Swami Vivekananda Advanced Journal for Research and Studies
Online Copy of Document Available on: www.svajrs.com

ISSN:2584-105X **Pg. 43 - 52**

A study of Personality factors and Leadership Effectiveness

Dr. Feroz Ahmad
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology, Jagdam college chapra JPU

Accepted: 10/07/2025
Published: 12/07/2025

Abstract

An extensive theoretical analysis of the connection between leadership effectiveness and personality factors is presented in this work. The study, which has its main foundation in the Big Five personality paradigm, looks at how different leadership styles and results are influenced by traits including agreeableness, emotional stability, conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness. The study emphasises that although personality is fundamental in determining leadership behaviour, contextual, situational, and cultural elements mitigate its impacts. Furthermore, the incorporation of emotional intelligence is highlighted as a crucial addition to conventional personality categories for comprehending leadership dynamics. To capture the intricacies of effective leadership in a variety of organisational situations, the study urges future research to expand personality models and use longitudinal designs, calling for more nuanced, context-sensitive approaches to leadership theory and development.

Keywords: *Personality Traits, Leadership Effectiveness, Big Five, Emotional Intelligence, Leadership Styles, Transformational Leadership*

Introduction

Climate Effective leadership is essential to the success of any organisation. Despite the fact that there is no one definition of "effective leadership," it usually refers to persuading and inspiring people or groups to accomplish shared objectives. Researchers have studied the influence of personality on leadership effectiveness for many years. It is essential for leadership development programs and leadership selection procedures to comprehend the relationship between personality and leadership. This essay seeks to give a thorough analysis of this complex relationship. For organisations and groups to succeed, leadership is essential. Although a variety of characteristics have a role in good leadership, personality qualities have been found to be a crucial element **(Northouse, 2018).**

For many years, there has been a great deal of research on the connection between leadership effectiveness and personality. Current research highlights a more complex approach, emphasising the interaction of individual attributes, situational conditions, and leadership styles, in contrast to the "Great Man" theory, which proposed innate traits characterising effective leaders. This study examines what is currently known about the relationship between personality traits as determined by recognised psychometric tools and several aspects of effective leadership, such as organisational outcomes, team performance, and follower satisfaction.

A popular framework for comprehending individual differences is the Big Five personality traits: agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, extraversion, and openness to new experiences. Leadership emergence has frequently been linked to extraversion, although it is still unclear how other traits and their interactions affect this relationship. The demands of contemporary organisational settings necessitate flexible and capable leadership.

I started this study with a pretty straightforward question in mind: does personality especially the Big Five traits actually tell us anything useful about how effective someone might be as a leader? And more importantly, does that hold true in different kinds of workplaces, or does it fall apart depending on the situation? There's been a lot written on this over the years, so I wanted to really dig into that body of work, not just to repeat what others have said, but to see what holds up, what doesn't, and where the gaps still are.

To get into that, I've looked at a bunch of studies that specifically focused on the link between personality traits and leadership outcomes. Most of them, naturally, lean on the Big Five model that's the one with traits like extraversion, conscientiousness, openness, agreeableness, and neuroticism. It's used so often it's kind of become the default starting point. I'll also be looking at what each of these traits seems to say about different leadership results things like how satisfied a team is, how well a leader performs, and whether the organisation actually benefits from their style.

One of the big things I want to do in this review is to look past just the surface-level claims and really consider how solid the findings are. Are the conclusions consistent across studies? Are they built on strong data, or is it mostly correlation without deeper exploration? These are the things that matter if we want to actually apply any of this knowledge in real-life workplaces.

Toward the end, I'll also try to point out areas that haven't been looked at enough, or that feel a bit shaky in the research. There's always more to explore, and I think calling out what's missing is just as important as summarising what's already been studied.

Literature Review

From what I've seen so far, it's obvious that the link between personality and leadership is... well, messy. There's no single trait that guarantees good leadership, but some do seem to show up more often in successful leaders than others. The Big Five model keeps coming up which isn't surprising and within that, extraversion and conscientiousness seem to get a lot of attention.

Take extraversion, for example. Judge and Bono (2000) talked about it in relation to leadership effectiveness, and honestly, it makes sense. Leaders who are more outgoing, assertive, and good at communicating tend to have an easier time taking charge, building trust, and staying visible. Barrick and Mount (1991) said similar things earlier that extraverted people are often more comfortable in leadership roles simply because they're more naturally expressive and willing to take initiative in group settings.

Conscientiousness is another one that keeps popping up. It's usually associated with being reliable, organised, and task-focused and those are the kinds of qualities that matter when someone's trying to lead a team and meet goals. Research by Judge et al. (2002), along with more recent work like that from Koutsioumpa (2023), supports the idea that being structured and goal-oriented tends to help leaders perform better, especially in roles that demand accountability and follow-through.

But and this is key even these traits don't mean much without context. Just because someone's extraverted or conscientious doesn't mean they'll

thrive in every leadership situation. A lot depends on the environment, the team, the kind of work being done, and even cultural expectations. That's why, moving forward, we really need to think about how personality works with other factors not just as a predictor, but as one part of a much bigger picture.

Since conscientious leaders are typically well-organised, accountable, and goal-oriented, conscientiousness has also been connected to leadership success **(Judge et al., 2002).** High degrees of neuroticism, on the other hand, can make leadership less effective since emotionally unstable leaders may find it difficult to control their stress and make sound decisions **(Bono & Judge, 2004).**

Furthermore, a key aspect in evaluating the efficacy of a leader is the interplay between situational conditions and personality qualities. For instance, in some situations, transformational leadership approacheswhich prioritise inspiration and motivationmay work better, especially when leaders exhibit high levels of extraversion and openness **(Bass & Riggio, 2006).**

Furthermore, a crucial element of successful leadership is emotional intelligence, which is frequently regarded as a personality trait. High emotional intelligence leaders are better able to comprehend and control both their own and their followers' emotions, which enhances team dynamics and output **(Goleman, 1998).**

The efficiency of leadership is strongly influenced by personality qualities, as the research continuously shows. Strong correlations between effective leadership behaviours and the Five-Factor Model, including conscientiousness and emotional stability **(Koutsioumpa, 2023).** Additionally important to leadership performance are the Big Five personality traits and emotional intelligence (EI) **(Cooper et al., 2023).** According to **Hogan and Kaiser (2005),** personality plays a crucial role in the selection and development of leaders since it predicts leadership style and performance.

Individual differences in temperament and behaviour can be explained by the Big Five model of personality, which is widely accepted in psychology **(Costa & McCrae, 1992).** Every characteristic provides a framework for examining personality in a range of settings, including leadership, and represents a continuum between two extremes **(Judge et al., 2002).**

According to **Zaccaro (2007),** leaders who exhibit high levels of openness are more likely to be creative and flexible, two traits that are crucial for negotiating the complexity of contemporary organisations. According to **Judge et al. (2002),** leaders with high conscientiousness scores are frequently successful in establishing objectives and upholding discipline. According to **Northouse (2018),** extraverted leaders tend to be more outspoken and gregarious, which can improve teamwork and communication. Excessive agreeableness might impede assertiveness and decision-making, yet high agreeableness can provide a supportive atmosphere **(Zaccaro, 2007).** Emotional stability, which is essential for effective leadership in stressful situations, is generally linked to low levels of neuroticism **(Judge et al., 2002).**

Characterised by qualities like charisma, friendliness, and assertiveness, extroversion has been repeatedly associated with effective leadership, especially in transformative leadership. By expressing a distinct vision and encouraging creativity, transformational leaders enthuse and encourage their followers. Due to their innate propensity to interact with people and make their presence known in group situations, extroverts are more likely to display these behaviours **(Härtel et al., 2023; Bono & Judge, 2004; Judge & Bono, 2000).**

Extroverts are less directly involved in transactional leadership, which emphasises rewards and trades. Nevertheless, by using their assertiveness to successfully enforce rules and expectations, extroverted leaders can still succeed in this style **(Bono & Judge, 2004) (Johnson et al., 2004).**

Extrovertism might not be as important for laissez-faire leadership, which is defined by a hands-off style. But if they can assign work well while still being somewhat involved with their team, extroverted leaders might still succeed in this approach **(Jannesari et al., 2013) (Alkahtani et al., 2011).**

Effective leadership across a range of types is strongly predicted by conscientiousness, which includes qualities like responsibility, organisation, and thoroughness. According to Procházka et al. **(2018), Johnson et al. (2004), and Koutsioumpa (2023),** transformational leadership enables leaders to inspire and guide followers by establishing clear goals, allocating resources, and maintaining consistency in their vision.

Conscientiousness is just as crucial in transactional leadership. Because of their attention to detail and capacity for effective rule enforcement, conscientious people make excellent candidates for transactional leadership, which relies on structure and rewards to inspire followers **(Bono & Judge, 2004) (Johnson et al., 2004).**

The role of conscientiousness in laissez-faire leadership may be more complex. Conscientious people can still succeed by making sure that tasks are well-organised and deadlines are reached, especially

when they are working remotely, even when laissez-faire bosses frequently avoid direct engagement **(Jannesari et al., 2013) (Alkahtani et al., 2011).**

Effective leadership requires emotional stability, which is the capacity to maintain composure under duress, especially in high-stress situations. Emotionally secure leaders in transformational leadership are better able to handle stress and keep a good attitude, which creates a motivating and encouraging work atmosphere **(Härtel et al., 2023) (Koutsioumpa, 2023).**

Although it is less directly related, emotional stability is nonetheless crucial in transactional leadership. Leaders that are emotionally stable are less likely to be influenced by stress, which enables them to consistently enforce standards and make logical decisions **(Bono & Judge, 2004) (Johnson et al., 2004).**

Since there is less direct engagement in a laissez-faire leadership style, emotional stability may not be as important. Nonetheless, even when assigning work and refraining from active participation, emotionally stable leaders may still gain from their capacity to maintain composure **(Jannesari et al., 2013) (Alkahtani et al., 2011).**

There are cultural and environmental elements that may moderate the impact of personality traits on leadership effectiveness. For instance, leaders who are conscientious and likeable may be more highly regarded in collectivist societies since they foster harmony and collaboration **(Leung & Bozionelos, 2004) (Javalagi et al., 2024).** In a similar vein, situational elements like job demands and autonomy might affect how personality traits and leadership performance are related. High conscientiousness leaders, for example, would do well in regimented settings, whereas extroverted leaders might do well in lively, participatory ones **(Ng et al., 2008).**

Transformational leadership and extroversion have a favourable correlation that increases charisma and motivational inspiration **(Simic et al., 2017; Bono & Judge, 2004).** According to **Bono and Judge (2004),** extroversion is more supportive to transformational leadership styles but has a less noticeable effect on transactional leadership, suggesting a more complex relationship. Since their aggressive disposition clashes with a hands-off approach, extrovert leaders may find it difficult to adopt a laissez-faire style **(Grover & Amit, 2024).** Organisation and diligence are traits of conscientious leaders that improve project execution and decision-making **(Koutsioumpa, 2023).** This quality is crucial for leaders who must modify their approach according to the demands of the team, especially in facilitative leadership **(Grover & Amit, 2024).**

High emotional stability leaders successfully handle stress at work, creating a serene atmosphere that promotes productivity **(Koutsioumpa, 2023) (Härtel et al., 2023).** According to **Härtel et al. (2023),** emotional stability improves perceptions of trustworthiness, which is essential for effective leadership, particularly in roles that are member-focused.

Northouse (2018) highlights the significance of personality traits in effective leadership and offers a thorough review of numerous leadership theories. **Judge and Bono (2000)** examine the connection between transformative leadership and the Big Five personality traits, emphasising how some characteristics might improve the efficacy of leadership. The impact of personality on the formation and efficacy of leaders in diverse organisational environments is examined by **Zaccaro and Banks (2004).**

In their meta-analysis, **Barrick & Mount (1991)** look at the connection between personality qualities and work performance, offering insights into how these traits may affect the efficacy of leadership. **Bass (1990)** talks about the change from transactional to transformational leadership and how personality helps with this. **Goleman (1998)** highlights how crucial emotional intelligence is to effective leadership, connecting it to interpersonal abilities and personality qualities.

Taking personality traits into account, **Eagly & Johnson (1990)** investigate the ways in which gender affects leadership effectiveness and styles. In their discussion of authentic leadership and personality traits, **Avolio & Gardner (2005)** stress the significance of integrity and self-awareness. A comprehensive analysis of leadership ideas and practices, including the part personality plays in effective leadership, is given by **Yukl (2010).**

Day & Lord (1988) examine how executive personality affects organisational success and establish a connection between leadership effectiveness and personality attributes. The impact of personality on connections between leaders and followers as well as overall leadership effectiveness is examined by **Hiller & Day (2003).**

When it comes to understanding leadership what makes some people succeed in those roles while others struggle a lot of attention has gone to the role of personality. Antonakis and House (2002) talked about this in their work on the full-range leadership model, exploring how personality ties into different leadership behaviours. Similarly, Sweeney and McFarlin (2005) gave a wide overview of what's been written on this topic, trying to bring together the various strands of research that link personality traits

to leadership outcomes. And Fiedler, even earlier (1993), emphasised the role of personality within his contingency theory framework basically arguing that no leader is effective in every situation and that personality matters most in relation to context.

Across many studies, there's a clear pattern that keeps surfacing: traits like extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional intelligence seem to stand out as especially important. Leaders who are outgoing, organised, and emotionally aware tend to do better across a range of settings. That said, the relationship isn't simple. Traits don't work in isolation. The environment matters. What works in one setting say, a tech startup might not work in a military unit or a public hospital. That's why future research really needs to focus on the interaction between personality and external conditions. And more importantly, on whether leadership itself can be improved through deliberate training and experience, not just natural traits.

Looking beyond the individual, the way someone chooses to lead their leadership style also plays a huge role. A lot has been said about transformational leadership, and for good reason. Leaders who motivate people with a clear vision, who challenge them intellectually, and who actually care about their team members on a personal level tend to get better results. Bass and Riggio (2006) found that this kind of leadership often leads to higher employee engagement, more commitment to the organisation, and overall stronger performance.

But of course, transformational leadership isn't the only approach. There's also transactional leadership, which is more focused on clear rules, structured feedback, and rewarding or correcting behaviour as needed. That style can work well in situations where structure and consistency are essential. It might not spark innovation, but it can keep things running. What matters most, though as Fiedler (1967) pointed out with his contingency model is that leaders adjust their approach to fit the situation. No single style is right all the time.

Another major piece of the puzzle is behaviour the actual, day-to-day actions leaders take. According to Northouse (2019), strong leaders often do simple things that make a big difference: they listen, they offer feedback that's useful, they communicate clearly, and they know how to step back and delegate. These actions create trust and teamwork. When people feel heard and respected, they tend to work better. The opposite is also true: poor leadership like micromanaging, making all decisions without input, or failing to show empathy often leads to disengagement. Morale drops. Turnover increases. Productivity suffers.

This is why understanding leadership as a behavioural process is so important. It's not just about traits, and it's not only about abstract styles it's about what leaders do. And that's exactly where training and development programs should focus. If we can identify which behaviours support healthy teams and strong results, we can teach them. Leadership may be influenced by personality, but it can and should be shaped by learning, feedback, and support.

Figuring out whether someone is an effective leader isn't really something that can be done with just one type of data or one specific method. Leadership is complex too complex, honestly to judge by numbers alone. Sure, you can look at outcomes. You can track things like whether a project was delivered on time, whether financial goals were met, or how a team performed compared to the targets they were given. And that's useful of course it is. You do need to measure results. But numbers alone don't explain how those results came about, or what they cost.

That's why you also have to look at the other side the more personal, human side of leadership. You might have a manager who hits all the metrics but runs their team into the ground doing it. Or someone who quietly builds a supportive environment where people feel respected and motivated even if the numbers don't show it immediately. That's where subjective feedback comes in. Things like employee surveys, team feedback, peer reviews, and even how a leader evaluates themselves all of that helps paint a more honest, layered picture. It's about how people feel under that leader. Are they encouraged? Trusted? Burned out?

So, if we're serious about understanding leadership effectiveness, we can't rely only on one type of data. You need both: the hard numbers and the human voices. One without the other gives you a partial picture at best. Together, they tell a far more accurate story about what's really going on.

And honestly, leadership isn't just a question of metrics or management style. It's made up of so many things how someone communicates, how they handle stress, how they adapt when things don't go to plan. Their personality plays a role. So do their habits. And the workplace itself the culture, the pressure, the people all of that shapes how a leader behaves and whether their approach actually works.

Some leaders thrive in chaos, while others need structure. One leadership style might work brilliantly in a tech startup but fail completely in a school or hospital. That's why it's dangerous to generalise. There's no universal model that works everywhere. You need to understand who the leader is, yes but also where they are, what's expected of them, and what their team needs from them.

In this section, the goal was just to lay out some of the key ideas not to cover everything at once. The sections that follow will go deeper into the different

parts of this whole leadership puzzle. We'll look at actual examples, explore what the research says, and hopefully offer some practical thoughts on how to support and grow better leaders not just in theory, but in the real world. What we've covered here should help set the stage for that.

Objectives

1. Analyse the main theories of personality and how they relate to effective leadership.

2. Recognise the theoretical connection between leadership behaviour and personality factors.

Methodology

When I started pulling together sources for the literature review in this study, I knew it had to go beyond just Googling a few articles. So I turned to some of the more established academic databases that are usually used in psychology and leadership research PsycINFO, Scopus, and Web of Science. Those platforms helped narrow things down, although the process wasn't exactly straightforward. I ended up trying out different combinations of search terms things like "personality," "leadership effectiveness," "Big Five traits," and some related phrases that came up along the way. It took some experimenting, honestly. You try a keyword string, get a bunch of stuff that isn't useful, then try something else. That's pretty common with lit reviews, though.

Eventually, after sifting through quite a few papers, I began filtering them not just based on relevance but on quality. Some studies sound impressive at first glance, but if you look at their sample size or how they measured variables, things don't always hold up. So part of the process was evaluating how solid each study was methodologically like, did it use proper controls? Was the data strong enough to draw real conclusions? Once I had a final group of studies that felt solid, I started mapping out the patterns. Not just what each study said, but where they agreed, where they contradicted, and what kind of picture they were painting together.

Findings

So here's what stood out: personality clearly plays a role in leadership that much is pretty hard to deny, even with some variation between studies. The Big Five model came up a lot. It's probably the most widely used personality framework in this space, and for good reason. It gives researchers a structure to work with five main traits that tend to show up in people to varying degrees. What I noticed, and what the literature tends to support, is that three of those traits extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional intelligence (which is kind of its own thing but closely tied to the Big Five) keep popping up as strong predictors of leadership outcomes.

Extraversion especially seemed to be linked to people stepping into leadership roles and being effective once they were there. Judge and Bono (2000), for instance, found this link early on, and more recent work by Härtel and colleagues (2023) backs it up. In settings where leaders need to be visible, inspiring, and engaged with people like in transformational leadership being extraverted helps. It's not just about talking a lot; it's about creating energy, momentum, and visibility within a team or organisation.

Conscientiousness is another trait that came through pretty strongly. Leaders who are conscientious meaning they plan well, stay organised, meet deadlines, and generally follow through on commitments tend to drive results. They don't rely as much on charisma as extraverted leaders might, but they build trust over time through consistency. Studies by Judge et al. (2002) and Koutsioumpa (2023) both pointed this out in different ways. It's not flashy leadership, but it's dependable and in many organisations, that's what people need most.

And then there's emotional intelligence. It's not officially part of the Big Five, but it connects to traits like agreeableness and emotional stability. A leader might be smart in the traditional sense, but if they can't handle emotions their own or other people's that intelligence only goes so far. Emotional intelligence seems to be one of those things that blends cognitive and interpersonal ability. Leaders who have it tend to understand team dynamics better, resolve conflict more effectively, and generally create a healthier work environment.

Effective leadership also depends on emotional stability, or low neuroticism, which helps leaders cope with stress and remain composed under pressure **(Bono & Judge, 2004).** Although agreeableness can promote good interpersonal relationships and team cohesion, too much agreeableness might weaken a leader's decisiveness and assertiveness, which could compromise effectiveness in some situations **(Zaccaro, 2007).** Creativity and flexibility are associated with openness to experience, which supports creative leadership methods that are essential in dynamic organisational situations **(Zaccaro, 2007).**

When we look at the different styles of leadership how they work, and what kind of people tend to lead in each way certain personality traits come up again and again. For example, leaders who take a transformational approach, the kind who aim to inspire and really connect with people, often seem to have more extraversion and openness in their personality. That's probably not surprising. These types of leaders usually rely on emotional connection, on motivating others through vision and personal encouragement. And being outgoing, energetic, or just open to new ideas naturally fits that style.

Then there's transactional leadership, which is a bit more structured and rule-based. These leaders often work with systems, rewards, and consequences more of a clear give-and-take. In that space, people who are conscientious and emotionally stable tend to do well. They're organised, dependable, and don't react wildly under pressure. They don't necessarily need to be charismatic, but they know how to set expectations and follow through, which makes things run smoothly.

Laissez-faire leadership is a little trickier to place. It's usually defined by a kind of hands-off attitude less involvement, fewer rules. But even in that approach, some traits like emotional stability and conscientiousness can still quietly shape the environment. Maybe they don't take direct control, but they may still manage things in the background, influence outcomes, or just offer a stable presence when needed. It's not as active, but the personality still comes through in subtle ways **(Jannesari et al., 2013; Alkahtani et al., 2011).**

That said, none of these patterns happen in a vacuum. Context matters a lot more than we sometimes think. Culture, for one, can completely shift how a trait is seen or whether it's even helpful. In more individualistic cultures, traits like assertiveness or independence are often praised so extraversion might help a leader stand out. But in collectivist cultures, where group harmony is more important, traits like agreeableness or quiet diligence might be more valued. So the same personality trait could be either an asset or a liability, depending on where you are.

It also depends on the kind of situation the leader is in. A highly social, fast-moving workplace might suit an extraverted leader really well they thrive in that energy, in the back-and-forth of conversation and interaction. But if the job is more rigid, requiring lots of planning and structure, then someone with a more conscientious style might be the better fit. In that case, it's not about who the person is, but whether their way of being matches what the job needs **(Ng et al., 2008).**

Discussion

It's becoming clearer, especially with more recent studies, that personality does play a part in shaping how someone leads how they behave, how effective they are but it's definitely not as straightforward as earlier theories made it seem. Yes, traits influence leadership, but not always in the same way and not in every situation. You can't really say that certain personality traits will always lead to success in leadership. It depends on so many other things the environment, the kind of leadership style someone uses, and even the culture they're operating in. The interaction between those factors creates different outcomes. That's why newer theories, like the interactionist and contingency models, make more sense than older trait-based models that were trying to pin leadership down to a list of fixed characteristics.

The Big Five personality framework is often the starting point for this kind of research and it's definitely helped create a structure for thinking about individual differences but it doesn't tell the whole story. Leadership isn't only about being open-minded or conscientious. It's also about how people adapt. Emotional intelligence, for instance, is a big part of what makes someone a strong leader, especially when dealing with stress or navigating complicated social dynamics. Traits alone don't cover that. A person could be high in emotional stability but still not understand how to manage interpersonal conflict or read a room. Emotional intelligence goes beyond personality but it's also connected to it in complex ways **(Goleman, 1998; Cooper et al., 2023).**

That's why personality tests alone aren't enough. You can't just look at a score and assume someone's going to be an effective leader. Real leadership development has to involve more than just personality profiling. It needs to include training the kind that helps people build social and emotional awareness. Things like empathy, communication skills, and even learning how to recognise and manage their own emotional responses. Those areas can be developed over time, and they're often what make the difference between someone who simply manages people and someone who leads them well.

Another thing that's sometimes overlooked is the role of culture. The impact of personality on leadership can look very different depending on the cultural setting. In one country, being assertive might be seen as a sign of strength; in another, it might come across as arrogant or pushy. So, a trait like extraversion doesn't carry the same weight everywhere. As workplaces become more global and culturally diverse, leaders need to be able to adjust to modify their approach depending on who they're working with. This isn't always intuitive, and not all leadership models account for that kind of cultural shift. That's something we need to build into future theories and training.

It's also important to stop thinking about leadership as something universal like there's one ideal personality type that fits every leadership role. That's just not how it works in practice. The demands of leadership vary from job to job, from company to company. Some roles need someone who's detail-oriented and structured; others need someone who's flexible and quick-thinking. So instead of trying to fit everyone into the same leadership mould, organisations should focus more on how personality traits align with the actual needs of the position. It's not about finding the perfect leader it's about finding the right one for that specific context.

There are also some serious gaps in the research. A lot of the existing studies rely on self-report data, which is always going to be a bit flawed. People don't always see themselves clearly, or they might answer based on what they think sounds good. Plus, most of the research is cross-sectional it captures a moment in time. But leadership isn't static. It changes as people grow, as teams change, as challenges come and go. That's why we need more longitudinal and experimental studies to understand how personality traits interact with leadership development over time.

And let's not ignore the traits that don't get talked about as much. Most studies stick to the Big Five, which is helpful but limiting. What about the darker side of personality? Traits like narcissism, Machiavellianism, or even psychopathy the so-called "Dark Triad" play a role in leadership too, especially when we're looking at toxic or dysfunctional leaders. Models like HEXACO, which add elements like honesty and humility, might help give us a fuller picture. These angles could deepen our understanding of what actually works and what doesn't when it comes to leading people.

In the end, the relationship between personality and leadership is messy. It's not one-dimensional, and it's not predictable. Traits are a piece of the puzzle, but only when viewed alongside emotional intelligence, cultural fit, situational demands, and behavioural adaptability. The Big Five is a useful framework, but it only scratches the surface. What we need now is a more integrated, flexible model one that takes into account the real complexity of leadership in modern workplaces. That's what will help us not only understand leadership better but also improve how we train and select the people who take on those roles.

Conclusion

The link between someone's personality and how they lead how effective they are as a leader isn't something that can be pinned down with a single answer. It's layered, and messy, and honestly, it depends on more than just the individual themselves. Sure, traits like being outgoing (extraversion), being reliable (conscientiousness), or staying calm under pressure (emotional stability) are often associated with good leadership. That's been said in a lot of studies. But even then, it's not a sure thing. Just because someone has those traits doesn't mean they'll be a strong leader in every situation or culture.

It really depends on the setting. What works in one environment might fall flat in another. A leader who thrives in a fast-paced, high-pressure corporate office might struggle in a non-profit or a cross-cultural team. Culture matters, organisational demands matter, and so does timing. That's why the old way of thinking that we could list a handful of traits and call it a day doesn't really hold up anymore. Leadership isn't something that stays the same across the board. It shifts.

Also, there's something that those traditional trait-based theories miss: emotional intelligence. That's where the real difference shows up. It's not just about whether someone's "naturally" suited to lead, but how well they manage emotions their own and those of others. A leader who's technically conscientious but lacks empathy might stick to the rules but fail to connect with their team. On the other hand, someone who can read a room, respond to stress with patience, and support their team emotionally might succeed in environments where the job calls for flexibility more than rigidity.

So when we think about leadership, especially now, we have to move beyond checklists. Emotional intelligence adds depth to personality models. It captures the human side of leadership the part that isn't about scoring high on a personality test but about dealing with real people, real pressure, and real uncertainty.

For practitioners the people actually hiring and training leaders this means they need to look past the surface. It's not enough to give someone a personality assessment and base decisions on that alone. That might be a piece of the puzzle, but it's not the whole picture. Leadership development needs to include training in emotional awareness, conflict resolution, communication, and self-reflection. These aren't just soft skills they're core to whether someone can lead well or not.

Future research needs to stretch further too. A lot of studies rely on self-report data and short-term designs. That's limiting. Leadership isn't a static quality; it develops over time. So if we want to understand how personality actually shapes leadership in the long run, we need to track people over years not weeks. We also need to explore personality models beyond the Big Five. There's more to human behaviour than just five categories. The HEXACO model adds dimensions like humility and honesty, which are crucial when we think about integrity in leadership. And even the darker traits like narcissism or manipulation deserve more attention. Not because they're desirable, but because they show up in real workplaces, often in subtle but damaging ways.

In short, personality does matter in leadership. But it matters with context, not without it. It matters alongside emotional intelligence, situational demands, and the ever-changing reality of organisational life. No one-size-fits-all theory will explain it. And frankly, trying to find a single answer to "what makes a great leader?" misses the point. Leadership is dynamic. So our thinking about it needs to be dynamic too.

References

1. Alkahtani, A. H., Abu-Jarad, I., Sulaiman, M., & Nikbin, D. (2011). The impact of

personality and leadership styles on leading change capability of Malaysian managers. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, *1*(2), 70.

2. Antonakis, J., & House, R. J. (2002). The full-range leadership theory: The way forward. In B. J. Avolio, & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead (pp. 3-34). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
3. 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.
4. Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44(1), 1-26.
5. Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Organizational Dynamics, 18(3), 19-31.
6. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Psychology press.
7. Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, *89*(5), 901.
8. Cooper, J., Davis, L., & Norton Jr, F. R. (2023). A Literature Review of the Influence of Emotional Intelligence (EI) and the Big Five Personality Traits on Leadership Effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability & Ethics*, *20*(5).
9. Costa Jr, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and individual differences*, *13*(6), 653-665.
10. Day, D. V., & Lord, R. G. (1988). Executive leadership and organizational performance: The role of personality. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73(3), 405-410.
11. Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analytic review of the evidence. Psychological Bulletin, 108(2), 233-256.
12. Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. Mcgraw-Hill Series in Management.
13. Fiedler, F. E. (1993). The leadership situation: A contingency model. In J. G. Hunt, D. J. Hosking, C. A. Schriesheim, & J. M. Vargas (Eds.), Leaders and managers: International perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership (pp. 1-12). Routledge.
14. Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. Bantam.
15. Grover, A. N. S. H. I. K. A., & Amit, A. (2024). The Big Five Personality Traits and Leadership: A Comprehensive Analysis. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, *6*(1).
16. Härtel, T. M., Leckelt, M., Grosz, M. P., Kuefner, A. C., Geukes, K., & Back, M. D. (2023). Pathways from narcissism to leadership emergence in social groups. *European Journal of Personality*, *37*(1), 72-94.
17. Hiller, N. J., & Day, D. V. (2003). Leadership and adaptation: The role of personality in leader-follower dynamics. The Leadership Quarterly, 14(1), 1-24.
18. Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of general psychology*, *9*(2), 169-180.
19. Jannesari, H., Iravani, M. R., Masaeli, A., Dareshori, E. F., & Ghorbani, A. (2013). A social work study on relationship between transactional and laissez-fair leadership style and personality traits: A case study of educational system. *Management Science Letters*, *3*(3), 813-820.
20. Javalagi, A. A., Newman, D. A., & Li, M. (2024). Personality and leadership: Meta-analytic review of cross-cultural moderation, behavioral mediation, and honesty-humility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
21. Johnson, A. M., Vernon, P. A., Harris, J. A., & Jang, K. L. (2004). A behavior genetic investigation of the relationship between leadership and personality. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, *7*(1), 27-32.
22. Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(5), 751-765.
23. 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.
24. Koutsioumpa, E. (2023). Personality Traits and Leadership Effectiveness. A Mini Review. *Technium Education and Humanities*, *6*, 1-11.
25. Lim Leung, S., & Bozionelos, N. (2004). Five-factor model traits and the prototypical image of the effective leader in the Confucian culture. *Employee Relations*, *26*(1), 62-71.
26. McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2008). The five-factor theory of personality. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp. 159-181). Guilford Press.
27. Ng, K. Y., Ang, S., & Chan, K. Y. (2008). Personality and leader effectiveness: a moderated mediation model of leadership

self-efficacy, job demands, and job autonomy. *Journal of Applied psychology*, *93*(4), 733.
28. Northouse, P. G. (2018). Leadership: Theory and practice. Sage publications.
29. Prochazka, J., Vaculik, M., Smutny, P., & Jezek, S. (2018). Leader traits, transformational leadership and leader effectiveness. *Journal of East European Management Studies*, *23*(3), 474-501.
30. Simić, D., Kovačević, I., Svirčević, V., & Simić, S. (2017). 50 years of fuzzy set theory and models for supplier assessment and selection: A literature review. *Journal of Applied Logic*, *24*, 85-96.
31. Sweeney, P. J., & McFarlin, D. B. (2005). The role of personality in leadership effectiveness: A review of the literature. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 11(1), 1-12.
32. Yukl, G. (2010). Leadership in organizations. Pearson Education.
33. Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American psychologist*, *62*(1), 6.
34. Zaccaro, S. J., & Banks, D. (2004). Leader emergence and effectiveness: The role of personality. In D. V. Day, & J. Antonakis (Eds.), The nature of leadership (pp. 1-29). Sage Publications.

****