



ASIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES

Journal homepage: <https://www.sab.ac.lk/ajms/>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4038/ajms.v3i1.58>

Faculty of Management Studies
Sabaragamuwa University of Sri Lanka



The Big Five Dimensions of Personality of Bank Managers: A Study in Sri Lanka

HHDNP Opatha¹ and HHDP Janath Opatha^{2,*}

¹*Department of Human Resource Management, Faculty of Management Studies and Commerce, University of Sri Jayawardenepura, Nugegoda, Sri Lanka*

² *BBM (HRM) Researcher, Department of Human Resource Management, Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies, University of Kelaniya, Kelaniya, Sri Lanka*

ABSTRACT

One of the most useful models of personality is the Big Five Dimensions of Personality (BFDP). Regarding the BFDP, a gap exists in the empirical knowledge of the BFDP among senior bank managers in Sri Lanka. Five conceptual research questions were formulated, and they were answered through desk research. Furthermore, two empirical research questions were formulated and answered through a structured survey among 129 senior managers working in one of the largest and most successful commercial banks in Sri Lanka. The instrument used to measure the phenomenon of the BFDP was based on an operational definition, i.e., the summated rating received on a 20-item, 5-point Likert scale, and its content validity, construct validity, and internal reliability were ensured. The empirical findings revealed that, on average, senior bank managers in Sri Lanka have a BFDP to a high extent, and the degree of the BFDP of senior managers in the selected bank is higher than that of senior managers in general.

© Faculty of
Management Studies
Sabaragamuwa
University of Sri Lanka

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 10 March 2023

Accepted: 16 April 2023

Published: 31 July 2023

E-mail Address:
prabhathjanath98@gmail.com

Keywords: Human Resource Management, Organizational Behaviour, Personality, Sri Lankan Bank Manager, Big Five Dimensions

INTRODUCTION

The Big Five Dimensions of Personality (BFDP) are an important theory described and explained in Human Resource Management (HRM) and Organizational Behaviour (OB) literature. The BFDP is generally considered a vital concept that is a set of five traits or characteristics which are work-related personality traits (Greenberg and Baron, 2008). These traits are considered to be essentially possessed by managers who aspire to become successful in managing resources to accomplish organizational goals. It seems that the concept of the BFDP of Managers has been researched empirically in Sri Lanka to a little extent. In particular, it reveals a contextual gap in the empirical knowledge of the existence of the BFDP among senior managers who work in the banking sector in Sri Lanka. Theoretically, also little research exists with respect to the concept of the BFDP in the Sri Lankan literature. In addition, the researchers had an intellectual curiosity to ascertain the extent of the BFDP of Sri Lankan managers, particularly senior managers who are currently working in the banking sector the impact of which on the socio-economic development of Sri Lanka is notable.

Research Questions and Objectives

The following research questions were systematically attempted to answer in this research paper:

1. What is the BFDP?
2. Why are they important?
3. How are they measured?
4. Is there a universally accepted instrument to measure them?
5. How to conceptualize and operationalize the concept of the BFDP for this study's empirical part?
6. What are the degrees of the BFDP of senior managers or middle managers working in the bank selected for the empirical study?
7. Is the average degree of the BFDP of senior managers working in the

bank selected different from the degree of the BFDP of senior managers who are working in the banking industry?

There are two parts to this study, i.e., the conceptual part and the empirical part. The first, second, third, fourth, and fifth questions mentioned above are relevant to the conceptual part of this study while the sixth and seventh questions are in respect of the empirical part of the study. The nature of the five questions which are in the conceptual part is explorative elementarily. The sixth and seventh questions which are in the empirical part are explorative and descriptive. Consistently with the research questions of this study, the objectives of the study are:

1. To explore the definitions given by the main authors in the available OB literature for the concept of the BFDP and present a working definition of the concept.
2. To explore and present the relevant explanations as to why the concept of the BFDP is important given by the main authors in the available OB literature.
3. To explore and describe how the concept of the BFDP is measured.
4. To find whether there is a universally accepted instrument to measure the BFDP.
5. To perform a conceptualization and operationalization of the concept of the BFDP for this study's empirical part.
6. To describe the degrees of the BFDP of senior managers or middle managers working in the bank selected for the empirical study.
7. To investigate whether the average degree of the BFDP of senior managers working in the bank selected is different from the degree of the BFDP of senior managers who are working in the banking industry or not.

METHOD

This research paper is both conceptual and empirical. Desk research was carried out to answer the above-mentioned five conceptual research questions while a structured survey was conducted to answer the above-

mentioned two empirical research questions. The desk research involved doing a synthesis by combining relevant theoretical writings and/or arguments drawing from the existent literature available to the researchers and the literature was mainly based on seven well-known textbooks (authorities) in the field of OB. The survey consisted of a self-administered questionnaire that included the instrument which measured the construct of the BFDP. The instrument developed by Opatha (2015) was utilized for the empirical part of the study and its details will be given in a later section of the paper.

CONCEPTUAL STUDY

The BFDP

The first research question of the study is: What is the BFDP? Greenberg and Baron (2008) define the BFDP as five basic dimensions that are assumed to underlie many specific traits. According to them, the basic five dimensions include extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism. They identify these dimensions as our most fundamental traits of personality. Over the years, hundreds of personality traits such as sociable, anxious, curious, dependable, suspicious, talkative, and adventurous have been described, so personality experts have tried to organize them into smaller clusters, and the most widely respected clustering of personality traits is the BFDP (McShane & Glinow, 2019). In fact, they identified this clustering of personality traits as the five-factor model of personality. Alternatively, they called the “Big Five” personality dimensions which include Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, Openness to experience, and Extraversion. Kinicki and Fugate (2018) define the BFDP as five basic dimensions that simplify more complex models of personality: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience. According to Robbins and Judge (2019), a personality assessment model that describes five basic dimensions of personality is the BFDP. Huczynski and Buchanan (2019) define it as the Big Five consistent trait clusters that capture the main dimensions of personality such as openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. Colquitt, Lepine, and Wesson (2019) define it as five broad dimensions or “factors” that can be used to summarize our personalities, and those five personality dimensions include conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness to experience, and extraversion. According to Griffin,

Phillips, and Gully (2020), the BFDP is a set of five fundamental traits that are especially relevant to organizations.

Definitions of the BFDP from the above seven sources are given in Table 1. The defining of the above seven sources becomes convergent, not divergent as well as contradictory suggesting a general agreement about the domain of meaning of the concept of the BFDP. Though there are two terms as emotional stability and neuroticism among the dimensions, they are indeed the same. Neuroticism characterizes people who tend to be anxious, insecure, self-conscious, depressed, and temperamental and it refers to low emotional stability while people with low neuroticism are poised, secure, positive, and calm, and it is high emotional stability (McShane & Glinow (2013). ‘Emotional stability’ is a flip (reverse) side of neuroticism (Colquitt, Lepine, & Wesson, 2019). The Exhibit shows that the BFDP has been labeled by the authors of the seven sources in a way that is slightly different and accordingly it is a model, taxonomy, and framework of personality. Thus, we consider the BFDP as a common theory of personality. A theory can be defined as an interrelated set of statements of relationship whose purpose is to explain and predict (Davis & Cozens, 1985). We perceive that the BFDP describes five basic dimensions of personality which are relevant to organizations and high degrees of these five dimensions of the personality of personnel, particularly managers in organizations predict high job performance.

Table 1: Definitions of the BFDP from Seven Sources

Specific Name/Label	Definition	Author/s
The Big Five Dimensions of Personality	Five basic dimensions are assumed to underlie many specific traits.	Greenberg and Baron (2008)
Five-Factor Model (FFM)	The five abstract dimensions represent most personality traits: conscientiousness, emotional stability, openness to experience, agreeableness, and extroversion.	McShane and Glinow (2013)
Big Five Personality Dimensions	Five basic dimensions simplify more complex models of personality: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience.	Kinicki and Fugate (2018)
The Big Five Personality Model	A personality assessment model that describes five basic dimensions of personality.	Robbins and Judge (2019)
The Big Five	The Big Five consistent trait clusters that capture the main dimensions of personality: Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism.	Huczynski and Buchanan (2019)
The Big Five Taxonomy	Five broad dimensions or “factors” that can be used to summarize our personalities, and those five personality dimensions include conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness to	Colquitt, Lepine, and Wesson (2019)

The “Big Five” Personality Framework	experience, and extraversion. A set of five fundamental traits that are especially relevant to organizations.	Griffin, Phillips, and Gully (2020)
--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------

The Importance of the BFDP

The second research question of the study is: Why are they (the BFDP) important? Personality is important because it determines people’s preferences and individual styles of behaviour (Dunham, 1984). Preferences and behaviour styles affect significantly employees’ job satisfaction and job performance, and finally organizational performance. As the BFDP is a personality framework, it is important. Based on Barrick and Mount (1991) Luthans (2008, p. 152) writes in conclusion: *“Though many personality traits have been investigated over the years, the Big Five personality dimensions (conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, openness to experience, and emotional stability) have emerged as the most important because of their relationship with performance. However, consistent with what was discussed in this chapter, conscientiousness is the single strongest Big Five predictor of work performance. Conscientious people can be characterized as dependable, hardworking, responsible, persevering, and achievement oriented—all desirable qualities of effective, high-performing employees.”* Thus, the BFDP has a significant impact on the job performance of personnel in organizations. Personality (the psychological qualities that influence an individual’s characteristic behaviour patterns, stably and distinctively) is important for the purposes: wanting to know what kind of person we are; to understand our strengths and weaknesses; knowing how an individual deals with stress; and to know whether a person can do the job, work in a team, ‘fit’ with the organization culture, and be open to training (Huczynski & Buchanan, 2019).

Refer to Table 2 which presents the relevant explanations mostly in their writing for why the concept of the BFDP is important given by the main authors in the available OB literature (the seven sources).

Table 2: Explanations for the Importance of the BFDP from the Seven Sources

Explanations	Author/s
There are about 17,953 personality-related words found in a search of an English language dictionary in a study conducted over 60 years ago and even after combining words with similar meanings, the list contained 171 distinct traits. Thanks to the BFDP, there is no need of considering a huge number of traits to fully understand the role of personality in OB. These five dimensions emerged in many different studies conducted in many different ways according to Costa and McCare (1992).	Greenberg and Baron (2008)

As per the results found in studies of different languages, the five-factor model is fairly robust across cultures. Personality traits reflect an individual's behavioural tendencies, and therefore they are fairly good at predicting a number of workplace behaviours and outcomes, even after controlling for employee ability and other factors. Conscientiousness and emotional stability (low neuroticism) stand out as the personality traits that best predict individual performance in almost every job group.	McShane and Glinow (2013)
The Big Five personality structure is not unique to the culture in which it was developed. It can be applied in any culture. There is no compelling evidence that culture affects personality structure.	Kinicki and Fugate (2018)
Five basic dimensions underlie all others and encompass most of the significant variations in human personality. Test scores of these traits do a very good job of predicting how people behave in a variety of real-life situations. Conscientiousness affects higher performance, enhanced leadership, and greater longevity. Agreeableness affects higher performance and lower levels of deviant behavior. Openness affects enhanced training performance and enhanced leadership. Extraversion affects higher performance, enhanced leadership, and higher job and life satisfaction. Emotional stability affects higher job and life satisfaction, more adaptability to change, and lower stress levels.	Robbins and Judge (2019)
Personality is linked to success in management. By using the Big Five personality assessment, Moutafi, Furnham, and Crump (2007) studied 900 British managers from ten organizations in retailing, telecoms, manufacturing, consultancy, accounting, and legal services. Three conclusions drawn were: Conscientiousness was positively related to management success level; Neuroticism was negatively related to management success level; and Extraversion was positively related to management success level.	Huczynski and Buchanan (2019)
Personality traits are needed to describe what employees are like. Without dealing with a large number of personality adjectives (for example, 1,710 adjectives were found in the third edition of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary), Five "factors" can be used to summarize our personalities. It is a useful tool for organizational hiring.	Colquitt, Lepine, and Wesson (2019)
The framework encompasses an integrated set of traits that appear to be valid predictors of certain behaviors in certain situations. Thus, managers who can both understand the framework and assess those traits in their employees are in a good position to understand how and why they behave as they do.	Griffin, Phillips, and Gully (2020)

Measurement of the BFDP

The third research question of the study is: How are they measured? Measurement of the BFDP is essential owing to two major reasons: (i) to make decisions about candidates and employees when performing HRM functions such as selection, training, career development, health & safety management, and others; and (2) to conduct empirical research studies. A proper conceptualization as well as an adequate operationalization is indispensable for measuring an abstract concept (Davis & Cosenza, 1985; Sekaran, 1992; Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). Table 3 presents how the concept of the BFDP has been measured in the four sources in OB literature. However, three of the seven sources do not discuss measuring the BFDP.

Table 3: Details of Measurement of the BFDI given in the Four Sources

Level of Measurement or Type of Scale	Scaling Technique	Question/ Measurement Items	Sample Question Items	Author/s
Interval	Likert scale	Altogether 10, and 2 for each dimension	“I keep my room neat and clean.” “People generally find me to be extremely reliable.” (Measuring Conscientiousness); “I like lots of excitement in my life.” “I usually am very cheerful.” (Measuring Extraversion)	Greenberg and Baron (2008)
Interval	Graphic rating scale	All together 5	Each dimension is rated directly.	McShane and Glinow (2013)
Interval	Semantic differential scale	All together 15	Bipolar adjectives: quiet and talkative; tolerant and critical; disorganized and organized; tense and calm etc	Huczynski and Buchanan (2019)
Interval	Itemized rating scale	All together 20	“I get chores done right away.” “I often forget to put things back in their proper place.” (Measuring Conscientiousness); “I am the life of the party.” “I don’t talk a lot.” (Measuring Extraversion)	Colquitt, Lepine, and Wesson (2019)

According to Table 3, the level of measurement is not different in measuring the BFDI performed by the different authors considered but scaling technique, measurement items, and question items or statements become different. Furthermore, eight empirical studies in respect of the BFDI were considered to study how the concept of the BFDI has been measured. Table 4 shows measurement information derived from those 08 empirical studies. Further, it reveals that different instruments have been used by different authors.

Table 4: Measurement Information Derived from 08 Empirical Studies

Measurement	Author/s	Year
The Mini-IPIP, a 20-item short form of the 50-item International Personality Item Pool—Five-Factor Model measure originally developed by Goldberg (1992) was used and this instrument (the mini version) was developed by Donnellan, Oswald, Baird, and Lucas (2006). The interval was the level of measurement of the instrument that had a five-point Likert-type scale.	Migliore	2011
The 60-item NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) developed by Costa and McCrae in 1992 was used to measure the personality traits of managers in the Cyprus hospitality industry. Specific details were not given in the research paper.	Zopiatis and Constanti	2012

A total of 44 items for the BFDI were adapted from John and Srivastava (1999). There were 9 items for conscientiousness, 9 items for disagreeableness, 8 items for emotional stability, 8 items for extraversion, and 10 items for openness to experience. The level of measurement was interval and the instrument had a five-point Likert-type scale.	Mahmoud, Ahmad, and Poespowidjojo	2020
A measure with a 5-point Likert scale displaying: strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) was used. The question items were taken from a previous study done by one of the two authors previously. Five items were given as sample items and they were extroversion ("I am a cheerful, high-spirited person."), agreeableness ("I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate."), openness ("I often try new and foreign foods."), conscientiousness "I keep my belongings neat and clean."), and neuroticism ("I often feel tense and jittery.").	Anwar and Clau	2021
The questionnaire was designed by using the literature and findings from previous studies. Definitions used in previous studies were adopted for the study with some modifications. Information about the level of measurement, scaling technique, measurement items, and question items or statements were not available.	Awad and Al-Aseer	2021
The 44-item scale developed by John, Donahue, and Kentle in 1991 for tapping the Big Five traits was used. Six items were removed for better factor structure and reliability. Sample items are agreeableness: "I see myself as someone who is helpful and unselfish with others."; Conscientiousness "I see myself as someone who does a thorough job."; Extraversion "I see myself as someone who is talkative."; Openness to experience "I see myself as someone who is inventive."; and Neuroticism "I see myself as someone who is depressed/blue.". The level of measurement was interval and the concept was measured on a five-point Likert-type scale.	Shahzad, Raja, and Hashmi	2021
The 15-item personality scale developed by Lang, John, Ludtke, Schupp, and Wagner (2011) was used. Sample items include "I see myself as someone who has an active imagination" for measuring openness to experience, "I see myself as someone who does things efficiently" for measuring conscientiousness), "I see myself as someone who is outgoing, sociable" for measuring extraversion, "I see myself as someone who is considerate and kind to almost everyone" for measuring agreeableness, and "I see myself as someone who gets nervous easily" for measuring neuroticism. The level of measurement was interval and a five-point Likert-type scale was adopted.	Sameer and Priyadarshi	2021
The Arabic Big-Five Personality Inventory (ABFPI) was used. It had 25 items. Sample items are: "I like to socialize with people" "I have many friends" and "I am sympathetic with others". A four-point Likert-type scale was used from 1 (No), 2 (Some), 3 (Much), to 4 (Always).	Abdel-Khalek, Carson, Patel, and Shahama	2022

The fourth research question of the study is: Is there a universally accepted instrument to measure them? When Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 4 are examined, it is possible to notice that there is no universally accepted instrument to measure them. One reason may be that relevant authors or researchers are interested in developing their own measures. Another reason may be that researchers from different countries which have different cultures assume that measurement items or question items of an instrument (at least

some) developed in a foreign country (for example, USA) are difficult for local respondents to answer owing to lack of understanding or irrelevancy. Operationalizing the BFDP separately in a culture that may have different connotations seems to be better.

A Conceptualization and an Operationalization

The fifth research question of the study is: How to conceptualize and operationalize the concept of the BFDP for this study's empirical part? The BFDP is conceived as an abstract concept that needs a good conceptualization to transform it into a distinct construct that needs further adequate operationalization to make it measurable. Instead of considering a large number of traits to understand fully the personality at work, the BFDP is worthy of considering as it covers the most fundamental traits of personality which include conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability, and openness to experience. The working definition that is used for the empirical part of this study is the extent to which the manager possesses conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability, and openness to experience.

Thus, the variable, the BFDP is composed of five dimensions, and of course, theoretically, these dimensions should possess elements or subdimensions. After observing the relevant literature [particularly Greenberg and Baron (2007); and DuBrin (1997)] Opatha (2014) and Opatha (2015) identified a set of subdimensions or elements for each of the five dimensions. Exhibit 5 presents the five dimensions, definitions (working) for these five dimensions, and the identified subdimensions or elements for each dimension.

Table 5: The Big Five Dimensions, Their Definitions, and Their Sub-Dimensions

Big Dimension	Definition	Associated Traits (Sub-Dimensions)
Conscientiousness	The extent to which an individual is very careful and thorough to do his or her work properly.	Being responsible, hardworking, achievement-oriented, persevering, and painstaking.
Extraversion	The degree to which an individual is open, talkative, expressive, gregarious, and lively, not quiet and reserved.	Being social (living in groups and relating well with others), assertive, talkative, and gregarious (enjoying being with other people).
Agreeableness	The extent to which an individual is cooperative and warm (friendly).	Courteousness, flexibility, trusting, forgiving, being good-natured, soft-heartedness, and tolerance.
Emotional stability	The extent to which an individual is calm and reasonable without having frequent changes of mood.	Calmness, not being anxious, not being depressed, not being embarrassed, and the ability to control anger.
Openness to experience	The extent to which an individual is receptive (becomes ready and willing) to learn.	Being imaginative, cultured, curious, original, broad-minded, and artistically sensitive.

Note: Developed by Opatha (2015) by basing on material written by Greenberg and Baron (2007) and DuBrin (1997)

As per Table 5, each dimension has been broken down into several elements for measurement through a set of items. There are five elements for conscientiousness, four elements for extraversion, seven elements for agreeableness, five elements for emotional stability, and six elements for openness to experience. Table 6 gives the question items that tap each dimension. As per the Table, there are four items that tap each dimension. To reduce the number of question items, only four items that cover almost all the elements identified were developed.

Table 6: The Question Items for Each Dimension

Big Dimension	Question/Statement Items
Conscientiousness	1. Others consider me as hardworking.
	2. I have a strong desire to excel at work.
	3. I want to do difficult tasks better than others do.
	4. I have a habit of not giving up important tasks I started and working till completion.
Extraversion	5. I can live in groups of other people.
	6. I can relate well with others.
	7. I really enjoy being with other people.
	8. I show and express clearly and strongly my feelings, demands, opinions, and attitudes to others.
Agreeableness	9. Generally, I am courteous to others.
	10. Generally, I am warm and friendly.
	11. Generally, I tolerate others' differences although I agree or disagree with them.
	12. I have a habit of forgiving mistakes done by others.
Emotional stability	13. I am indeed a calm person.
	14. Generally, I am not nervous or worried that some bad things might happen.
	15. Hardly I get embarrassed.
	16. I have a very good ability to control anger.
Openness to experience	17. I am easily able to think of and form pictures or things which are different and exciting.
	18. I am well-educated and have good manners.
	19. I have the desire to know about things and learn them as much as possible.
	20. Generally, I don't disapprove of things and attitudes which others disapprove of.

Source: Opatha (2015)

EMPIRICAL STUDY

Instrument

The instrument developed by Opatha (2015) was used for measuring the BFDI and the instrument has five parts or sub-instruments representing each Big Five dimension. The instrument was based on an operational definition, i.e., the summated rating received on a 20-item, 5-point Likert scale. Each respondent was informed that there are 20 statements about his or her generalized psychological traits, and requested to tick the response that best fits his or her genuine evaluation about him or her: that best reflects how much he or she agrees or disagrees with each statement. The interpretation

was done by using the following scale for the overall degree of the BFDP:

Points

20 – 36	Very low on the big five
37 – 52	Low on the big five
53 – 68	Moderate on the big five
69 – 84	High on the big five
85 – 100	Very high on the big five

Essentially the instrument used should possess a type of validity called content validity (Sekaran, 1992; Opatha, 2003). The BFDP instrument used for this study was developed in a way that covered almost all the elements identified from the relevant literature. The conceptualization and operationalization procedure adopted for the study ensured that the BFDP possesses an adequate degree of content validity. According to Exploratory Factor Analysis, the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) for the construct BFDP was .76 which is above the cut-off point (0.5). Bartlett's Test for the construct (Approximate Chi-Square=784.886; df=190; Significance = .000) was also significant. Thus, the question items measuring the construct are related and it suggests good construct validity. The internal reliability of the instrument was adequate as Cronbach's coefficient alpha value was .75. Furthermore, the instrument had the following qualities which too contributed to increasing the goodness of the instrument.

1. There were 20 items measuring the construct rather than using only a few items such as 3 or 5.
2. Each dimension had 4 items and therefore consistency existed.
3. The wording of the items did not include jargon, double-barreled items, and unclear ones.
4. Some items were negatively worded to minimize the tendency of respondents to mechanically check the items toward one end of the scale.

Respondents

There are several large banks in Sri Lanka and for the study purpose, the largest commercial bank in Sri Lanka was selected. Indeed, it is the most

profitable commercial bank in Sri Lanka and the first author of this research paper served as a resource person for the bank. The bank has been highly successful since its commencement. In the bank, the managerial hierarchy consists of Management Trainee, Junior Executive, Executive, Senior Executive, Assistant Manager, Manager, Senior Manager, Chief Manager, Assistant General Manager, Deputy General Manager, and General Manager. Out of these jobs, the job of senior manager is critical and it is in the bank's middle management. All senior managers were taken as the respondents for the study without considering all the types of managers by following the principle of parsimony. About 130 middle managers were working at the time of doing the research's empirical part and data were collected from all. Senior managers are key managerial employees for the success of the bank and they need to have the potential to assume responsibilities of higher jobs in the future. It was possible to collect data from 129 Senior Managers.

Study Design Decisions

The unit of analysis is one of the study design decisions and it was the individual level, i.e., Senior Manager. As the data were collected only at one point in time, the time horizon of the study was cross-sectional. This study was neither relational nor causal. The study setting was non-contrived as there were no manipulation and control of variables.

Hypothesis

For the purpose of making the study scientific to a certain extent, a descriptive hypothesis was formulated. A descriptive hypothesis typically states the existence, size, form, or distribution of some variable (Emory & Cooper, 1991). The selected bank has been more successful financially for a considerable number of years compared with other commercial banks in Sri Lanka. To enter the managerial hierarchy of the bank there are higher qualification requirements for applicants to apply for the entry-level job, management trainee, and selection is very competitive and rigorous. The main qualification category for a Management Trainee is a Degree with a minimum 2nd Class (Upper Division) or Grade Point Average (GPA) with a minimum of 3.5 out of a maximum of 4.0 points obtained from a local or foreign University recognized by the University Grants Commission of Sri Lanka, in any of the subjects or disciplines which include Economics; Statistics, Mathematics, Physical Science; Accountancy, Banking, Finance;

Engineering; Commerce or Business Administration (Accounting/Finance); Computer Science or Information Technology; Management (Public/Financial/Accountancy/Business); Marketing; Human Resources; Law; Valuation; International Business; and Agriculture. The selection procedure has a competitive examination and an interview. Numerical Skills and IQ, General Knowledge and IT, English Language, and Verbal Reasoning (Structured and MCQ Questions) are tested in four question papers. Relatively these higher requirements are not seen in other commercial banks. Furthermore, the senior managers who work as middle managers in the bank which is one of the largest and most highly successful banks in Sri Lanka have a higher opportunity of getting more exposure and experience compared with other commercial banks in the country. Hence it is assumed that they should possess a higher degree of BFDP. Relatively, annual targets in respect of key result areas of job performance are more serious and competitive and, managers are evaluated according to the degree of accomplishing the targets. Thus, the following hypothesis was formulated for the empirical part of the study.

Alternative Hypothesis: The degree of the BFDP of senior managers in the selected bank is different from that of senior managers in general.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference in the BFDP between senior managers in the selected bank and senior managers in general.

The Degree of the BFDP of Senior Managers under Study

The sixth research question of the study is: What are the degrees of the BFDP of senior managers or middle managers working in the bank selected for the empirical study? The data collection was done from 129 senior managers in the selected bank. The descriptive statistics are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics

Mean	4.2093
Standard Deviation	.46224
Minimum	3
Maximum	5
Range	2

As per Table 7, the mean of the PFDP of senior managers under the study was 4.2093 revealing a finding that the majority of senior managers in

the bank are having a high degree of BFDP. In other words, on average, senior managers possess a high degree in terms of the BFDP. The standard deviation is .46224 which is less than 1. It suggests that the dispersion is not much and most of the senior managers are centered on the measure of central tendency, i.e., the mean. Frequencies are provided in Table 8.

Table 8: Frequencies of the BFDP

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 3	03	2.3	2.3	2.3
4	96	74.4	74.4	76.7
5	30	23.3	23.3	100.0
Total	129	100.0	100.0	

As per the above table, there are no responses in terms of 1 and 2 values. The first row is for the composite response *moderate degree of the BFDP* (coded in the data with the value 3). The second row is for the composite response *high degree of the BFDP* (coded in the data with the value 4). The third row is for the composite response *very high degree of the BFDP* (coded with the value 5). Only 3 senior managers are having a moderate degree of BFDP and the percentage of such managers is 2.3. 96 senior managers are having a high degree of BFDP and as a percentage, it is 74.4. 'Being very high' degree includes 30 senior managers and they produce a percentage of 30. 96 of senior managers have a high degree of BFDP. Thus, the degrees of the BFDP of senior managers or middle managers working in the bank selected for the empirical study are moderate, high, and very high, not low or very low. However, the majority of senior managers are high in terms of the BFDP.

Hypothesis Testing

The seventh research question of the study is: Is the average degree of the BFDP of senior managers working in the bank selected different from the degree of the BFDP of senior managers who are working in the banking industry? Based on the assumption that senior managers working in the bank selected for the study should possess a higher degree of BFDP, an alternative hypothesis was formulated and it was: Degree of the BFDP of senior managers in the selected bank is different from that of senior managers in general. The hypothesis is about a single mean, and therefore the appropriate technique for the purpose of testing the validity of the alternative hypothesis was the One-sample t-test (Norusis, 1997). The text value was taken as 3 assuming that the degree of the BFDP of senior managers working in other

banks is moderate. The results of the One-sample t-test are presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Frequencies of the BFDP

Test Value = 3							
Degree of Internality	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
	29.714	128	.000	1.20930	Lower	Upper	
					1.1288	1.2898	

As per Table 9 the difference between the observed mean and the hypothetical population mean of 3 (labeled Test Value) is 1.20930. For the sample that consisted of 129 senior managers, the average degree of the BFDP was 4.2093 which is higher than the hypothesized 3. The observed t-statistic is 29.714 which is higher than the appropriate table value which is 1.960. This suggests that the mean difference is significant. The observed significance level (.000) is higher than the .05 level. Thus, it is possible to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is a significant difference in the degree of the BFDP between senior managers in the bank under study and senior managers in general. In fact, the degree of the BFDP of senior managers in the selected bank is higher than that of senior managers in general.

CONCLUSION

The variable of BFDP is a critical factor in explaining the job performance of managerial personnel. A systematic study was carried out to know some details of the concept of BFDP and to explore and describe the degrees of the BFDP of senior managers in a Sri Lankan commercial bank which is the largest and the most successful bank in the country. The study had a conceptual part and an empirical part as well. In line with the seven research questions asked at the beginning of the study, the findings are: the concept of BFDP includes conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness to experience, and extraversion which are the most fundamental traits of personality especially relevant to organizations; the concept of BFDP is important because they (dimensions) affect significantly employees' job performance and job satisfaction and are useful for taking right decisions about employee selection and training; the BFDP can be measured in different

ways but there should be a sound conceptualization and an operationalization; there is no universally accepted instrument to measure the BFDP; the working definition for the BFDP was the extent to which the manager possesses conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness to experience, and extraversion. It was operationalized in the way that it has 5 dimensions, 27 elements, and 20 question items; the degrees of the BFDP of senior managers or middle managers working in the bank selected for the empirical study were moderate, high, and very high, not low or very low. Furthermore, the majority of senior managers possessed a high degree of BFDP; and the degree of the BFDP of senior managers in the selected bank is higher than that of senior managers in general.

This research paper is of theoretical value in the sense that it provides a synthesis of the concept of the BFDP, particularly in the Sri Lankan literature. It has an empirical contribution in the sense that it provides empirical evidence with regard to the degrees of the BFDP among senior managers working in the bank selected for the study. As far as the particular bank is concerned, there are only 30 senior managers who have a very high degree of the BFDP out of 129 implying that the majority of managers are supposed to improve their individual degrees of the BFDP to the level that is very high. A proper training and development program for the purpose can be formulated and implemented. As a suggestion for future research studies, it will be better to study the degrees of the BFDP among all the managers working in the bank and to make a comparison. Furthermore, it is suggested to do an empirical investigation of the degrees of the BFDP of senior managers in other commercial banks and to make a comparison. It will be useful to know empirically whether managers in more successful banks are higher in terms of the BFDP compared with managers who are less successful in commercial banks by taking a larger sample representing all the commercial banks. In the Sri Lankan context, it is possible to conduct future studies which consider the BFDP as an explanator (for example, of bank managers' job performance), as a mediator (for example, on the relationship between bank managers' leading and their job performance), and as a moderator (for example, on the relationship between locus of control of bank managers and their job performance).

REFERENCES

- Abdel-Khalek, A.M., Carson, J., Patel, A., & Shahama, A. (2022). The Big Five Personality Traits as predictors of life satisfaction in Egyptian college students. *Nordic Psychology*, DOI: 10.1080/19012276.2022.2065341
- Anwar, M., & Clau, T. (2021). Personality traits and bricolage as drivers of sustainable social responsibility in family SMEs: A COVID-19 perspective. *Business and Society Review*, 126, 37–68.
- Awwad, M. S., & Al-Aseer, R.M.N. (2021). Big Five personality traits impact on entrepreneurial intention: the mediating role of entrepreneurial alertness. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 15(1), 87-100.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1-25.
- Colquitt, J. A., Lepine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2019). *Organizational Behaviour: Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace*. 6th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Costa, P. T., & McCare, R. R. (1992). *The NEO-PI Personality Inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Davis, D., & Cosenza, R. M. (1985). *Business Research for Decision Making*. Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing Company.
- Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., & Lucas, R. E. (2006). The Mini-IPIP scales: tiny-yet-effective measures of the big five factors of personality”, *Psychological Assessment*, 18(2), 192-203.
- DuBrin, A. J. (1997). *Human Relations: Interpersonal Job-Oriented Skills*. 6th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Dunham, R. B. (1984). *Organizational Behavior*. Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Emory, C. W., & Cooper, D. R. (1991). *Business Research Methods*. Boston: IRWIN.

- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development markers for the big-five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4(1), 26-42.
- Greenberg, J. and Baron, R.A. (2008). *Behavior in Organizations*. (9th Ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Griffin, R. W., Phillips, J. M., & Gully, S. M. (2020). *Organizational Behaviour: Managing People and Organizations*. 13th Ed. Boston: Cengage Learning, Inc.
- Huczynski, A. A., & Buchanam, D. A. (2019). *Organizational Behaviour*. 10th Ed. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The “Big Five” Inventory – Versions 4a and 5a*. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 2, 102–138. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kinicki, A., & Fugate, M. (2018). *Organizational Behaviour: A Practical, Problem-Solving Approach*. (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Education.
- Lang, F. R., John, D., Ludtke, O., Schupp, J., & Wagner, G. G. (2011). Short assessment of the big five: robust across survey methods except telephone interviewing, *Behavior Research Methods*, 43(2), 548-567.
- Luthans, F. (2008). *Organizational Behaviour*. (11th Ed.). Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Moutafi, J., Furnham, A., & Crump, J. (2007). Is managerial level related to personality? *British Journal of Management*, 18(3), 272–280.
- McShane, S. L., & Glinow, M. A. V. (2019). *Organizational Behaviour*. (4th Ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Education.

- Migliore, L. N. (2011). Relation between big five personality traits and Hofstede's cultural dimensions: Samples from the USA and India, *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 18(1), 38-54.
- Norusis, M. J. (1997). *SPSS 7.5 Guide to Data Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2003). *Research Methods for HRM*. Colombo: Author Publication.
- Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2014). *Personality Development*. HETC Project, Ministry of Higher Education, Sri Lanka.
- Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2015). *Organizational Behaviour: The Human Side of Work*. Colombo: Department of HRM, University of Sri Jayewardenepura.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational Behaviour*. 18th Ed. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Sameer, S. K., & Priyadarshi, P. (2021). Role of Big Five personality traits in regulatory-focused job crafting. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 10(3), 377-395.
- Sekaran, U. (1992). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*. (3rd Ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*. 5th Ed, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- 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.
- Zopiatis, A., & Constanti, P. (2012). Extraversion, openness and conscientiousness: The route to transformational leadership in the hotel industry. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 33(1), 86-104.