



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

The Relationship between Personality, Gender and Hotel Department: The Case of Alanya

Yıldız, Sevcan and Üngüren, Engin and Polat, Cihan

Akdeniz University, Akdeniz University, Akdeniz University

25 May 2008

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/25304/>

MPRA Paper No. 25304, posted 23 Sep 2010 14:35 UTC

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY, GENDER AND HOTEL DEPARTMENTS: APPLICATION OF 16 PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ALANYA REGION IN TURKEY

Sevcan Yıldız
Akdeniz University

Engin Üngüren
Akdeniz University

Cihan Polat
Akdeniz University

This study evaluates relationship between personality, gender and departments of a random sample of 91 employees working in 5-star hotels in the Alanya Region of Turkey. Evaluation was conducted using Cattell's 16 PF (Sixteen Personality Factor) questionnaire. T-test assessed the relationship between personality and gender and one-way Anova analysed personality and department relationship. Results indicate that in the relationship between personality and gender there were significant variance for the openness to change. 16 PF showed significant differences for openness to change, vigilance, privateness and perfectionism subscales, in terms of personality and department relationship.

Key words: *Personality Tests, 16 PF, Tourism, Hotels*

INTRODUCTION

In today's highly competitive commercial world, amongst production factors such as management, labor, technology, capital and natural resources, human related issues of 'management and labor', have increasing importance. In order to gain commercial success, recruiting the right person at the right time to the right establishment, with the right applications and procedures, are of critical importance. When selecting the right person, in other words, identifying the appropriate personality,



the use of personality tests should be considered. Recognition of the importance and use of personality tests is common, especially in implementing recruitment, selection and development processes (Furnham and Drakeley, 2000: 103).

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, use of personality tests gained increasing interest (Dakin et al., 1994: 3). 'Personality' as a concept is not easily definable. It can be described as ways of thinking, feeling and behaving by individual's to their surroundings (Huczyski and Buchanan, 1991). Other definitions include personality as characterised by differences between individuals (www.dbe-online.com: reachingdate:25.09.2007). Personality can be considered as a total sum of psychological aspects that can be used to categorize individuals. It is dynamic, and has a continous development process. Normally there is little change in the personality of individuals over time. According to conditions, however, individuals will change and behave accordingly. But in terms of personality, there is little change (www.isgucdergi.org: reachingdate:11.07.2007). The different reactions of individuals to events, indicate differences in individuals in terms of their unique personality.

There are four significant factors affecting personality: physical appearance, the role of individuals, potential energy, and morals. Additionally, it is recognized that 'community aspects' and the individual *per se* must considered (Eren, 2000: 67,68). According to the related literature, personality has been investigated from different perspectives, including traits, social-cognitive approaches and goal orientation. (Zweig and Webster, 2004: 1693). Some psychologists argue that personality is determined by parental genes , whilst others prefer that personality is affected by environmental , cultural and social factors (Huczynski and Buchanan, 1991).

Whilst the literature includes studies regarding personality and gender and relationships in general, there appears to be no research addressing personality and department relationships. For the tourism sector, there appears to be no research focussing on the relationship between personality, gender and departments. These authors' believe that this study will contribute important insights to the literature. Typical gender related studies can be summarized as follows: Jenkins (1994), Brownell (1994) (Ladkin, 1999: 179), Prosser and Robinson (1997), Gould and Penley (1984); regarding female career paths, there is Melamed (1995), and for gender, human capital and career (Tokar et al., 1998: 127). On managerial style and behaviour, there is Caligiuri and Cascio (1998), Adler and Izraeli (1995) (Guthrie et al., 2003: 233). On

earnings, Bowles et al. (2001), Thoresen and Barricle (1999) and (Semykina and Linz, 2007: 388).

IMPORTANCE OF PERSONALITY AND PERSONALITY TESTS IN THE TOURISM SECTOR

It is widely recognized that the tourism sector is labor-intensive, therefore, having the right personnel with the 'right personality' is very important. Jobs in the tourism sector require 24 hours service to customers. As Kim et al. (2007) have identified, despite of the importance of personnel in tourism activities, few researches have been completed on *personality*. In job descriptions, skills and abilities are invariably defined, but greater attention is needed in terms of quantifying personality, attitudes and values (Johns et al., 2007: 147).

Personnel recruitment processes, especially the actions of human resource managers, should align to selection of the appropriate person who is suited with company image, tourism sector realities, and customer needs and expectations. In this context, personnel selection can benefit from personality tests. There are many personality tests, for example: California Psychological Inventory, Comrey Personality Scales, Employment Inventory, Hogan Personality Inventory, Jackson Personality Inventory, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Occupational Personality Questionnaire, Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (4th and 5th edition), Personality Research Form, etc. (Goffin and Christiansen, 2003: 341).

In this study, Cattell's 16 PF (Sixteen Personality Factor) Questionnaire 5th edition was used. Cattell's questionnaire is based on 16 personality factors : warmth, reasoning, emotional stability, dominance, liveliness, rule-consciousness, social boldness, sensitivity, vigilance, abstractedness, privateness, apprehension, openness to change, self-reliance, perfectionism, and tension. Cattell's work was heavily based on the prior studies of numerous researchers. Undoubtedly he has made valuable contributions to aspects of industrial psychology (www.personalityresearch.org/papers/fehringer.html:reachingdate:04.07.2007). Cattell's questionnaire can be applied to an individual or to a group of people; it has been used worldwide for more than thirty years (Clarke et al., 1994: 393). Cattell's 16 PF has been used in such countries as Australia, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, and New Zealand (Konuk, 1996: 10). Academicians that have used 16 PF include Dale (1995), Muller (1994), Swanepoel and Van Oudtshoorn (1988) and (Prinsloo and Ebersöhn, 2002: 49).

APPLICATION OF 16 PF QUESTIONNAIRE

Cattell's sixteen personality factor (16 PF) questionnaire was used for a group of 91 employees from two different 5-star hotel chains operating in the Alanya Region of Turkey.

Objectives of the Study

This study has two main objectives, namely gaining understanding of the rationale of human resource managers when using personality tests, and identifying the relationship between personality, gender and departments.

Methodology

Identifying the relationship between personality, gender and departments involved 187 items for 16 personality factors: specifically, warmth, reasoning, emotional stability, dominance, liveliness, rule-consciousness, social boldness, sensitivity, vigilance, abstractedness, privateness, apprehension, openness to change, self-reliance, perfectionism and tension.

For a Turkish version of the 16 PF questionnaire, these authors have benefited from Emre Konuk's (1996) study. In calculating 16 factors, raw scores were used. In finding raw scores, every item score was added and divided by the number of items. In Table 1 the 16 personality factors and their related items are shown.

Table 1. 16 Personality Factors and their Related Items in the Questionnaire

Warmth	3,26,27,51,52,76,101,126,151,176
Reasoning	28,53,54,77,78,102,103,127,128,152,153,177,178
Emotional Stability	4,5,29,30,55,79,80,104,105,129,130,154,179
Dominance	1,6,31,32,56,57,81,106,131,155,156,180,181,
Liveliness	8,33,58,82,83,107,108,132,133,157,158,182,183
Rule-	9,34,59,84,109,134,159,160,184,185

Consciousness	
Social Boldness	10,35,60,85,110,135
Sensitivity	11,12,37,62,87,112,137,138,162,163
Vigilance	13,38,63,64,88,89,113,114,139,164
Abstractedness	14,15,39,40,65,90,115,140,165
Privateness	16,17,41,42,66,67,92,117,142,167
Apprehension	18,19,43,44,68,69,93,94,118,119,143,144,168
Openness to Change	20,45,70,95,120,145,169,170
Self-reliance	22,47,71,72,96,97,121,122,146,171
Perfectionism	23,24,48,73,98,123,147,148,172,173
Tension	25,49,50,74,75,99,100,124,125,149,150,174,175

In addition to Table 1, the scores of each item is shown in Appendix 1.

Data from a 5-star hotel was collected using 105 questionnaire randomly distributed to employees (on 12.04.2008). A total of 91 questionnaires were returned by 19.04.2008. All types of employees (doormen to general manager) from all departments (housekeeping to sales & marketing) completed the questionnaires. Rate of return was %95,5 per cent. The distribution of replied questionnaires was as follows:

By using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), results of Cattell's 16 PF were analyzed.

Findings

In terms of gender, the differences between 16 PF subscales total scores were used to calculate the t test for independent groups. The result show that there are significant differences for dominance, rule-consciousness, sensitivity and self-reliance subscale total scores. T Test results are given in Table 2.

Table 2. T Test Results For Openness to Change

Variables	Level	N	\bar{X}	S	df	t	p
Openness to Change	Male	70	5,33	2,1	91	-2,179	0,032
	Female	21	6,52	2,4			

$p < 0.05$

Table 2 shows there is a significant difference between males and females for dominance subscale [$t_{(91)} = -2,179$; $p < 0.05$]. It can be argued that the male's average score is higher than that for females ($\bar{x} = 5,33$). It may be said that, "Openness to Change" subscale point average is higher than male. Tourism industry is dynamic and high employee turnover rates by its structure. From that reason in order to correspond of customer and company's needs, employee should always follow new development, actualize of them and improve themselves in accordance with necessity of period. The reason of high Openness to Change of female may be the necessity of them to show more effort than males in order to be more successful in the workplace than their male counterparts with their existing social roles.

For other subscales in 16 PF, there is no significant difference between total scores, in terms of gender. In other words, there is no significant difference between males and females in terms of warmth subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,748$; $p > 0.05$], reasoning subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,961$; $p > 0.05$], dominance subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,081$; $p > 0.05$], emotional subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,479$; $p > 0.05$], liveliness subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,114$; $p > 0.05$], Rule-Consciousness subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,369$; $p > 0.05$], social boldness subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,069$; $p > 0.05$], Sensitivity subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,787$; $p > 0.05$], vigilance subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,918$; $p > 0.05$], abstractedness subscale [$t_{(257)} = 0,109$; $p > 0.05$], privateness subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,590$; $p > 0.05$], apprehension subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,473$; $p > 0.05$], Self-reliance subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,069$; $p > 0.05$], perfectionism subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,832$; $p > 0.05$], and tension subscale [$t_{(91)} = 0,750$; $p > 0.05$].

One-way Anova analysis was completed to find the difference between 16 PF subscale total scores for departments. The result shows that there are significant differences for Vigilance, Privateness, Openness to Change and Perfectionism subscales. The results of one-way Anova is given in Table 3.

Table 3. One-Way Anova Results for Departments

Variable	Level	N	\bar{X}	S	KT	sd	KO	F	p	
Vigilance (L)	General	1	14,00		Between Groups	119,726	9	13,303	2,731	,008
	Managerial	4	9,50	2,517						
	Accounting	19	10,26	2,281	Within Groups	514,286	90			
	F&B	19	9,21	1,584						
	Housekeeping	1	3,00		Total					
	g Human	5	12,20	2,490						
	Resource	10	9,10	3,107						
	Security	8	8,63	1,685						
	Front office	3	9,00	1,732						
	Technical	21	9,43	2,226						
	Service									
	Animation									
	Kitchen									
Privateness (N)	General	1	5,00		Between Groups	171,505	9	19,056	2,584	,011
	Managerial	4	9,75	2,217						
	Accounting	19	10,26	3,142	Within Groups	768,747	90			
	F&B	19	8,42	2,063						
	Housekeeping	1	6,00		Total					
	g Human	5	10,60	2,793						
	Resource	10	11,50	3,598						
	Security	8	11,00	2,070						
	Front office	3	6,33	,577						
	Technical	21	8,76	2,737						
	Service									
	Animation									
	Kitchen									
Openness to Change (Q1)	General	1	6,00		Between Groups	102,718	9	11,413	2,619	,010
	Managerial	4	5,25	2,754						
	Accounting	19	5,16	2,410	Within Groups	455,758	90			
	F&B	19	6,53	2,412						
	Housekeeping	1	4,00		Total					
	g Human	5	4,20	2,387						
	Resource	10	7,60	1,506						
	Security	8	4,88	1,808						
	Front office	3	7,33	2,082						
	Technical	21	4,71	1,521						
	Service									
	Animation									
	Kitchen									
Perfectionism (Q3)	General	1	13,00		Between Groups	95,742	9	10,638	2,445	,016
	Managerial	4	11,25	2,217						
	Accounting	19	12,32	2,162	Within Groups	448,110	90			
	F&B	19	11,00	2,582						
	Housekeeping	1	13,00		Total					
	g Human	5	11,20	1,095						
	Resource	10	11,20	2,044						
	Security	8	10,63	1,768						
	Front office	3	8,33	2,082						
	Technical	21	12,86	1,740						
	Service									
	Animation									
	Kitchen									

p<0.05

Average scores of 'Vigilance' subscale have significant differences in terms of working departments [$F=2,731;p<0.01$]. Average scores of 'Privateness' subscale have significant difference, in terms of working departments [$F=2,584;p<0.01$]. One-way Anova analysis was used to identify the difference between average scores, in terms of 'Openness to Change' subscale. The result shows that average scores have significant differences in terms of working departments [$F=2,619;p<0.01$]. Identifying the differences between average scores, in terms of 'Perfectionism' subscale, one-way Anova analysis was used. Results show that there are significant differences between 'dominance' average score for departments [$F=2,445;p<0.01$].

For other subscales in 16 PF, there are no significant differences between departments: in terms of 'Warmth' subscale [$F=1,875;p<0.01$]; 'Reasoning' subscale [$F=1,057;p<0.01$]; 'Emotional Stability' subscale [$F=1,239;p<0.01$]; 'Dominance' subscale [$F=1,792;p<0.01$]; 'liveliness' subscale [$F=1,951;p<0.01$]; 'rule-consciousness' subscale [$F=1,729;p<0.01$]; 'Social Boldness' subscale [$F=1,565;p<0.01$]; 'sensitivity' subscale [$F=1,883;p<0.01$]; 'Abstractedness' subscale [$F=0,972;p<0.01$]; 'Apprehension' subscale [$F=0,934;p<0.01$]; 'self-reliance' subscale [$F=1,724;p<0.01$] and 'Tension' subscale [$F=1,712;p<0.01$].

CONCLUSION

The research results of personality and organizational behaviours show that personality is the most important factor in an individual's behaviour. It is complex to understand individuals. Individuals can be considered as a "closed box". In order to benefit from humans in an efficient and productive way, human resource managers, especially, should try to understand personalities of their employees. With this study, the authors' consider the interests of human resource managers in the context of personality subject /tests.

As a Turkish society, having higher averages than other cultures, in terms of 'warmth', 'social boldness', 'rule-consciousness' and 'sensitivity' subscales can be evaluated as an advantage of Turkish culture. These advantages can be / must be used in the tourism sector.

From the results it can be concluded that gender or departmental differences in a way, have some advantages for individuals during recruitment process.

This study benefitted from Cattell's 16 PF questionnaire. The relationship between personality, gender and departments of sampled hotel employees were considered. Our study can be considered as an important contribution in personality tests in the Turkish tourism sector. However, as a limitation, it is not possible to generalize our findings.

REFERENCES

- Clarke, I.M.C. et al. (1994). "Personality Factors and the practice of Anaesthesia: A Psychometric Evaluation". *Canadian Journal of ANAESTHESIA*, Vol. 41, No.5, pp.393-399.
- Dakin, S., Nilakant V. & Jensen R. (1994). "The Role of Personality Testing in Managerial Selection". *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 9, No.5, pp.3-11.
- Eren, E. (2000). *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım.
- Furnham, A. & Drakeley, R. (2000). "Predicting Occupational Personality Test Scores". *The journal of Psychology*, Vol. 134, No.1, pp.103-111.
- Goffin, R.D. & Christiansen, N.D. (2003). "Correcting Personality Tests for Faking: A Review of Popular Personality Tests and An Initial Survey of Researchers". *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 11 No.1/2, pp.340-344.
- Guthrie, J.P., Ronald A.A. & Stevens, C.D. (2003). "Are Women "Better" Than Men? Personality Differences and Expatriate Selection". *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 18, No.3, pp.229-243.
- Huczynski, A.A. & Buchanan, D.A. (1991). *Organizational Behaviour*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Johns, N., Henwood, J. & Seaman, C. (2007). "Culture and Service Predisposition Among Hospitality Students In Switzerland and scotland". *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 19, No.2, pp.146-158.
- Kim, H.J., Shin, K.H. & Umbreit, W.T. (2007). "Hotel Job Burnout: The Role of Personality Characteristics". *Hospitality Management*, Vol. 26, pp.421-434.
- Konuk, E. (1996). "The Development of The Turkish Form, Test-Retest Reliability and Validity Studies of The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 PF)", *Master Thesis*, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul: 10, 85-96.
- Ladkin, A. (1999). "Hotel General Managers: A Review of Prominent Research Themes". *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 1, pp.167-193.
- Prinsloo, C.H. & Ebersöhn, I. (2002). "Fair Usage of the 16 PF in Personality Assessment in South Africa: A Response to Abrahams and Mauer With Special Reference to Issues of Research Methodology". *S.Afr. Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 32, No.3, pp.48-57.

- Semykina, A. & Linz, S.J. (2007). "Gender Differences in Personality and Earnings: Evidence From Russia". *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol. 28, pp.387-410.
- Tokar, D.M., Fischer, A.R. & Mezydlo Subich, L. (1998). "Personality and Vocational Behavior: A Selective Review of the Literature, 1993-1997". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 53, pp.115-153.
- Zweig, D. & Webster, J. (2004). "What are We Measuring? An Examination of the Relationships Between The Big-Five Personality Traits, Goal Orientation and Performance Intentions". *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 36, pp.1693-1708.
- www.dbe-online.com. Accessed the 25th of September 2007.
- www.isgucdergi.org. Accessed the 11th of July 2007.
- www.personalityresearch.org/papers/fehringer.html. Accessed the 4th of July 2007.

Appendix 1: Scores of Each Item

1*	a: yes	b: uncertain	c: no
2*	a: yes	b: uncertain	c: no
3	a: in a sociable suburb: 2	b: in between: 1	c: alone in the deep woods: 0
4	a: always: 2	b: generally: 1	c: seldom: 0
5	a: yes (true): 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: no (false): 2
6	a: yes: 0	b: sometimes: 1	c: no: 2
7	a: generally: 2	b: sometimes: 1	c: never: 0
8	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2
9	a: leave them to settle it: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: reason with them: 2
10	a: readily come forward: 2	b: in between: 1	c: prefer to stay quietly in the background: 0
11	a: a construction engineer: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: a writer of plays: 2
12	a: true: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 0
13	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
14	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
15	a: agree: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: disagree: 2
16	a: yes: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 2
17	a: only if necessary: 2	b: in between: 1	c: readily, whenever I have a chance: 0
18	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
19	a: have no feeling of guilt: 0	b: in between: 1	c: still feel a bit guilty: 2
20	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
21	a: heart: 0	b: feelings and reason equally: 1	c: head: 2
22	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
23	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2
24	a: to say things, just as they occur to me: 0	b: in between: 1	c: to get my thoughts well organized first: 2
25	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
26	a: a carpenter or cook: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: a waiter or waitress in a good restaurant: 2
27	a: only a few offices: 0	b: several: 1	c: many offices: 2
28	a: sharp: 0	b: cut: 1	c: point: 0
29	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2
30	a: true: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 0
31	a: only after considerable discussion: 0	b: in between: 1	c: promptly: 2
32	a: true: 0	b: in between: 1	c: false: 2
33	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
34	a: just accept it: 0	b: in between: 1	c: get disgusted and annoyed: 2
35	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
36	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
37	a: music: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: handwork and crafts: 0
38	a: yes: 2	b: sometimes: 1	c: no: 0
39	a: help their children develop their affections: 2	b: in between: 1	c: teach their children how to control emotions: 0
40	a: try to improve arrangements: 2	b: in between: 1	c: keep the records and see that rules are followed: 0
41	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
42	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
43	a: true: 2	b: in between: 1	c: false: 0
44	a: make it a chance to ask for something I want: 0	b: in between: 1	c: fear I've done something wrong: 2
45	a: more steady and "solid" citizens: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: more "idealists" with plans for a better world: 2
46	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
47	a: occasionally: 2	b: fairly often: 1	c: a great deal: 0
48	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
49	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
50	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0

Sevcan Yıldız, Engin Üngüren & Cihan Polat

51	a: a forester: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: a high school teacher: 2
52	a. like to give personal presents: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: feel that buying presents is a bit of a nuisance: 0
53	a: smile: 0	b: success: 1	c: happy: 0
54	a: candle: 0	b: moon: 1	c: electric light: 0
55	a: hardly ever: 2	b: occasionally: 1	c: quite a lot: 0
56	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
57	a: true: 0	b: in between: 1	c: false: 2
58	a: more than once a week (more than average): 2	b: about once a week (average): 1	c: less than once a week (less than average): 0
59	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2
60	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
61	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
62	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
63	a: try to calm that person down: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: get irritated: 2
64	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2
65	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
66	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
67	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2
68	a: very rarely: 0	b: in between: 1	c: quite often: 2
69	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
70	a: kept my own opinion: 2	b: in between: 1	c: accepted their authority: 0
71	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
72	a: true: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 0
73	a: true: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 0
74	a: often: 2	b: occasionally: 1	c: never: 0
75	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
76	a: working on it in the laboratory: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: selling it to people: 2
77	a: brave: 0	b: anxious: 0	c: terrible: 1
78	a: 3/7: 0	b: 3/9: 1	c: 3/11: 0
79	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2
80	a: often: 0	b: occasionally: 1	c: never: 2
81	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
82	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
83	a: true: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 0
84	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
85	a: quite often: 0	b: occasionally: 1	c: hardly ever: 2
86	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
87	a: a realistic account of military or political battles: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: a sensitive, imaginative novel: 2
88	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
89	a: true: 0	b: in between: 1	c: false: 2
90	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
91	a: read something profound, but interesting: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: pass the time talking casually with a fellow: 0
92	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
93	a: it doesn't upset me a bit: 0	b: in between: 1	c: I tend to get downhearted: 2
94	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
95	a: a fixed certain salary: 0	b: in between: 1	c: to rely on the actual news reports: 2
96	a: to discuss issues with people: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
97	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
98	a: true: 2	b: in between: 1	c: false: 0
99	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
100	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2

101	a: talking to customers: 2	b: in between: 1	c: keeping office accounts and records: 0
102	a: prison: 0	b: sin: 0	c: stealing: 1
103	a: qp: 0	b: bq: 1	c: tu: 0
104	a: keep quiet: 2 a: can keep my mind on the music and not be bothered: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: despise them: 0 c: find is spoils my enjoyment and annoys me: 0
105	a: polite and quiet: 0	b: in between: 1	c: forceful: 2
106	a: yes: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 2
107	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2 c: assume I can handle them when they come: 0
108	a: try to plan ahead, before I meet them: 2	b: in between: 1	c: false: 0
109	a: true: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
110	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: in charge of efficiency engineering: 0
111	a: a guidance worker helping young people find jobs: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
112	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
113	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
114	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
115	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 0
116	a: true: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: "apparently that person is misinformed": 0
117	a: "that person is a liar"2	b: in between: 1	c: never: 0
118	a: often: 2	b: occasionally: 1	c: no: 0
119	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
120	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: not at all: 2
121	a: a lot: 0	b: somewhat: 1	c: on my own: 2
122	a: with a committee: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: never: 2
123	a: often: 0	b: occasionally: 1	c: no: 0
124	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
125	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: a navigator or pilot: 0
126	a: a lawyer: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: quickest: 1
127	a: fast: 0	b: best: 0	c: xxxo: 0
128	a: oxxx: 0	b: oxxx: 1	c: false: 2
129	a: true: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
130	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
131	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
132	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
133	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
134	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
135	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
136	a: show my emotions as I wish: 2	b: in between: 1	c: keep my emotions to myself: 0
137	a: light, dry and brisk: 0	b: in between: 1	c: emotional and sentimental: 2
138	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
139	a: let it go: 0	b: in between: 1	c: give people a chance to hear it again: 2
140	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
141	a: yes: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 2
142	a: yes: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 2
143	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
144	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2 c: wish that it would be smoothed over: 0
145	a: like to see a "winner"2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
146	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
147	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
148	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
149	a: yes: 2	b: sometimes: 1	c: no: 0
150	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2

151	a: an artist: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: a secretary running a club: 2
152	a: any: 1	b: some: 0	c: most: 0
153	a: thorn: 0	b: red petals: 0	c: scent: 1
154	a: often: 0	b: occasionally: 1	c: practically never: 2
155	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
156	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
157	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2
158	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2
159	a: occasionally: 0	b: hardly ever: 1	c: never: 2
160	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
161	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
162	a: true: 0	b: in between: 1	c: false: 2
163	a: English: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: mathematics or arithmetic: 0
164	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
	a: is often quite interesting and has a lot to		
165	it: 0	b: in between: 1	
166	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
			c: have the child learn desirable habits and attitudes: 2
167	a: give the child enough affection: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 2
168	a: yes: 0	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
169	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: the political difficulties: 2
170	a: the question of moral purpose: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: joining a group discussion: 0
171	a: reading a well-written book: 2	b: in between: 1	
172	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2
173	a: always: 2	b: generally: 1	c: only if it's practicable: 0
174	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
175	a: true: 0	b: uncertain: 1	c: false: 2
176	a: accept: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: politely say I'm too busy: 0
177	a: wide: 1	b: zigzag: 0	c: straight: 0
178	a: nowhere: 1	b: far: 0	c: away: 0
179	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
180	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
			c: tolerance of other people's wishes: 0
181	a: nerve in meeting challenges: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
182	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
183	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: false: 0
184	a: true: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
185	a: yes: 2	b: in between: 1	c: no: 0
186	a: yes: 2	b: uncertain: 1	c: no: 0
187*	a: yes	b: uncertain	c: no

* In all 16 PF studies these items have no scores.

ENDNOTES

This study was supported by Akdeniz University Scientific Research Projects Unit.

SUBMITTED: MAY 2008

REVISION SUBMITTED: JULY 2008

ACCEPTED: AUGUST 2008

REFEREED ANONYMOUSLY

Sevcan Yıldız (sevcanyildiz@akdeniz.edu.tr) is a Research Assistant at the Akdeniz University Social Sciences Institute, 07058 Campüs, Antalya, Turkey.

Engin Üngüren (enginunguren@akdeniz.edu.tr) is a Research Assistant at the Akdeniz University Social Sciences Institute, 07058 Campüs, Antalya, Turkey.

Cihan Polat (polat_cihan@hotmail.com) is a Staff member at Akdeniz University Health Sciences Institute, 07058 Campüs, Antalya, Turkey.