

THE EFFECT OF PERSONALITY TRAITS ON LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS: A RESEARCH ON THE STUDENTS OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT

Agah Sinan Ünsar *, Serol Karalar **

ABSTRACT

In leadership definitions, it is generally approved that superior personality traits are one of the factors which form successful leadership. Furthermore, individuals follow leaders consistently and choose leaders as their role models. In this context; the purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of personality traits on leadership behaviors. Thus; a questionnaire has been implemented on the students of Trakya University Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences (FEAS) and Vocational School of Social Sciences, Departments of Business Administration (Edirne-Turkey). Subsequently the findings have been commented by means of analyses and tables. Gender, grow-up places, educational level of students' parents and types of high schools which students graduated from were found to affect the adopted leadership styles. Besides that, there are differences between the FEAS and the Vocational School students on extravert, responsible, open to experience personality traits and laissez-faire leadership style.

Keywords: Leadership, Behavior, Personality traits, Business administration

JEL: M10

1. INTRODUCTION

In the global world, enterprises face intensive competition on the international and national markets. That factor forces the enterprises to improve their performances and be more

efficient in their sectors. Proper and efficient management mentality and competent leaders help enterprises to reach their goals. Enterprises should piece employees and managers together under the same organizational culture in order to work within the frame of aims and objectives. For gathering a large number of employees and managers with various personality traits under the same umbrella, enterprises need to turn differences into advantages. This can be provided by analyzing personality traits.

Leaders also have importance on combining different personality traits under the organizational culture. It is believed that investigating the relationship between personality traits and leadership behaviors of the Business Administration department students who will go into their careers and possibly advance to managerial positions after graduation, plays a key role for the leadership literature.

2. THE NOTIONS OF PERSONALITY AND PERSONALITY TRAITS

2.1. Personality

In this part it is agreeable to indicate the definitions of personality and various personality traits which can be seen among individuals. People have different personality traits because of their DNAs. Personality traits have big effects on the individuals' views of life, levels of success and their social lives. The origin of the word personality lies in the Latin word, *persona*, which means a mask (Bhatti

* Trakya University, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Turkey

** Trakya University, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Turkey, serol_karalar@yahoo.com

2009). Oxford Dictionary puts the origins of the word personality in the late Middle English period. The word is derived from Old French *personalite*, from Medieval Latin *personalitas*, from Latin *personalis* 'of a person' (oxforddictionaries.com 2013).

Personality is the set of unseen characteristics and processes that underlie a relatively stable pattern of behavior in response to ideas, objects or people in the environment (Daft 2007). According to Gordon Allport, one of the most known psychologists, personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment (Roodt 2009). McAdams and Pals (2006) define personality as "an individual's unique variation on the general evolutionary design for human nature, expressed as a developing pattern of dispositional traits, characteristic adaptations, and integrative life stories, complexly and differently situated in culture" (DeYoung 2011).

As can be seen definitions given above reveal personality as a process or a system and share some common features. On the other hand, personality is unique for every individual. Thus; it is possible to say that it takes time for personality to be developed and sharpened. Culture might be an other factor to be researched in the future papers on personality. There are several factors which reveal personality. To form one's personality there is need, first of all, to know oneself thoroughly; to compute accurately the balances of moral, intellectual and physical qualities and defects (Laurent 2008). The lack of these factors causes bad or inadequate personality.

2.2. Personality Traits

The idea of examining personality traits goes back to the start of human history. Aristotle and his student Theophrastus wrote a book describing thirty characters or personality

types (Matthews, Deary and Whiteman 2003). Allport, one of the original trait theorists, counted more than 4000 adjectives in the English language that can be used for describing one's personality (Burger 2010). Numbers and qualities may differ from language to language.

According to Hogan (2007), 50% of personality is genetic and laid down at birth. That means that the other half of personality is formed by individual experiences during lifetime. Thus Figueredo et al. (2005) stated that traits of personality are classified by the problems which people face and try to solve....and traits evolve in the organism over time (Carducci 2009). As said before, some of the personality traits might change even at the later periods of individuals' lives. Allport has introduced various kinds of traits. According to him, there are four kinds of traits. These are: cardinal, central, secondary and common traits (Ryckman 2007).

Cardinal trait is the need of being powerful and competitive against others. These traits are the master motives for passions such as winning. But only few people have cardinal traits (Ashcraft 2011). Central traits are the characteristics which other people think about us. They can also be accepted as the way and adjectives other people use while describing us. Central traits are coherent with the cardinal traits. Secondary traits mean the preferences, tastes of individuals and they may vary from person to person. Finally, common traits are generalized characteristics and help people to categorize other people: polite, nice, nervous etc. Allport argued that each person's pattern of the traits mentioned above is unique and that one can understand a person only by examining this unique pattern (James and Mazerolle 2002). It is known that investigating about individuals' personalities, requires diverse methods and techniques.

3. THE NOTION OF LEADERSHIP AND ITS CONTEXT

Leadership, which can be discussed within the leading function of management, is a notion which is needed by today's enterprises and managers in order to fulfill specific aims. Throughout history, leadership has been examined in military and political fields as well as the social sciences. However, in this paper, leadership will be discussed from the point of the management science.

3.1. The Notions of Leadership and Leader

Leadership is a notion which has been investigated from the early periods of human history. But it was not until the beginning of the twentieth century, when scholars began applying the scientific method to social processes, that the study of leadership became widespread both in academic and in the business world (Mendenhall 2008). Thus, the notion of leadership started to be discussed from the scientific point. Even though thousands of studies have been implemented on the notion of leadership, it is still difficult to give an exact definition of leadership. According to the consensus that 54 leadership experts from 38 countries made leadership is about effecting, motivating and enabling the individuals to contribute to their organizations' success and efficiency (McShane and Von Glinow 2008). In addition to effect, Luthans (2002) defines leadership as the combination of group processes, personality, harmony, special behaviors, persuasive skills, power, effectuation of purposes, interaction, role differentiation and acceptance of the organization. According to another definition leadership is the ability of creating support, cooperation and confidence among individuals who have to accomplish organizational purposes and the art of effecting individuals by persuasion and exemplariness in order to achieve series of activities (DuBrin 2009).

On the other hand, leadership is a "human" activity which is constituted between people, far from paperwork about management and problem solving activities (Daft and Marcic 2009). These definitions vary as to form but also share the same thought on many issues that form the leadership. But the notion of effect can usually be seen in leadership definitions as a distinctive feature. Some management scientists define leadership as a process. In this process, importance of followers, as a key factor for leadership, has to be considered. Some other management scientists regard leadership as an art because of creating the whole from different pieces. After leadership definitions, leaders can be defined as individuals who have the commitment of other individuals who are willing to follow them (Costley and Todd 1991). According to another definition, a leader is described as a visioning and attempting individual (Huczynski and Buchanan 2007). Leadership process requires a vision and followers.

3.2. Leadership and Personality

Leadership as personality and biography is surely the earliest approach to understanding leadership (Sashkin and Sashkin 2003). Psychologists have grouped various traits of a leader into four categories: physical, psychological, intellectual and qualities of character (Kumar and Mittal 2001). The Trait Approach which was formed by the first studies on the notion of leadership, emerged from the opinion saying that successful and efficient leaders should have different traits than other people. By the help of their traits, efficient leaders vary with their followers. This approach is often termed as the "Great Person" theory of leadership since it was assumed that from the consistent view of personality and physical traits, leaders were quite different than the individuals with average skills (Bowditch and Buono 2005).

The traits most commonly associated with effective leadership include the general personality traits of extraversion, conscientiousness and openness to experience (Dyck and Neubert 2008). According to Ralph M. Stogdil; there are 16 personality traits (such as adaptability, aggressiveness, enthusiasm and self-confidence), which are related to leadership ability (Wehrich, Cannice and Koontz 2010). Inborn and subsequently gained personality traits of the leaders have a part in their success and efficiency. Understanding how personality traits and dimensions affect behavior can be a valuable asset for leaders (Daft 2007). This expression forms the purpose of our research.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Materials and methods implemented within the research have been explained under this title.

4.1. Purpose, Importance and Methodology of the Research

The purpose of this research is to determine the effect of personality traits on leadership behaviors of the students who study in Business Administration departments of the Trakya University Vocational School of Social Sciences and the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences. Other purpose of the research is to display whether personality traits and leadership behaviors of the students vary or not with the type of institution they study, total family income, grow-up places, educational level of their parents and type of high school they graduated from.

In this research, the relationship between leadership styles and sub-dimensions of personality has been examined. The research has been implemented on the students of Business Administration Departments of Trakya University Vocational School of Social Sciences and Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences. Questionnaires and first-hand data based

instant method have been used in the research.

As well as socio-demographic questions, a shorter version of the five factor inventory scale with 20 questions which was developed by McCrae and Costa has been implemented on the respondents. This scale measures personality traits under extraversion, responsibility, compatibility, emotional stability and openness to experience factors. Five point Likert scale from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" has been used for the personality questionnaire (Çeribaş 2007). In order to determine the leadership behaviors of students, a leader behavior description questionnaire, based on the Ohio State Questionnaire, has been used. This questionnaire consists of 30 questions with "Strongly Agree - Strongly Disagree" choices. The factor analysis has also been made on the leadership questionnaire and 3 sub-dimensions have been determined as a result: democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles.

Due to some answers not being offered, 197 questionnaires have been taken into the analysis process. The SPSS Programme has been used in order to evaluate the questionnaires. Parametric and non-parametric statistical analysis techniques have been used on the gained data. In this study, statistical significant limit has been approved as $p < 0.05$.

4.2. Socio-Demographic Variables

Table 4.1 shows the socio-demographic variables. According to the table 55.8% of the respondents are female students, 52.3% of them study at the vocational school, 36.5% of them has 999 Turkish Lira or below family income, 31.5% of them grew up in counties, 60.4% of their fathers graduated from primary or secondary schools, 68.5% of their mothers graduated from primary or secondary schools and 44.7% of the

respondents graduated from vocational high schools.

Table 4.1 Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Students

		n: 197	
		N	%
Gender	Female	110	55.8
	Male	87	44.2
School	Vocational School	103	52.3
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	94	47.7
Family Income	999 Turkish Lira or Below	72	36.5
	1000-1999 TL	66	33.5
	2000 TL or above	59	29.9
Grow-up Places	Village	21	10.7
	Township	14	7.1
	Town	42	21.3
	County	62	31.5
	Metropolis	58	29.4
Graduation from High School	Anadolu High School	20	10.2
	Super High School	44	22.3
	Regular High School	44	22.3
	Vocational High School	88	44.7
	Teacher High School	12	6.1

4.3. Hypotheses of the Research

Various hypotheses have been developed depending on the purpose of this research and these hypotheses have been tested below.

4.4. Testing the Hypotheses and Analyzing the Findings

4.4.1. Analyzing the Mean Points of Scale Sub-Dimensions by Students' Gender

A *t*-test has been done on the data in order to test our first hypothesis: "There is/is not a significant difference between students' gender and personality-leadership behaviors". The results of the test have been shown in Table 4.2. As a result of the test, it has been revealed that there is a significant difference because the *p* values of autocratic and laissez-faire leadership sub-dimensions are less than 0.05 within the extraversion scale. Thus H_0 hypothesis has been refused and H_1

hypothesis "There is a significant difference between students' gender and personality-leadership behaviors" has been approved.

When Table 4.2 is analyzed, it is possible to say that female students have more extravert personality than male students. In addition to that, it can be said that male students display autocratic leadership behavior while female students have laissez-faire leadership behavior. Masculine characteristics of male students might be a reason in adopting autocratic leadership.

Table 4.2 *t*-test Results of the Scale Sub-Dimensions by Students' Gender

Sub-dimensions	Females Mean \pm Standart Deviation	Males Mean \pm Standard Deviation	T	p
Extraversion	2.62 \pm 0.54	2.39 \pm 0.66	2.736	0.0
Autocratic Leadership Style	1.60 \pm 0.52	1.84 \pm 0.68	-2.753	0.0
Laissez-Faire Leadership Style	3.18 \pm 0.78	2.87 \pm 0.83	2.690	0.0

4.4.2. Analyzing the Mean Points of Scale Sub-Dimensions by Students' Schools

A *t*-test has been implemented on the data in order to test our second hypothesis: "There is/is not a significant difference between students' schools and personality-leadership behaviors". The results of the test have been shown in Table 4.3. As a result of the test, it has been revealed that there is a significant difference because the *p* values of laissez-faire leadership sub-dimension are less than 0.05 within the extraversion, responsibility and openness to experience scales.

Thus H_0 hypothesis has been refused and H_1 hypothesis "There is a significant difference between students' schools and personality-leadership behaviors" has been approved. When we analyze the data in Table 4.3, students of the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences (FEAS) are more extravert, responsible and open to experience

than students of the Vocational School. Also, it has been determined that students of the FEAS display more laissez-faire leadership behaviors than students of the Vocational School. The educational level of the FEAS might affect the personality traits and leadership styles.

Table 4.3 *t*-test Results of the Scale Sub-Dimensions by Students' Schools

Sub-dimensions	Vocational School Mean \pm Standard Deviation	FEAS Mean \pm Standard Deviation	T	p
Extraversion	2.38 \pm 0.60	2.68 \pm 0.57	3.574	0.00
Responsibility	2.19 \pm 0.53	2.33 \pm 0.46	-1.937	0.05
Openness to Experience	2.24 \pm 0.52	2.58 \pm 0.46	-4.745	0.00
Laissez-Faire Leadership Style	2.74 \pm 0.90	3.37 \pm 0.56	-5.808	0.00

4.4.3. Analyzing the Mean Points of Scale Sub-Dimensions by Students' Family Income

ANOVA test has been implemented on the data with the purpose of testing our third hypothesis: "There is/is not a significant difference between students' family income and personality-leadership behaviors". The results of the test can be seen in Table 4.4. As a result of the test, it has been revealed that there is a significant difference because the *p* values of compatibility sub-dimension are less than 0.05.

Thus H_0 hypothesis has been refused and H_1 hypothesis "There is a significant difference between students' family income and personality-leadership behaviors" has been approved. Tukey test has been done in order to find out which income group causes the difference.

After this test, it has been revealed that significant difference has taken its source from the students who have 1000-1999 TL family income.

Table 4.4 ANOVA Test Results by Students' Family Income

Sub-dimensions	999 TL or below Mean \pm Standard Deviation	1000-1999 TL Mean \pm Standard Deviation	2000 TL and above Mean \pm Standard Deviation	F	p
Compatibility	2.10 \pm 0.41	2.31 \pm 0.50	2.19 \pm 0.56	3.13	0.04

4.4.4. Analyzing the Mean Points of Scale Sub-Dimensions by Students' Grow-up Places

ANOVA test has been done on the data to test our fourth hypothesis: "There is/is not a significant difference between students' grow-up places and personality-leadership behaviors". The results of the test have been shown in Table 4.5. As a result of the test, it can be seen that there is a significant difference because the *p* value of democratic leadership behavior sub-dimension is less than 0.05.

Thus H_0 hypothesis has been refused and H_1 hypothesis "There is a significant difference between students' grow-up places and personality-leadership behaviors" has been approved. The Tukey test has been done for testing the differentiating factor. After this test, it has been revealed that students who grew up in towns cause the difference. It is possible to say that the students who grew up in towns have more democratic leadership behaviors than other students.

Table 4.5 ANOVA Test Results by Students' Grow-up Places

Sub-dimensions	Village Mean \pm Standard Deviation	Township Mean \pm Standard Deviation	Town Mean \pm Standard Deviation	County Mean \pm Standard Deviation	Metropolis Mean \pm Standard Deviation	F	p
Democratic Leadership Style	1.69 \pm 0.41	1.63 \pm 0.49	2.05 \pm 0.52	1.84 \pm 0.57	1.90 \pm 0.53	2.67	0.03

4.4.5. Analyzing the Mean Points of Scale Sub-Dimensions by the Educational Level of Students' Fathers

ANOVA test has been implemented on the data in order to test our fifth hypothesis: "There is/is not a significant difference between the educational level of students' fathers and personality-leadership behaviors". The results of the test have been displayed in Table 4.6. As a result of the test, it can be seen that there is a significant difference because the p value of laissez-faire leadership behavior sub-dimension is less than 0.05.

Table 4.6 ANOVA Test Results by the Educational Level of Students' Fathers

Sub-dimensions	Literate Mean \pm Standard Deviation	Primary-Secondary Mean \pm Standard Deviation	High School Mean \pm Standard Deviation	University Mean \pm Standard Deviation	F	p
Laissez-Faire Leadership Style	1.83 \pm 1.17	2.94 \pm 0.82	3.19 \pm 0.82	3.30 \pm 0.63	3.65	0.01

Thus H_0 hypothesis has been refused and H_1 hypothesis "There is a significant difference between the educational level of students' fathers and personality-leadership behaviors" has been approved. Tukey test has been done to find out the differentiating factor. After this test, it has been revealed that the students whose fathers have university degree have more laissez-faire leadership behaviors than other students. Growing up in a democratic and well-educated family, might cause changes in people's personality traits and leadership behaviors.

4.4.6. Analyzing the Mean Points of Scale Sub-Dimensions by the Educational Level of Students' Mothers

ANOVA test has been implemented on the data with the purpose of testing our sixth hypothesis: "There is/is not a significant difference between the educational level of students' mothers and personality-leadership behaviors". The results of the test have been shown in Table 4.7. As a result of the test, it can be seen that there is a significant difference because the p value of openness to experience sub-dimension is less than 0.05.

Thus H_0 hypothesis has been refused and H_1 hypothesis "There is a significant difference between the educational level of students' mothers and personality-leadership behaviors" has been approved. Afterwards, Tukey test has been implemented to find out the educational level that causes difference. After this test, it has been revealed that the students whose mothers graduated from primary-secondary schools are more open to experience than other students.

Table 4.7 ANOVA Test Results by the Educational Level of Students' Mothers

Sub-dimensions	Illiterate Mean \pm Standard Deviation	Literate Mean \pm Standard Deviation	Primary-Secondary School Mean \pm Standard Deviation	High School Mean \pm Standard Deviation	University Mean \pm Standard Deviation	F	p
Openness to Experience	2.06 \pm 0.42	1.96 \pm 0.54	2.46 \pm 0.53	2.34 \pm 0.46	2.29 \pm 0.43	2.62	0.03

4.4.7. Analyzing the Mean Points of Scale Sub-Dimensions by the High Schools that Students Graduated from

ANOVA test has been done on the data to test our seventh hypothesis: *“There is/is not a significant difference between the high schools that students graduated from and personality-leadership behaviors”*. The results of the test can be seen in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8 ANOVA Test Results by the High Schools that Students Graduated from

Sub-dimensions	Anadolu High School Mean \pm Standard Deviation	Super High School Mean \pm Standard Deviation	Regular High School Mean \pm Standard Deviation	Vocational High School Mean \pm Standard Deviation	Teacher High School Mean \pm Standard Deviation	F	p
Extraversion	2.81 \pm 0.59	2.60 \pm 0.56	2.64 \pm 0.65	2.35 \pm 0.57	2.75 \pm 0.00	3.57	0.00
Openness to Experience	2.42 \pm 0.49	2.56 \pm 0.43	2.57 \pm 0.59	2.22 \pm 0.47	3.25 \pm 0.00	6.11	0.00
Laissez-Faire Leadership Style	3.13 \pm 0.84	3.48 \pm 0.52	3.23 \pm 0.57	2.71 \pm 0.90	3.33 \pm 0.00	8.65	0.00

As a result of the test, it has been revealed that there is a significant difference because the p value of laissez-faire leadership sub-dimension is less than 0.05 within the extraversion and openness to experience scales.

Thus H_0 hypothesis has been refused and H_1 hypothesis *“There is a significant difference between the high schools that students graduated from and personality-leadership behaviors”* has been approved. Afterwards, Tukey test has been done to find out the types of high schools which cause the difference. After this test, it has been revealed that the students who graduated from Anadolu High Schools are more extravert and the students who graduated from teacher high schools are more open to experience. Similarly, the students who graduated from Anadolu High Schools are different than the others under the laissez-faire leadership sub-dimension.

4.4.8. Frequency Table for the Answers Given by the Students on the “Leadership is an inborn trait and cannot be learnt afterwards” Expression

Frequencies for the *“Leadership is an inborn trait and cannot be learnt afterwards”* expression can be seen in Table 4.9. It is possible to say that 58.4% of the students think that leadership is an inborn trait and

cannot be learnt afterwards. Actually, this belief might direct students not to perform as a leader.

Table 4.9 Frequency Table for the Answers Given by the Students on the “Leadership is an inborn trait and cannot be learnt afterwards” Expression

Answers	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	74	37.6
Agree	41	20.8
No idea	27	13.7
Disagree	38	19.3
Strongly Disagree	17	8.6
Total	197	100

4.4.9. Frequency Table for the Answers Given by the Students on the “Education is obligatory for leadership” Expression

Frequencies for the *“Education is obligatory for leadership”* expression have been revealed in Table 4.10. It can be seen that 56.3% of the students believe in the importance of education for having a leader personality and most of them think that education is obligatory for being a leader.

Table 4.10 Frequency Table for the Answers Given by the Students on the "Education is obligatory for leadership" Expression

Answers	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	54	27.4
Agree	57	28.9
No idea	33	16.8
Disagree	34	17.3
Strongly Disagree	19	9.6
Total	197	100

4.4.10. Regression Analysis between Personality Sub-Dimensions and Leadership Styles

According to One-Way ANOVA in Table 4.11 there is a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between one of the personality sub-dimensions, extraversion and democratic leadership behavior. Thus it can be said that the students who have extravert personality traits will display a better democratic leadership behavior.

Table 4.11 One-Way ANOVA between Extraversion Sub-Dimension and Leadership Style

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
1 Regression	9.608	4	2.402	7.261	0.00
Residual	63.615	192	.331		
Total	73.123	196			

According to One-Way ANOVA in Table 4.12 there is a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between one of the personality sub-dimensions, responsibility and democratic leadership behavior. Thus it is possible to say that the students who have more responsible personality traits will display better a democratic leadership behavior.

Table 4.12 One-Way ANOVA between Responsibility Sub-Dimension and Leadership Style

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
1 Regression	8.457	4	2.137	9.905	0.00
Residual	41.421	192	.216		
Total	49.968	196			

According to One-Way ANOVA, shown in Table 4.13, there is a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between one of the personality sub-dimensions, openness to experience and democratic leadership behavior. Thus it can be said that the students who are more open to experience will display better a democratic leadership behavior.

Table 4.13 One-Way ANOVA between Openness to Experience Sub-Dimension and Leadership Style

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
1 Regression	12.874	4	3.219	15.022	0.00
Residual	41.13	192	.214		
Total	53.887	196			

According to One-Way ANOVA in Table 4.14, there is a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between one of the personality sub-dimensions, compatibility and democratic leadership behavior. Thus it is easy to say that the students who have more compatible personality traits will display better a democratic and laissez-faire leadership behavior.

Table 4.14 One-Way ANOVA between Compatibility Sub-Dimension and Leadership Style

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
1 Regression	8.762	4	2.191	10.507	0.00
Residual	40.030	192	.208		
Total	48.792	196			

5. DISCUSSION

Taher, Chen and Yao's research (2011) shows that there are significant correlations between extraversion, conscientiousness and openness to experience personality traits with MBA students' learning performance and educational achievement. Thomas and Thomas (2011) reveal that the globalization process and criticisms on the business schools address the deans and managers to change curriculum and leadership process of the schools. These schools should be able to respond to the changing students' characteristics and sectoral needs. The relationship between personality traits and leadership is a popular subject in the leadership literature about schools and students. According to Bartone, Eid, Johnsen, Laberg and Snook's (2009) research on US Military academy cadets; psychological hardiness, extraversion and conscientiousness are important factors on influencing leader effectiveness.

Researchers also display that different personality factors may affect leadership in different organizational contexts. According to the research on leadership from the trait perspective, extraversion was the most consistent correlate of leadership across leader emergence and effectiveness (Judge, Ilies, Bono and Gerhardt 2002). Ishibashi and Kottke's (2009) research results indicate that Japanese and U.S. participants similarly rated the effective leader as extraverted and open to experience. Wolff and Kim (2011) found that extraversion and openness to experience personality traits are broadly related to networking in general. It is important for the leaders to have effective relationships with their followers in their networks. According to De Hoogh, Den Hartog and Koopman's (2005) research results, perceived dynamic work environment moderated the relationships of four of the Big Five-Factors with both charismatic and transactional leadership. In their research, Hirschfeld, Jordan, Thomas and

Feild (2008) introduced a team-leader personality profile as a higher-order construct for explaining covariation among extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability.

Based on a questionnaire, the study implemented by Leung and Bozionelos (2004) on Chinese origin individuals in Hong Kong, high levels of extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, emotional stability and openness were perceived as characterizing effective leaders. Zopiatis and Constanti's (2012) research on managers working in the hotel industry of Cyprus suggest that transformational leadership is positively associated with extraversion, openness and conscientiousness, while in contrast, passive/avoidance leadership style is negatively associated with conscientiousness and agreeableness.

6. CONCLUSION

As a result of the research implemented in order to determine the effect of personality traits on the leadership behavior of students who study at Trakya University Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences (FEAS) Department of Business Administration and Trakya University Vocational School of Social Sciences Department of Business Administration, it can be concluded that gender is a differentiating factor on leadership styles and extravert personality traits.

Besides that, differences between the FEAS and the Vocational School students have been found on extravert, responsible, open to experience personality traits and laissez-faire leadership style. In addition to that, grow-up places, educational level of students' parents and types of high schools from which students graduated affect the adopted leadership style. Types of high schools also affect the personality traits. Finally, the relationship between personality traits and leadership styles has been displayed.

Future researches can gather wider data from larger samples. Furthermore, it is possible to compare different departments, patterns and trends. This can be accepted as a limitation for our research. However, we believe that our findings may contribute to the leadership literature and future researches. The business managers may take personality traits into consideration in recruiting employees and forming teams inside the organization.

REFERENCES

1. Ashcraft, D. (2011) *Personality Theories Workbook*. 5th Edition, California: Cengage Learning.
2. Bartone, T.P., Eid, J., Johnsen, H.B., Laberg, C.J. & Snook, A. S. (2009) Big Five Personality Factors, Hardiness, And Social Judgement As Predictors of Leader Performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. 30(6), pp. 498-521.
3. Bhatti, R.J. (2009) *The Dynamics of Personality Development And Projection*. New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley.
4. Bowditch, L.J. & Buono, F.A. (2005) *A Primer On Organizational Behavior*. 6th Edition, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
5. Burger, J. (2010) *Personality*. 8th Edition, California: Cengage Learning.
6. Carducci, J. B. (2009) *The Psychology of Personality*. Second Edition, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
7. Costley, L.D. & Todd, R. (1991) *Human Relations In Organizations*. 4th Edition, St.Paul: West Publishing.
8. Çeribaş E. (2007) "Yöneticilerin Kişilik Özelliklerinin İş Etiğine Etkileri". *Kütahya: Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*.
9. Daft, R. (2007) *The Leadership Experience*. 4th Edition, Ohio: Thomson Learning.
10. Daft, L.R. & Marcic, D. (2009) *Management: The New Workplace*. 6th Edition, Beijing: South-Western College Publishing.
11. De Hoogh, B.H.A., Den Hartog, N.D. & Koopman, L.P. (2005) Linking The Big Five-Factors of Personality to Charismatic And Transactional Leadership; Perceived Dynamic Work Environment As a Moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 26, pp. 839-865.
12. DeYoung, G.C. (2011) *The Cambridge Handbook of Intelligence*. Edited By; Robert J. Stenberg, Scott Barry Kaufman. New York: Cambridge University Press.
13. DuBrin, J.A. (2009) *Leadership: Research Findings, Practice And Skills*. 6th Edition. Canada: South-Western Cengage Learning, Nelson Education.
14. Dyck, B. & Neubert, M. (2008) *Management: Current Practices And New Directions*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing.
15. Hirschfeld, R.R., Jordan, H.M., Thomas, H.C. & Feild, S.H. (2008) Observed Leadership Potential of Personnel In a Team Setting: Big Five Traits And Proximal Factors As Predictors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*. 16(4), pp. 385-402.
16. Hogan, R. (2007) *Personality And The Fate of Organizations*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
17. Huczynski, A.A. & Buchanan, A.D. (2007) *Organizational Behaviour*. 6th Edition, Essex: Pearson Education.

18. Ishibashi, Y. & Kottke, J. (2009) Confucianism, personality traits, and effective leaders in Japan and the United States. *Annual Conference of the Association for Psychological Science*. San Francisco, California, USA.
19. James, R.L. & Mazerolle, D.M. (2002) *Personality In Work Organizations*. California: Sage Publications.
20. Judge, A.T., Ilies, R., Bono, E.J. & Gerhardt, W.M. (2002) Personality And Leadership: A Qualitative And Quantitative Review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 87(4), pp.765-780.
21. Kumar, N. & Mittal, R. (2001) *Organisational Behaviour*. 1st Edition. New Delhi: Anmol Publications.
22. Laurent, H. (2008) *Personality: How To Build It*. USA: Funk & Wagnalls.
23. Leung, L.S. & Bozionelos, N. (2004) Five-Factor Model Traits And The Prototypical Image of The Effective Leader In The Confucian Culture. *Journal of Employee Relations*. 26(1), pp. 62-71.
24. Luthans, F. (2002) *Organizational Behaviour*. 9th Edition, Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
25. Matthews, G., Deary, J.I. & Whiteman, C.M. (2003) *Personality Traits*. 2nd Edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
26. McShane, L.S., Von Glinow, A.M. (2008) *Organizational Behaviour*. 4th Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
27. Mendenhall, E.M., Osland, S.J., Bird, A., Oddov, R.G. & Maznevski, L.M. (2008) *Global Leadership: Research, Practice And Development*. New York: Routledge.
28. Roodt, G. (2009) *Organisational Behaviour: Global And Southern African Perspectives*. 2nd Edition, Cape Town: Pearson Education.
29. Ryckman, M.R. (2009) *Theories of Personality*. 9th Edition, California: Thomson Higher Education.
30. Sashkin, M. & Sashkin, G.M. (2003) *Leadership That Matters*. 1st Edition, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
31. Taher, M.M.A., Chen, J. & Yao, W. (2011) Key Predictors of Creative MBA Students' Performance. Personality Type And Learning Approaches. *Journal of Technology Management in China*. 6(1), pp. 43-68.
32. Thomas, H. & Thomas, L. (2011) Perspectives On Leadership In Business Schools. *Journal of Management Development*. 30(5), pp. 526-540.
33. Weihrich, H., Cannice, V.M. & Koontz, H. (2010) *Management: A Global And Entrepreneurial Perspective*, 13th Edition, New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill.
34. Wolff, G.H. & Kim, S. (2011) The Relationship Between Networking Behaviors And The Big Five Personality Dimensions. *Career Development International*. 17(1), pp. 43-66.
35. Zopiatis, A. & Constanti, P. (2012) Extraversion, Openness And Conscientiousness: The Route To Transformational Leadership In The Hotel Industry. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. 33(1), pp. 86-104.