationship between age, Big Five personality traits and leadership initiation in changing business environment. Finally, determine the predictors of leadership initiation within the personality traits and age of subjects for the overall sample of male and female groups.

3.1. Hypothesis

For the attainment of above stated research objective, the following hypotheses have been formulated:

H0₁: There will not be significant relationships between age, personality traits, and leadership initiation for the total sample.

H0₂: There will not be predictor/s of leadership initiation within personality traits and age of overall respondents.

H0₃: There will not be predictor/s of leadership initiation within personality traits and age of male marketing executives.

H0₄: There will not be predictor/s of leadership initiation within personality traits and age of female marketing executives.

4. Methodology

4.1. Data Collection

In the present study, the sample consisted of 233 (Male=136 and Female=97) advertising/marketing executive working in the marketing MNCs located in Delhi, NCR, India. Questionnaires were distributed among the respondents through the online survey method using different social media platforms. The confidentiality of each participant's responses was completely ensured, and detailed feedback on their personality profile was also provided to improve the authenticity of the data collected.

4.2. Design of the Research

Correlational research design has been used to investigate the relationships between leadership initiation and age, gender, openness to experience; conscientiousness; extraversion; agreeableness, and neuroticism of respondents.

4.3. Instruments

4.3.1. Big Five Inventory

John and Srivastava (1999) constructed a 44-item inventory to measure the Big Five traits of personality that is, "Openness to Experience; Conscientiousness; Extraversion; Agreeableness; and Neuroticism" (Goldberg, 1993). Response category of inventory is based on a 5-point rating scale on a continuum of strongly disagree to strongly agree with a weighted score of 1 to 5, except negatively loaded question scoring is reverse from 5 to 1. The reliability and validity of the inventory determined is quite high.

4.3.2. Leadership Initiation Test

Shahnawaz (2018) constructed a six-item leadership initiation test. Each statement/question are rated on a 5-point rating scale on a continuum of strongly agree to strongly disagree with a weighted score of 1 to 5 and total range of scores varies from 6 to 30. The reliability and validity of the test were determined and found satisfactory.

4.3.3. Statistics and Model Specifications

To analysing the impact of personality traits on the leadership initiation among the marketing executives in Delhi NCR, descriptive statistics, mean, sd., correlation and further to determine the predictors' Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis has been applied using SPSS. The regression model is depicted as:

$$\text{Leadership initiation}_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (F1) + \beta_2 (F2) + \beta_3 (F3) + \beta_4 (F4) + \beta_5 (F5) + \beta_6 (F6) + e_{it}$$

In the above equation, β_0 is constant and β_i is the regression coefficient of the explanatory variables (F1) Age, (F2) Neuroticism, (F3) Extraversion, (F4) Openness to experience, (F5) Agreeableness, (F6) Conscientiousness, while e_{it} is the residual error of the regression.

5. Results and Discussion

Table 1 is showing descriptive statistics and multiple correlations between the age of subjects and Big Five personality factors with leadership initiation among marketing executives in Delhi NCR. Overall sd. for all variables showed normal variation in the data set. The mean age of incumbents appears 26.22 with sd. 2.39, and the correlation between age and leadership initiation revealed significant inverse association ($r = -.163, p < .05$). The mean and sd. for neuroticism observed 36.29 and 4.69 respectively and revealed an inverse significant correlation between neuroticism and leadership initiation ($r = -.323, p < .01$). Extraversion appeared as the most important personality factor for the marketing executives, showing mean and sd. 39.17 and 4.66, respectively.

The correlation between extraversion and leadership initiation calculated .519, which is significant at .01 levels of significance. Openness to experience revealed insignificant correlation ($r = .114$), whereas agreeableness ($r = .164, p < .05$) is the important personality factor that appeared significant traits to influence the leadership initiation. Though, these factors revealed positive relations with leadership initiation among marketing executives. Indeed, conscientiousness one of the personality dimensions appeared as the dominant factor of leadership initiation among marketing executives. Conscientiousness with mean score 43.00 and sd. 5.59 showed significant positive correlation ($r = .479, p < .01$). Extraversion and conscientiousness are highly correlated factors of personality among marketing executives, since these traits significantly influence the leadership initiation and encourage, motivate and force them to take initiation to face the new marketing challenges and take the risk to achieve the goals of the organization. Conscientiousness and extraversion significantly correlated with leadership initiation, while neuroticism showed significant inverse relationship and openness-to-experience had a weak positive correlation with leadership initiation (Baptiste, 2018).

Table 1: Descriptive statistics mean, Sd. and correlations between age, big five personality factors, and Leadership initiations among marketing executives (N= 233)

Variables studied	Mean	Sd.	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
Age (F1)	26.22	2.39	1						
Neuroticism(F2)	36.29	4.69	.113	1					
Extraversion(F3)	39.17	4.66	.008	-.354**	1				
Openness to experience (F4)	34.58	3.14	-.022	-.250**	-.055	1			
Agreeableness(F5)	36.60	3.80	-.214**	-.124	.183**	-.015	1		
Conscientiousness(F6)	43.00	5.59	.051	-.342**	.545**	.039	.006	1	
Leadership initiation(F7)	22.78	3.71	-.163*	-.323**	.519**	.114	.164*	.479**	1

*5% significance level (2-tailed).

**1% significance level (2-tailed).

Table 2: Model summary on leadership initiations among marketing executives (N= 233)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.519 ^a	.269	.266	3.18127	.269	84.977	.000
2	.569 ^b	.324	.318	3.06661	.055	18.597	.000
3	.597 ^c	.356	.348	2.99820	.033	11.616	.001

a. Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion

b. Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion, Conscientiousness

c. Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Age.

Proposed null hypothesis H_{01} assumes that there will not be significant relationships between age, personality traits, and leadership initiation. But significant relationships observed within studied variables, hence the proposed null hypothesis H_{01} rejected. The personality traits like conscientiousness and extraversion positively influenced leadership initiation whereas neuroticism and age of respondents inversely influenced the leadership initiation.

Table 2 is showing the summary of regression analysis; extraversion appeared the most dominant personality factor of leadership initiation for marketing executives. In the first model, extraversion emerged as a predictor of leadership initiation, the coefficient of correlation observed between extraversion and leadership initiation ($R = .519$) portrayed that initiation taken by marketing executives was attributed to this personality feature. Extraversion appeared as the dominant personality factor (Sieff and Carstens, 2006) influences leadership initiation attributed to the tendency like assertive, dominant, active, outspoken, enthusiastic, and sociable to improves employees' morale and decrease absenteeism. And extravert leaders can take initiative, organize effective meetings, and dealing with challenges. The observed value of the coefficient of determination (R^2

$= .269$) shows the discrepancy in the initiation. Extraversion explained 26.9% variation in dependent variable and F-change ($F = 84.977$, $P < .001$) in leadership initiation of the total sample of marketing executives depends on self-motivation. Individuals tend to be more curious to learn new things, insightful of the thoughts, and accept the changes useful for effective and successful leadership (Northouse, 2013; Naydenova et al., 2012).

In the second step, conscientiousness is observed as the predictor of leadership initiation. The leaders holding high conscientiousness tend to be more hard-working and organized to achieve organizational goals effectively (Northouse, 2013; Naydenova et al., 2012; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000), also conscientiousness is the strong predictor in individual's career identity (Arora & Rangnekar, 2016). The coefficient of correlation between conscientiousness along with extraversion and leadership initiation ($R = .569$) revealed a linear relationship. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .324$) explained 32.4% variation in dependent variable, while conscientiousness alone accounted for 5.5% variation in leadership initiation. Conscientiousness trait is described as the predisposition to act within society in acceptable ways that assist goal-directed

behavior (John & Srivastava, 1999) and characterized by self-discipline, persistence, ambition, thoroughness, etc. Employees high in conscientiousness traits are expected to succeed in a career and better in a leadership position (Lebowitz, 2016a). Individual characteristics like openness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability have a significant response on the leadership domain (Stewart et al., 2008), and the differences in the degrees of personality traits affect the individual leadership development processes (Kail, 2007). F change ($F = 18.59$, $P < .01$) is significant.

In the third model, age becomes a predictor of leadership initiation. The coefficient of correlation between extraversion, conscientiousness, and age with leadership initiation appeared ($R = .597$) for the total sample of marketing executives. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .356$) accounted for 35.6% variation in the dependent variable, while age alone explained 3.3% variation in leadership initiation. F change ($F = 11.616$) observed significant beyond .01 levels. In the proposed null hypothesis H_{0_2} , there will not be predictor(s) of leadership initiation within personality traits and age for a total sample of marketing executives. Since predictors emerged then the proposed null hypothesis rejected.

The coefficient of regression for leadership initiation is showing in Table 3 for the total sample of marketing executives. In the first model, leadership initiation made constant at $B = 6.599$ with standard error 1.768, unstandardized coefficient $B = .413$, standard error .045 set up for extraversion with leadership initiation in the regression equation. Extraversion appeared as a predictor of leadership initiation of marketing executives. Standard errors are describing the deviation in sample scores on marketing executives. The standardized Beta

coefficient for extraversion observed .519, which explains all variables in z-score form. The $t = 9.218$ appeared significant at .01 level and rejected the proposed null hypothesis (H_{0_2}).

To compute regression equation for total sample of marketing executives in the second model, leadership initiation made constant at $B = 3.380$, extraversion = .292 and Conscientiousness = .185 with standard error 1.860, .052 and .043, respectively. Standardized Beta coefficient observed .367 and .279 used to describe the variables in the same unit. The t-value of extraversion ($t = 5.666$, $P < .01$) and Conscientiousness ($t = 4.312$, $P < .01$) were found significant. Furthermore, the coefficient of Beta established .288; .193 and -.281 for extraversion, Conscientiousness, and age, respectively, that explained the variables in the same unit of measurement. Age did not yield positive correlation; hence there was not a linear relationship between the age of executives and leadership initiation. The t-values on extraversion, Conscientiousness, and age were found statistically significant at .01 level.

Extraversion is observed as the dominant predictor of leadership initiation shown in Table 4 for male marketing executives. The coefficient of correlation between criterion and predictor variable $R = .462$ and calculated coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .214$) accounted for 21.4% variation in criterion variable among male marketing executives. Extraversion appeared as the most important personality factor of leadership initiation among male marketing executives attributed to the tendency like assertive, dominant, active, outspoken, enthusiastic, and sociable to improves employees' morale and decreases absenteeism (ref. Table 2). The F change ($F = 36.418$) is significant beyond .01 levels.

Table 3: Coefficient of regression on leadership initiation among marketing executives (N= 233)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(constant)	6.599	1.768		3.733	.000
	Extraversion	.413	.045	.519	9.218	.000
2	(constant)	3.380	1.860		1.817	.071
	Extraversion	.292	.052	.367	5.666	.000
	Conscientiousness	.185	.043	.279	4.312	.000
3	(constant)	10.561	2.783		3.794	.000
	Extraversion	.288	.050	.361	5.712	.000
	Conscientiousness	.193	.042	.291	4.594	.000
	Age	-.281	.082	-.181	-3.408	.001

a. Dependent variable: leadership initiation

Table 4: Model summary on leadership initiations among male marketing executives (N= 136)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.462 ^a	.214	.208	3.16699	.214	36.418	.000
2	.536 ^b	.287	.277	3.02655	.074	13.724	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion

b. Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion, Age

Table 5: Coefficient of regression on leadership initiation among male marketing executives (N= 136)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	8.743	2.284		3.829	.000
	Extraversion	.348	.058	.462	6.035	.000
2	(Constant)	17.495	3.216		5.440	.000
	Extraversion	.349	.055	.464	6.332	.000
	Age	-.340	.092	-.271	-3.705	.000

a. dependent variable: leadership initiation

In the second model, the observed correlation coefficient between extraversion along with age and leadership initiation $R = .536$ is highly significant, and $R^2 = .287$ as coefficient determination explained the 28.7% variance in criterion variable. The age of male executives plays an important role in leadership initiation and it alone accounted for 7.4% variation in criterion variable. It emerged as the predictor of leadership initiation. The F change ($F = 13.724$) is significant beyond .001 levels. The proposed null hypothesis H_{03} not accepted. Extroversion is appeared as the most important personality characteristics of leadership initiative that may have the quality like integrity, empathy, accountability positively influence the attitude and behavior.

Table 5 presents the coefficient of regression for leadership initiation for male respondents. In the first model leadership initiation made constant at $B = 8.743$ with standard error 2.284, unstandardized coefficient $B = .348$, standard error .058 set up for extraversion with leadership initiation in the regression equation. Extraversion appeared as a predictor of leadership initiation of male marketing executives. Standard errors are explaining the variation in sample scores on a male group of marketing executives. The standardized Beta coefficient for leadership initiation observed .462, which clarifying all variables in the form of z-score. The t-value = 6.035 is significant at .01 levels, hence the proposed null hypothesis (H_{03}) was rejected. It implies that the relationship between extraversion and leadership initiation is linear.

In the second model of regression equation, leadership initiation is made constant at $B = 17.495$, extraversion = .349 and age = -.340 with standard error 3.216, .055 and .092, respectively. The observed value of the Standardized Beta coefficient .464 and -.271 used to describe the variables in the same unit of measurement. The t-value of extraversion ($t = 6.332$, $P < .01$) and age ($t = -3.705$, $P < .01$) were found statistically significant, though age did not yield positive correlation; hence, there was not a linear relationship between the age of respondents and leadership initiation. It implies that the age of the leader did not positively influence the attitude and behavior in taking the initiation to face the challenges.

Table 6 shows the results of regression analysis on leadership initiation among female executives. Extraversion emerged as the dominant personality factor, regressed the leadership initiation (ref. Table 2). The correlation coefficient between criterion and predictor variable $R = .612$ and calculated coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .375$) accounted for 37.5% variation in criterion variable among female marketing executives. Extraversion appeared as the most important personality factor of leadership initiation among female marketing executives attributed to the tendency like assertive, dominant, active, outspoken, enthusiastic, and sociable to improves employees' morale and decreases absenteeism. The F change ($F = 56.888$) is significant beyond .001 levels.

Table 6: Model summary on leadership initiations among female marketing executives (N= 97)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.612 ^a	.375	.368	3.08706	.375	56.888	.000
2	.705 ^b	.497	.486	2.78320	.122	22.875	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion

b. Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion, Openness, Conscientiousness.

Table 7: Coefficient of regression on leadership initiation among female marketing executives (N= 97)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.084	2.696		1.144	3.084
	Extraversion	.518	.069	.612	7.542	.518
2	(Constant)	-13.733	4.274		-3.213	-13.733
	Extraversion	.592	.064	.700	9.279	.592
	Openness	.401	.084	.361	4.783	.401

a. Dependent Variable: Leadership Initiation

In the second step, openness appeared as an important personality factor that predicts leadership initiation among female respondents. The observed coefficient of correlation between extroversion along with openness and leadership initiation $R = .705$, and $R^2 = .497$ as the coefficient of determination accounted for 49.7% variation in the criterion variable, while openness alone 12.2% variation in leadership initiation among female respondents. Female respondents possessing openness traits are creative, broadminded (Smith & Canger, 2004), and less involved in interpersonal relationships to satisfy their physical and emotional needs. The result means that they visualize new ideas, are attentive to intellectual curiosity, inner feeling, and listening feedback (Grehan et al., 2011; George et al., 2007; Popper & Mayseless, 2007) influenced leadership initiation. The F change ($F = 22.875$) is significant at .01 levels. The proposed null hypothesis H_0 asserted that there will not be any predictor of leadership initiation within the studied variable among female respondents was rejected.

Table 7 shows the coefficient of regression for the female sample of marketing executives. In the first model leadership initiation made constant at $B = 3.084$ with standard error 2.696, unstandardized coefficient $B = .518$, standard error .069 set up for extraversion with leadership

initiation in the regression equation. Extraversion appeared as a predictor of leadership initiation among female marketing executives. Standard errors are describing the deviation in sample scores on female respondents. The standardized Beta coefficient for leadership initiation observed .612, explains all variables in the form of z-score. The t-value = 7.542 appeared significant at .01 level and rejected the proposed null hypothesis (H_0). In the second model, leadership initiation made constant at $B = -13.733$, extraversion = .592 and openness = .401 with standard error 4.274, .064 and .084 respectively. Standardized Beta coefficient observed .700 and .361 used to describe the variables in the same unit of measurement in the regression equation. The t-value of extraversion ($t = 9.279$, $P < .01$) and openness ($t = 4.783$, $P < .01$) were found significant. Openness to experience emerged as a predictor of leadership initiation among female respondents, yield positive correlation; hence, there was a linear relationship between openness to experience and leadership initiation.

6. Conclusion and Suggestions

The present study conducted on marketing executives in Delhi NCR sought to determine the factors as predictors of leadership initiation. The significance of leadership

initiation remains vibrant in the fast pace of global change and development. The leadership initiative behavior needs organizing and defining the relationship in the group members through engaging their activities to followed by members, scheduling jobs, and clarifying expectations for team members, providing initiative and responsibilities in assigning their tasks to achieve challenging goals of the organization. A personal initiative is a proactive approach characterized by its self-starting nature and persistent in overwhelming difficulties that comes in the course of goals (Frese et al., 1996; Frese et al., 1997) different from passive nature of the behavior that follows the instruction of superior and even not developing the plan and taking the initiative to deal with difficulties in future. Personality is the individual's differences based on personal characteristics as a pattern of thinking, feeling, learning, attitude, behavior, etc. Personality factors have constantly related to numerous work-related features, which can be classified into Big Five facets – extroversion, agreeableness, openness to experience, conscientiousness, and neuroticism.

The overall analysis of results revealed extraversion as the most important personality trait for the marketing executives, showing a significant positive correlation with leadership initiation. Openness to experience showed a weak positive correlation and agreeableness revealed a significant correlation with leadership initiation. Indeed, conscientiousness as one of the personality dimensions appeared as the dominant factor of leadership initiation. Extraversion and conscientiousness are highly correlated factors of personality traits that significantly influence the leadership initiation and encourage, motivate and force them to take initiation to face the new marketing challenges and take the risk to achieve the goals of the organization. Extraversion followed by conscientiousness emerged as the dominant personality traits (Sieff & Carstens, 2006) influences leadership initiation attributed to the tendency like assertive, dominant, active, outspoken, enthusiastic and sociable to improve employees' morale and decreases absenteeism. And the leaders with extravert personality traits can take initiative, organize effective meetings, and dealing with challenges. The leaders holding high conscientiousness tend to be more hard-working and organized to achieve organizational goals effectively. The personality traits like openness to experience, extraversion, and conscientiousness make them proactive and they do not wait for the order to do something, but take initiative with confidence and courage to accomplish the task at the workplace. It is recommended that organizations provide leadership initiation training to the executive to develop proficiency to make appropriate decisions and inspire others, develop skills to foresee future demand, make an effort to overcome the obstacle, develop confidence, and conduct SWOT analysis to take initiative to achieve goals.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York, NY: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.
- Arora, R., & Rangnekar, S. (2016). Linking the Big Five personality factors and career commitment dimensions. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(9), 1134-1148. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-10-2015-0142>
- Baptiste, B. (2018). The Relationship Between the Big Five Personality Traits and Authentic Leadership. *Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies*. 4714. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/4714>
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 901-910. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.901>
- Burger, J. M. (2013). *Desire for control: Personality, social and clinical perspectives*. New York, NY: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Cohen, W. A. (1990). *The art of a leader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1988). Personality in adulthood: A six-year longitudinal study of self-reports and spouse ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 853-863. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.853>
- Crant, J. M., & Bateman, T. S. (2000). Charismatic leadership viewed from above: The impact of proactive personality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 63-75. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(200002\)21:1<63::AID-JOB8>3.0.CO;2-J](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200002)21:1<63::AID-JOB8>3.0.CO;2-J)
- Denisi, A. S., & Griffin, R. W. (2011). *Managing Human Resources*. Boston, MA: Cengage Press.
- Derue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N. & Humphrey, S.E. (2011), Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 7-52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x>
- Eacott, S. (2019). Starting points for a relational approach to organizational theory: An overview. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, 4(1), 16-45. DOI: 10.30828/real/2019.1.2
- Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 44(3), 329-344. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0057198>
- Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). 4. Personal Initiative (PI): An Active Performance Concept for Work in the 21st Century. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 23, 133-187. DOI: 10.1016/S0191-3085(01)23005-6

- Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K., & Tag, A. (1997). The concept of personal initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal of Organizational and Occupational Psychology*, 70, 139-161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00639.x>
- Frese, M., Garst, H., & Fay, D. (2000). Control and Complexity in Work and the Development of Personal Initiative (PI): A Four-Wave Longitudinal Structural Equation Model of Occupational Socialization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. <http://www.evidence-based-entrepreneurship.com/content/publications/085.pdf>
- Frese, M., Kring, W., Soose, A., & Zempel, J. (1996). Personal Initiative at work: Differences between East and West Germany. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(1), 37-63. DOI: 10.2307/256630
- George, B., Sims, P., McLean, A. N., & Mayer, D. (2007). Discovering your authentic leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(2), 129-138. <https://hbr.org/2007/02/discovering-your-authentic-leadership>
- Grehan, P. M., Flanagan, R., & Malgady, R. G. (2011). Successful graduate students: The roles of personality traits and emotional intelligence. *Psychology in the Schools*, 48(4), 317-331. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20556>
- Han, J. H. (2020). The Effects of Personality Traits on Subjective Well-being and Behavioral Intention Associated with Serious Leisure Experiences. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics, and Business*, 7(5), 167-176. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no5.167>
- Harms, P. D., Spain, S. M., & Hannah, S. T. (2011). Leader development and the dark side of personality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(3), 495-509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.04.007>
- Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. In: R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement* (pp. 6-38). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Hogan, R. & Hogan, J. (2001), Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2), 40-51. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00162
- Hogan, R., & Warrenfeltz, R. (2003). Educating the modern manager. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2, 74-84. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2003.9324043>
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49, 493-504. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.49.6.493>
- Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Kaiser, R. (2010). *Management derailment: Personality assessment and mitigation*. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292717475>
- Hurtz, G., & Donovan, J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The big five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869-879. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.6.869>
- Jalal, R., Zeb, N., & Fayyaz, U. E. (2019). The effect of personality traits on employee job satisfaction with moderating role of Islamic work ethics. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 6(2), 161-171. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2019.vol6.no2.161>
- Jaques, E., & Clement, S. D. (1994). *Executive leadership: A practical guide to managing complexity*. London, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 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* (pp. 102–138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Johnson, J. L., & Hill, W. R. (2009). Personality Traits and Military Leadership. *Individual Differences Research*, 7(1), 1-13.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 765-780. <http://doi:10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.765>
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002a). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 765-780. <http://doi:10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.765>
- Judge, T.A. & Zapata, C.P. (2015). The person-situation debate revisited: effect of situation strength and trait activation on the validity of the Big Five personality traits in predicting job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(4), 1149-1179. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0837>
- Kail, E. (2007). Does personality predict perceived performance change following a leader development intervention? Unpublished dissertation. North Carolina State University.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive*, 5, 48–60. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1991.4274679>
- Langford, P. H., Dougall, C. B., & Parkes, L. P. (2017). Measuring leader behaviour: evidence for a “big five” model of leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. 38(1), 126-144. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-05-2015-0103>
- Lebowitz, S. (2016a). The ‘Big 5’ personality traits could predict who will and won’t become a leader. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from: <http://www.businessinsider.com/big-five-personality-traits-predict-leadership-2016-12>
- Lievens, F., Ones, D., & Dilchert, S. (2009). Personality scale validities increase throughout medical school. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1514-1535. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016137>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81>
- Naydenova, I., Lounsbury, J. W., Levy, J. J., & Kim, J. (2012). Distinctive Big Five and Narrow Personality Traits of

- Psychology Majors. *Individual Differences Research*, 10(3), 129-140. <https://bibliotecausatpdqt.files.wordpress.com/2013/02/pdf-distinctive-big.pdf>
- Nguyen, H. M., Mai, L. T., & Huynh, T. L. (2019). The role of transformational leadership toward work performance through intrinsic motivation: A study in the Pharmaceutical field in Vietnam. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 6(4), 201-212. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2019.vol6.no4.201>
- Northouse, P (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ozbag, G. K. (2016). The role of personality in leadership: Five factor personality traits and ethical leadership. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 235-242. <http://doi: 10.4236/jss.2018.67014>
- Popper, M., & Mayseless, O. (2007). The building blocks of leader development: A psychological conceptual framework. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 28, 664–684. <http://doi: 10.1108/01437730710823905>
- Power, R. A., & Pluess, M. (2015). Heritability estimates of the Big Five personality traits based on common genetic variants. *Translational Psychiatry*, 5(7), e604. <http://doi: 10.1038/tp.2015.96>
- Raymark, P., Schmit, M., & Guion, R. M. (1997). Identifying potentially useful personality constructs for employee selection. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 723-736. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00712.x>
- Ruth, J. (2020). Professional development of school leadership as boundary work: patterns of initiatives and interactions based on a Norwegian case, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, DOI: 10.1080/13603124.2020.1716998
- Shahnawaz, M. G. (2018). Psychological Capital and Employees Performance: Exploring positive psychology at work. Project report submitted to Indian Council of Social Science Research. New Delhi.
- Sieff, G. & Carstens, L. (2006). The relationship between personality type and leadership focus. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(1), 52-62.
- Smith, G. M. (1967). Usefulness of peer ratings of personality in educational research. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 27(4), 967-984. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446702700445>
- Smith, M. A., & Canger, J. M. (2004). Effects of supervisor “Big Five” personality on subordinate attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(4), 465-481. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOBU.0000028447.00089.12>
- Sosik, J. J., Kahai, S. S., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). Transformational leadership and dimensions of creativity: Motivating idea generation in computer-mediated groups. *Creativity Research Journal*, 11, 111-121. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1102_3
- Stewart, L., Palmer, S., Wilkin, H., & Kerrin, M. (2008). The influence of character: Does personality impact coaching success? *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 6, 32-42.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1997). Extraversion and its positive emotional core. In: R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 767-793). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Weinberg, R. S., & Gould, D. (1999). *Foundations of sport and exercise psychology* (2nd ed). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.