

Relationship between Authentic Leadership and Big Five Personality Trait of Neuroticism: An Empirical Study

Jasmine J. Baker

School of Business, Wayland Baptist University, Plainview, TX 79072, USA

E-mail for correspondence: jasmine.baker@wayland.wbu.edu



<https://doi.org/10.18034/abr.v13i1.665>

ABSTRACT

The scope of study that has been done on the significant personality impact of neuroticism on authentic leadership has been relatively minimal. Using a correlational method, this study aims to investigate the relationship between one of the Big Five personality traits, specifically neuroticism and authentic leadership components (self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency). The authentic leadership questionnaire (ALQ) is used to measure authentic leadership and the Big Five Inventory (BFI) was used to self-report leader personality. The results of this research showed that there is a negative correlation between neuroticism and all authentic leadership dimensions. This was the key takeaway from the study.

Key words: Personality, Leadership, Neuroticism, Authentic Leadership, ALQ

INTRODUCTION

Authentic leadership has garnered attention, particularly in fast-changing environments like organizations and institutions. Leaders within these atmospheres must have a strong understanding of who and what they are and their authenticity. Authentic leadership is a contemporary leadership theory in management that has seen enormous evolution, especially in the 21st century (Nikolić et al., 2020). Higher education agencies have tried to pinpoint common personality traits and behaviors that relate to the authentic university leader. Leadership is vital to our country, community, and colleges. Governance has an influence on how organizations and educational institutions ethically and effectively achieve their mission and satisfy their goals. This is specifically important today in a multiplex and fast changing higher education environment. Navigating a dynamic fluctuating sector requires a genuine, self-aware, and transparent leader who encourages open communication (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

Student leadership development is the apex of outputs promoted through higher education. Therefore, it is logical to assume that education establishments would desire student leadership as an outcome of the college experience (Astin, 2000; Guthrie & Osteen, 2012; Komives, 2011).

Hence, it is likely that authentic leadership will boost leadership qualities among graduates. The definition of graduates for the purpose of this study is a person who is recognized by a university as having completed the requirements of a degree studied at the institution (*What Does Graduate Mean?*, n.d.). One way to accomplish this is considering an individual's personality traits and how they impact authentic leadership components such as self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency. A better understanding of both personality traits and their effect on authentic leadership components is crucial to the success of leadership.

Previous studies have noted multiple domains in the area of leadership. For example, Martin et al. (2013) researched various leadership models and behaviors. Osteen et al. (2016) explored desirable leadership qualities and capabilities. Still others like Foti et al. (1982) reviewed leaders' characteristics. Cote (2017) examined effective leadership.

Kalshoven et al. (2010) analyzed ethical leadership. Authentic leadership patterns were studied by Walumbwa et al. (2008) and Gardner et al. (2005). Wong et al. (2010) looked at leadership impacts in business while Luthans and Avolio (2003), alongside Gardner et al. (2005), researched authentic leadership psychological states. Authentic leadership's impact on employees' job



outcomes and voice were explored (Leroy et al., 2012; Hsiung, 2012; Milliken et al., 2003). Laschinger et al. (2014) reviewed authentic leadership empowerment, while Hinojosa et al. (2014) investigated followership. Finally, Antonakis et al. (2012) examined personality types associated with leadership style.

While these factors are proposed to provide leadership development and success, what is not well known is the relationship with a Big Five personality factor (neuroticism) and authentic leadership components (self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency). This is an area of exploration identified as a gap in the present literature. Specifically, Walumbwa et al. (2008) discovered that more research was needed in areas like authentic leadership. In this study, the variables were the Big Five personality trait (neuroticism) and authentic leadership components (self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency). The research about five-factor personality traits and authentic leadership is limited, hence, this study proposes to fill this gap.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem addressed in the study relates to a decline in commitment to moral principles, trust, honesty, loyalty, openness, and awareness of self-abilities, weakness, and consequences of actions by leaders within the workforce. Understanding leadership among graduate students is significantly vital to students, leaders, and general society (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). According to Pless and Maak (2011), the future of a society lies in the rising generation. It is, therefore, essential to note that leadership among graduate students shapes the outlook of the future, given that those who are going to drive modern-day society will be graduates (Teague, 2021). According to Hougaard (2018), leadership exploration unraveled the state of leadership in organizations and revealed that only 18% of leaders demonstrate a high level of talent for managing. Challenges to authentic leadership have been attributed to many factors, including personality traits that shape leaders into what they are in conjunction with other elements (Shahzad et al., 2021). Moreover, today's organizational system and leadership style will dictate the nature of tomorrow's leaders, policymakers, administrators, parents, and role models; hence, poor leadership among graduate students breeds a danger to society tomorrow.

Much of the leadership among graduate students can be characterized by dishonesty, cheating, inadequate commitment to moral principles, and corruption (McCabe, 2006). In addition, Murage et al.'s (2019) examination of leadership exposed that 54.3% of the respondents believed that student leaders had mismanaged finances. This type of financial mismanagement postures a more significant challenge to society, translating to poor leadership in the future. It can be concluded that poor leadership among

graduate students today compromise the future, and if this issue is not addressed today, a problem will be created for tomorrow.

Today, quality leadership among graduate students can be understood better by appreciating the personality traits of the leaders. Crawford (2015) highlights that leaders' personalities influence their leadership qualities. One of the practical approaches to understanding contemporary leadership and personality trait management is the Big Five personality traits (Sharma & Saha, 2015). Therefore, it is against this backdrop that an exploration aims to establish the impact of the Big Five personality trait of neuroticism and authentic leadership among graduate students to enhance authentic leadership.

Past studies have centered on personal characteristics such as self-awareness, self-regulation, and integrity (George et al., 2007; Walumbwa et al., 2008). Researchers not only examined personal characteristics, but they also explored construct variables like self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency (Gardner et al., 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008). These variables, according to Walumbwa et al. (2008), are the four elements of authentic leadership. Succeeding studies have recognized that a person's characteristics, like demographics, expertise, and personality traits, predict leadership effectiveness (Eagly et al., 1995; Judge et al., 2002).

The key concepts discussed in this study include authentic leadership, authentic leadership dimensions, the Big Five personality trait of neuroticism, and the connection between personality and leadership. The study highlights the Big Five personality trait of neuroticism; it also focuses on the dimensions of authentic leadership, which include self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and internalized moral perspective. The Big Five personality groundwork is a wide scale of characteristics that explains individual behavior differences.

Personality characteristics are at the core of authentic leaders' behavior. For instance, McLean and Nathan (2007) argued that individuals with high levels of neuroticism are more likely to be depressed and insecure. Because authentic leaders are confident and secure within themselves, one would assume that authentic leaders display low levels of neuroticism. However, others like Kalshoven et al. (2010) have suggested a negative relationship between neuroticism and authentic leadership. According to the philosophies of the Big Five personality traits, conscientious leaders are expected to be great time managers and are more likely to be fair and appreciate following scripted guidelines (Fincham & Rhodes, 2005; Kalshoven et al., 2010; Rustiarini, 2013). Personality traits like extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, conscientious, and low levels of neuroticism are all precursors to authentic leadership (Shahzad et al., 2021).

METHODOLOGY

The methodology section describes the actions prescribed to investigate the research questions as presented in the study.

Population and Sample

The research population included participants in the United States recruited by SurveyMonkey® to participate in the survey to satisfy multiple research inquiries. The target population for this research encompassed participants in the United States to include their education, age, race, employment status, income, and gender. To reach a 90% confidence level with a 10% margin of error, 100 responses were required (Hair et al., 1995). However, to ensure the minimum responses were obtained and to increase the robustness of the analysis, 200 responses were requested. The SurveyMonkey® research team provided survey takers through selected demographic requirements until the required number of desired responses was reached. In total, 234 participants completed the survey.

Research Instrument

The research instrument used in this study comprises three sections. The first section is John and Srivastava's (1999) Big Five Inventory (BFI), designed to measure five dimensions of the variable of personality traits. The second section is Walumbwa et al.'s (2008) Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) used to measure the variable of authentic leadership. Finally, the third section includes all-purpose demographic information: education, age, race, employment status, income, and gender.

Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ)

The Authentic Leadership Questionnaire was used to assess authentic leadership. The ALQ is a self-reporting instrument that assessed the perception of authentic leadership (Walumbwa et al., 2008). The ALQ measures self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency. The ALQ is a 16-item measurement on a five-point Likert scale of 0 through 4; 0 represented not at all, and 4 represented "frequently, if not always, separated in four dimensions distributed as follows: self-awareness (four items), internalized moral perspective (four items), balanced processing (three items), and relational transparency (five items). Sample statements for each dimension are self-awareness (say exactly what I mean), internalized moral perspective (admit mistakes when they are made), balanced processing (encourage everyone to speak their mind), and relational transparency (tell you the hard truth). As noted previously, data collected from measurement instruments must be deemed reliable as indicated by a Cronbach's alpha score of at least $\alpha = .60$. The Cronbach's alpha (coefficient of reliability) for the ALQ ranges from .72 to .92, indicating acceptable internal reliability. Scores were calculated as averages of the item values specified by the publisher. Permission to use the

ALQ for research was obtained from Mind Garden (Copyright© 2007 Authentic Leadership Questionnaire by Avolio et al. 2007).

Big Five Inventory (BFI)

The Big Five Inventory (BFI) was utilized to measure the variable of personality (John & Srivastava, 1999). The BFI framework has gained substantial support and is the most frequently used model of personality. The BFI is a self-report inventory devised to measure the Big Five dimensions of personality using 44 characteristics communicated as statements about oneself and evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly). Sample statements for neuroticism (is depressed and blue). Data collected from measurement instruments should be deemed as reliable; Hair et al. (2009) state alpha reliabilities of .70 are generally acceptable, with .60 being at the lower end of acceptability. Cronbach's alpha (coefficient of reliability) for the questionnaire is more than 0.70, hence demonstrating the reliability of the scale: neuroticism (0.70) personality (John & Srivastava, 1999). The instrument is not copyrighted and is available in open source.

Quantitative Data Analysis

Upon completion of the data collection process, the information was separated from SurveyMonkey® and exported into an Excel spreadsheet. No individually identifiable information was supplied. Instead, respondents' responses were numerically provided. The survey information was entered into SPSS Statistics software. The data taken from the ALQ were used to run a correlation analysis. The technique was used to assess the associations between the Big Five personality trait (neuroticism) and authentic leadership components (self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency). The Pearson's correlation coefficient was used for parametric data, and the Spearman's Rank Order correlation was used for nonparametric data. Both provide a value to gauge the direction and strength of the relationship between the two variables. The correlation coefficient can range from +1 to -1, demonstrating a positive (+1) or negative (-1) relationship. A zero (0) correlation coefficient reflects no connection. The five assumptions of Pearson's correlation include having two continuous variables, linearity, no significant outliers, and a normal distribution of participants. Spearman's Rank Order correlation assumptions include (a) two variables measured as ordinal, interval, or ratio; (b) paired observations, (c) monotonic relationship.

AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP AND NEUROTICISM

Authentic leadership is a process that conglomerates positive leader capabilities and a highly developed organizational background (Luthans & Avolio, 2003).

Neuroticism is characterized by anxiety, worry, anger, trouble, impulsiveness, pretending, insecurity, and stress (Widiger & Oltmanns, 2017). Brown et al. (2005) suggest that more neurotic individuals are less likely to be perceived as ethical leaders because they tend to be hostile and not warm to others. McLean and Nathan (2007) write that neuroticism refers to a broad personality trait dimension representing how a person experiences the world as distressing, threatening, and unsafe. They add that neurotic individuals are likely to be distressed and dissatisfied with their jobs, themselves, and their lives; hence, they are prone to negative emotions. Neuroticism as a personality is a concept that accounts for a good portion of discourse in psychometrics; it is a trait that is associated with many other traits, concepts, and characteristics in psychology.

Relationship Between Neuroticism to Self-Awareness

Kalshoven et al. (2010) suggested a negative relationship between neuroticism and authentic leadership. In addition, research indicates that neuroticism is associated with low self-esteem and self-efficacy (Judge et al., 2002). Still, others like McLean & Nathan (2007) argue that neurotic individuals may have a rich inner world and are interested in seeking the true nature of their intrapsychic experiences. Neurotic individuals tend to possess high anticipatory apprehension, which may orient them to pay closer attention to contingencies previously associated with punishments (McLean & Nathan, 2007). Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis a There is a positive relationship between neuroticism and self-awareness. Null hypothesis: There is no relationship between neuroticism and self-awareness.

Relationship Between Neuroticism to Internalized Moral Perspective

Yildirim (2022) argues there is a strong association between neuroticism and internalizing psychopathology, such as depression and anxiety. This viewpoint stresses the drive of leaders by internal ethical standards which are utilized to self-regulate their actions. The literature highlights that individuals with neuroticism have the propensity to be emotionally unstable and exhibit negative feelings due to a low tolerance for unanticipated situations. Regarding anxiety, this could point to the possibility of dysfunctional emotion processing (Wortman et al., 2012). Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis b There is a positive relationship between neuroticism and internalized moral perspective. Null hypothesis: There is no relationship between neuroticism and internalized moral perspective.

Relationship Between Neuroticism to Balanced Processing

Brown and Trevino (2006) argue that neurotic persons are less likely to be perceived as ethical leaders because they are likely to be sensitive and unsympathetic toward others. Judge et al. (2002) argue that neuroticism is weakly linked to leadership. Two works of literature have indicated a correlation between neuroticism and the quality of leadership. Judge et al. (2002) found that a high score on the neuroticism trait affects leadership emergence negatively and makes it difficult for a leader to be an effective role model. McLean and Nathan (2007) also write that highly neurotic individuals tend to be poor problem solvers as they tend to withdraw and possess an impoverished repertoire of behavioral alternatives to address the demands of reality. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis c There is a positive relationship between neuroticism and balanced processing. Null hypothesis: There is no relationship between neuroticism and balanced processing.

Relationship between Neuroticism to Relational Transparency

Research concludes that individuals high in neuroticism are more susceptible to negative emotions because neurotic individuals are more likely to suffer with low self-esteem and self-efficacy (Judge et al., 2002). Neuroticism relates to mental disorders like depression, anxiety, and phobia all of which are common with internalizing types of psychopathologies (McLean & Nathan, 2007). Individuals exhibiting higher levels of neuroticism may be afraid of the perceptions of those around them, resulting in a lack of relational transparency. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis d There is a positive relationship between neuroticism and relational transparency. Null hypothesis: There is no relationship between neuroticism and relational transparency.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Upon completion of the data collection process, the information was separated from SurveyMonkey® and exported into an Excel spreadsheet. No individually identifiable information was supplied. Instead, participant's responses were numerically provided. The survey information was entered into SPSS Statistics software version 28. The data taken from the ALQ were used to run a correlation analysis. The technique was used to assess the associations between the Big Five personality trait (neuroticism) and authentic leadership components (self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency). The correlation coefficient value is a gauge of the direction and strength of the relationship between the two variables. The

correlation coefficient can range from +1 to -1, demonstrating a positive (+1) or negative (-1) relationship. A zero (0) correlation coefficient reflects no connection.

The study is designed to answer a research question. What is the correlation between the Big Five personality trait of neuroticism and the authentic leadership constructs of self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency? This study offers a more in-depth evaluation and perhaps a new direction for understanding the correlation between authentic leadership and this Big Five personality trait (neuroticism). Based on the tremendous amount of literature on the Big Five personality traits, this paper proposes the following research hypotheses:

Research Question

What is the correlation between the Big Five personality trait of neuroticism and the authentic leadership constructs of self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency?

- Hypothesis a: There is a positive relationship between neuroticism and self-awareness. Null hypothesis: There is no relationship between neuroticism and self-awareness.
- Hypothesis b: There is a positive relationship between neuroticism and internalized moral perspective. Null hypothesis: There is no relationship between neuroticism and internalized moral perspective.
- Hypothesis c: There is a positive relationship between neuroticism and balanced processing. Null hypothesis: There is no relationship between neuroticism and balanced processing.
- Hypothesis d: There is a positive relationship between neuroticism and relational transparency. Null hypothesis: There is no relationship between neuroticism and relational transparency.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

An online survey was the primary data collection method used for this research and was disseminated by SurveyMonkey® through its survey audience. The survey was distributed by SurveyMonkey® and closed within three days of the survey distribution. Within this time frame, 234 respondents consented to the survey. The results show that 120 (51.3%) of the surveyed participants were female, 113 percent (48.3%) of the participants were male, and 1 percent (0.4%) chose other as their gender profile.

To test the proposed relationships between the variables a quantitative survey was utilized. This study set out to investigate the relationships between the Big Five personality trait of neuroticism and authentic leadership by

employing a correlation method. The research hypotheses characterize that one variable influences the other in a particular way. The correlation is impacted by the amount and sign of the correlation coefficient. The range spans -1 to +1 with -1 indicating a perfect negative linear relationship and +1 indicating a perfect positive linear relationship.

Pearson’s correlation technique was chosen to analyze the data. Before the technique could be used, five assumptions had to be satisfied. The first assumption relates to the variables being measured on a continuous scale. The second assumption is that the continuous variables are paired. The third assumption relates to the linear relationship. The fourth assumption is the absence of outliers and the fifth assumption is that the data are normally distributed. Pearson correlation coefficient is stereotypically utilized for normally distributed data, also referred to as homoscedastic data. Upon analyzing the assumptions, it was determined that the assumption of normally distributed data was violated.

Big Five personality trait of Neuroticism and authentic leadership components (self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency).

Table 1: Spearman's Correlation Analysis between Neuroticism and Self-Awareness

			Neuroticism	Self-Awareness
Spearman's rho	TOTAL Downward Comm.	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.282**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	<.001
		N	234	234
	TOTAL Effective Comm.	Correlation Coefficient	-.282**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.
		N	234	234

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

Hypothesis a states there is a positive relationship between neuroticism and self-awareness. The null hypothesis is there is no relationship between neuroticism and self-awareness. The results reflected in Table 4.19 show a small negative correlation between neuroticism and self-awareness, $rs(232) = -.282, p < .001$. Thus, the relationship between neuroticism and self-awareness is significant, but not in the hypothesized direction. Therefore, hypothesis 5a is not significant; however, the null is rejected as there is a significant relationship between the two variables.

Hypothesis b states there is a positive relationship between neuroticism and internalized moral perspective. The null hypothesis is there is no relationship between neuroticism and internalized moral perspective. The results reflected in Table 2 show a small negative correlation between neuroticism and internalized moral perspective, $rs(232) = -.352, p < .001$. Thus, the relationship between neuroticism and self-awareness is significant, but not in the hypothesized direction. Therefore, hypothesis 5b is not



significant; however, the null is rejected as there is a significant relationship between the two variables.

Table 2: Spearman's Correlation Analysis between Neuroticism and Internalized Moral Perspective

			Neuroticism	Internalized Moral Perspective
Spearman's rho	TOTAL Downward Comm.	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.352**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	<.001
		N	234	234
	TOTAL Effective Comm.	Correlation Coefficient	-.352**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.
		N	234	234

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

Table 3: Spearman's Correlation Analysis between Neuroticism and Balanced Processing

			Neuroticism	Balanced Processing
Spearman's rho	TOTAL Downward Comm.	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.282**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	<.001
		N	234	234
	TOTAL Effective Comm.	Correlation Coefficient	-.282**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.
		N	234	234

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

Hypothesis c states there is a positive relationship between neuroticism and balanced processing. The null hypothesis is there is no relationship between neuroticism and internalized balanced processing. The results reflected in Table 3 show a small negative correlation between neuroticism and balanced processing, $r_s(232) = -.282, p < .001$. Thus, the relationship between neuroticism and self-awareness is significant, but not in the hypothesized direction. Therefore, hypothesis 5c is not significant; however, the null is rejected as there is a significant relationship between the two variables.

Table 4: Spearman's Correlation Analysis between Neuroticism and Relational Transparency

			Neuroticism	Relational Transparency
Spearman's rho	TOTAL Downward Comm.	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.291**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	<.001
		N	234	234
	TOTAL Effective Comm.	Correlation Coefficient	-.291**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.
		N	234	234

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

Hypothesis d states there is a positive relationship between neuroticism and relational transparency. The null hypothesis is there is no relationship between neuroticism

and relational transparency. The results reflected in Table 4 show a small negative correlation between neuroticism and relational transparency, $r_s(232) = -.291, p < .001$. Thus, the relationship between neuroticism and self-awareness is significant, but not in the hypothesized direction. Therefore, hypothesis 5d is not significant; however, the null is rejected as there is a significant relationship between the two variables.

DISCUSSION ON FINDINGS

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between the Big Five personality trait of neuroticism and authentic leadership. The results of this study showed negative correlation between neuroticism and all authentic leadership constructs. These results are consistent with previous studies of authentic leadership. For example, prior studies have supported the idea that personality traits like extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, conscientious, and low levels of neuroticism are all precursors to authentic leadership (Walumbwa et al. 2008; Gardner et al. 2005; Nikolić et al., 2020; Luthans & Avolio, 2003).

Authentic leadership is considered one of many leadership theories supported by virtue ethics. Moreover, neuroticism did not predict any of the criteria used in this study. Furthermore, future research may examine other Big Five personality traits' role in authentic leadership.

Finally, it is presumed that graduates who have extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness were expected to possess authentic leadership behaviors. This exploration will contribute an incentive to the organization to select and develop authentic leaders for better individual and hence, organizational outcomes.

These findings have certain useful managerial implications for college institutions, human resource professionals, and policymakers regarding the recruitment and advancement of leaders. Organizations must pay special attention to openness and morality among personnel in leadership roles. Choosing and supporting authentic managers and leaders is essential because of the impact they can have on both employees and the performance of the company. As a result, personality tests can be extremely helpful in identifying and elevating potential leaders. However, it is necessary to ensure that the information is being utilized to assist people in achieving their full potential and prepare for upcoming careers, rather than to achieve direct acceptance or disapproval because of specific features. If businesses are aware that some employees may be less prone to authentic leadership, they can also provide these individuals with the appropriate training to undertake leadership roles. Managers, in a similar manner, should evaluate and consider the personality attributes of their employees when selecting and grooming potential successors. It is important for managers to learn from people's perspectives on the honesty of their leadership style.

This research implies that companies and universities seeking authentic managers and leaders should prioritize applicants who score low on neuroticism. This research lends support to the big inventory's application in recruitment and advancement procedures, but moral and legal considerations demand prudence when employing such tools. Personality tests should never be employed in isolation because they can lead to discriminatory or illegal outcomes. When used in connection with other performance metrics and evaluation methods, personality assessments can offer a more detailed and precise picture of an individual's strengths and areas that need improvement.

Lastly, there is a negative correlation between neuroticism and authentic leadership. Comparable findings were made by Lim and Ployhart (2004), who found that soldiers under the direction of commanders with high traits of negative impacts were less likely to be inspired by their leaders. According to Brown and Trevino (2006), neurotic people are less likely to be seen as authentic leaders as they are more inclined to be easily offended and antagonistic toward others. The research also shows that neuroticism has a minimal correlation with leadership; this finding agrees with Judge et al. (2002). A leader with a high neuroticism score should also have a low authentic leadership score.

CONCLUSION

This research depended on a sample of 234 respondents to draw its conclusions. There was an oversight when designing the survey; the survey should have been created with graduate students as a participant selection criterion. Instead, the participants were not necessarily students, but graduates. Also, the number of questions may have influenced a longer time frame of survey completion, possibly affecting the number of surveys completed. Respondents ranked their responses on how they regarded their personalities and how genuine they were as leaders. Assessing one's own strengths and weaknesses could introduce some bias in the process of projected personality evaluation. The use of computerized questionnaires as the primary method for collecting information is another limitation of this study; utilizing both paper and computerized survey methods could have gained a wider audience. Finally, there was a missed opportunity of using MANOVA to compare differences between groups of graduates. Most studies discuss how the study's external validity could be improved if recreated with different groups of people. By taking this simple approach, the generalizability of results will better reflect the desired population. The current study encompasses graduates, particularly those who have obtained any institution or college degree. This study could also be done with specific industries, age groups, job titles, etc., and different leadership styles. Additionally, further research should prolong the recruiting period to attract a broader population sample.

REFERENCES

- Antonakis, J., Day, D. V., & Schyns, B. (2012). Leadership and individual differences: At the cusp of a renaissance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(4), 643–650. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.05.002>
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher Education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25, 297–308.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595–616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002>
- Cote, R. (2017). Vision of Effective Leadership. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 8, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v8n6p1>
- Crawford, J. A. (2015). *Authentic leadership in student leaders: An empirical study in an Australian university* [Unpublished bachelor's dissertation]. University of Tasmania. <https://www.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4267.6084>
- Fincham, R., & Rhodes, P. (2005). *Principles of organizational behaviour* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Foti, R. J., Fraser, S. L., & Lord, R. G. (1982). Effects of leadership labels and prototypes on perceptions of political leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3), 326–333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.67.3.326>
- Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 343–372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.003>
- George, O., Arain, F. M., & Toor, S.-R. (2007). Authentic leadership style and its implications in project management. *Business Review*, 2(1), 31–55. <https://doi.org/10.54784/1990-6587.1112>
- Guthrie, K. L., & Osteen, L. (2012). Editors' notes. In K. L. Guthrie & L. Osteen (Eds.), *New Directions in Student Services: No. 140. Developing students' leadership capacity* (pp. 1–3). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis: With readings*. Prentice-Hall.
- Hinojosa, A. S., McCauley, K. D., Randolph-Seng, B., Gardner, W. L. (2014). Leader and follower attachment styles: Implications for authentic leader–follower relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(3), 595–610. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.12.002>
- Hougaard, R. (2018). *How to be a more human manager: Leadership today is about unlearning management and relearning being human*. IESE Insight. <https://doi.org/10.15581/002.opi-4328>
- Hsiung H.-H. (2012). Authentic leadership and employee voice behavior: a multilevel psychological process. *Journal of*

- Business Ethics*, 107, 349–361. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1043-2>
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big-five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed.). Guilford.
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 530–541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.530>
- Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. B. (2010). Ethical leader behavior and big five factors of personality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(2), 349–366. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0685-9>
- Komives, S. R. (2011). Advancing leadership education, In S. R. Komives, J. P. Dugan, & J. E. Owen (Eds.), *The handbook for student leadership development* (pp. 1-19). Jossey-Bass.
- Laschinger, H. K., Wong, C. A., Cummings, G. G., & Grau, A. L. (2014). Resonant Leadership and Workplace Empowerment: The Value of Positive Organizational Cultures In Reducing Workplace Incivility. *Nursing economic*, 32(1), 5-15. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24689153/>
- Leroy H., Palanski M. E., Simons T. (2012). Authentic leadership and behavioral integrity as drivers of follower commitment and performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107, 255–264. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1036-1>
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership development. In J. E. Cameron & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 241–261). Barrett-Koehler.
- Martin, S., Liao, H., & Campbell, E. M. (2013). Comparing empowering leadership and directive leadership on task proficiency and proactivity: A field experiment in the UAE. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(5), 1372–1395.
- McCabe, M. (2006). Accelerating teamwork: A personal reflection. *Musculoskeletal Care*, 4(2), 116–121. <https://doi.org/10.1002/msc.83>
- McLean, D., & Nathan, J. (2007). Treatment of personality disorder: limit setting and the use of benign authority. *British Journal of Psychotherapy*, 23(2), 231–246.
- Milliken F. J., Morrison E. W., Hewlin P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1453–1476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00387>
- Nikolić, G., Grudić Kvasić, S., & Grbic, L. (2020). The development of authentic leadership theory. In G. Nikolić & M. Jurković (Eds.), *Conference proceedings of the 9th PAR international scientific-professional leadership conference: High impact leadership* (pp. 176–189). Visoka Poslovna Škola PAR. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343915712>
- Osteen, Laura & Guthrie, Kathy & Bertrand Jones, Tamara. (2016). Leading to Transgress: Critical Considerations for Transforming Leadership Learning. *New Directions for Student Leadership*. 2016. 95-106. 10.1002/yd.20212.
- Pless, N. M., & Maak, T. (2011). Responsible leadership: Pathways to the future. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98, 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1114-4>
- Rustiarini, N. W. (2013). The Influence of Task Complexity, Time Pressure, and Traits-Personality on Performance. *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, 17(2), 126. <https://doi.org/10.7454/mssh.v17i2.2961>
- Shahzad, K., Raja, U., & Hashmi, S. D. (2021). Impact of Big Five personality traits on authentic leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 42(2), 208–218. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lodj-05-2019-0202>
- Sharma, R. R. K., & Saha, S. (2015). Relating Big-Five factor theory of personality to innovative leadership. *California Business Review*, 3(2), 37–40. <https://doi.org/10.18374/cbr-3-2-5>
- Teague, L. (2022). Growing Number of Leadership Programs and Courses Supports Professional Identity Formation. *Santa Clara Law Review*, 62, 149. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3956067>
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., & Zhu, W. (2008). How transformational leadership weaves its influence on individual job performance: The role of identification and efficacy beliefs. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(4), 793–825. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00131.x>
- Widiger, T. A., & Oltmanns, J. R. (2017). Neuroticism is a fundamental domain of personality with enormous public health implications. *World Psychiatry*, 16(2), 144–145. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20411>
- Wong, C. A., Spence Laschinger, H. K., & Cummings, G. G. (2010). Authentic leadership and nurses' voice behaviour and perceptions of care quality. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 18(8), 889–900. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2010.01113.x>
- Wortman, J., Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2012). Stability and change in the Big Five personality domains: Evidence from a longitudinal study of Australians. *Psychology and Aging*, 27(4), 867–874. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029322>
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson.

--0--

How to cite this article

Baker, J. J. (2023). Relationship between Authentic Leadership and Big Five Personality Trait of Neuroticism: An Empirical Study. *Asian Business Review*, 13(1), 13-20. <https://doi.org/10.18034/abr.v13i1.665>