



**EFFECTS OF THE BIG FIVE, MACHIAVELLIANISM, AND NARCISSISM
ON PERSONNEL SELECTION METHODS AND LEADER PREFERENCES**

FATMANUR ESMA ÇİL

SEPTEMBER 2022

CANKAYA UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

MASTER'S THESIS IN PSYCHOLOGY



**EFFECTS OF THE BIG FIVE, MACHIAVELLIANISM, AND NARCISSISM
ON PERSONNEL SELECTION METHODS AND LEADER PREFERENCES**

FATMANUR ESMA ÇİL

SEPTEMBER 2022

ABSTRACT

EFFECTS OF THE BIG FIVE, MACHIAVELLIANISM, AND NARCISSISM ON PERSONNEL SELECTION METHODS AND LEADER PREFERENCES

ÇİL, Fatmanur Esmâ

M.A. in Psychology

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Aslı GÖNCÜ KÖSE

September 2022, 91 pages

Current research focuses on the effects of the Big Five personality traits, Machiavellianism, and narcissism on preferences for six different personnel selection methods (resume, interview, personality test, general cognitive ability test, reference letter, performance in a job sample) and preferences for four different leadership styles (i.e., Transformational leadership, Paternalistic leadership, Relationship-Oriented leadership, and Task-Oriented leadership) In Study 1, data were collected from 460 university students studying in different parts of Turkey. In Study 2, data were collected from 479 working adults in Turkey. The results were calculated by performing correlation analysis in the SPSS program. The findings showed that students with higher conscientiousness scores preferred the cognitive ability test method in their personnel selection system. Similarly, students with higher neuroticism and Machiavellianism scores preferred cognitive and work ability test methods. In addition, working adults with a high neuroticism score preferred interview and reference letters methods. Moreover, the "similar to me" effect, as assumed, finds partial support in the student sample; and it was fully supported among the working adult sample. In other words, the participants preferred leaders/managers who are similar to themselves. Students with high agreeableness scores preferred PL style. In addition, students who scored high on the Machiavellianism preferred the T-O leadership style. Likewise, working adults who scored high on extraversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness scores preferred TL style. Working adults with

high narcissism scores preferred TL and T-O leadership styles. Similarly, working adults with a high score on the agreeableness preferred the R-O leadership style. The findings are discussed in relation to their theoretical contributions and practical implications, along with recommendations for future research.

Keywords: Big Five personality, Machiavellianism, narcissism, personnel selection methods, similar to me effect, leadership preferences.



ÖZET

BÜYÜK BEŞLİ KİŞİLİK ÖZELLİKLERİ İLE MAKYAVELİZM VE NARSİSİZMİN PERSONEL SEÇİM SÜREÇLERİ VE LİDER TERCİHLERİNE ETKİSİ

ÇİL, Fatmanur Esma

Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Aslı GÖNCÜ KÖSE

Eylül 2022, 91 Sayfa

Mevcut araştırmalar, Beş Büyük kişilik özelliğinin, Makyavelizm ve narsisizmin altı farklı personel seçim yöntemi (özgeçmiş, görüşme, kişilik testi, genel bilişsel yetenek testi, referans mektubu, bir iş örneğindeki performans) tercihleri ve dört farklı liderlik stili (Dönüşümcü liderlik, Babacan liderlik, İlişki Odaklı liderlik ve Görev Odaklı liderlik) tercihleri üzerindeki etkilerine odaklanmaktadır. Çalışma 1'de Türkiye'nin farklı bölgelerinde okuyan 460 üniversite öğrencisinden veri toplanmıştır. Çalışma 2'de, Türkiye'de çalışan 479 yetişkinden veri toplanmıştır. Sonuçlar SPSS programında korelasyon analizi yapılarak hesaplanmıştır. Bulgular, sorumluluk puanı yüksek olan öğrencilerin personel seçim sistemlerinde bilişsel yetenek testi yöntemini tercih ettiklerini göstermiştir. Benzer şekilde nevrotiklik ve Makyavelizm puanları yüksek olan öğrenciler bilişsel ve iş yeteneği test yöntemlerini tercih etmişlerdir. Ayrıca nevrotiklik puanı yüksek çalışan yetişkinler mülakat ve referans mektubu yöntemlerini tercih etmişlerdir. Ayrıca, "bana benzer" etkisi, varsayıldığı gibi, öğrenci örnekleminde kısmen destek bulurken; çalışan yetişkin örnekleminde tam olarak desteklenmiştir. Diğer bir deyişle, katılımcılar kendilerine benzeyen liderleri/yöneticileri tercih etmişlerdir. Uyumluluk puanları yüksek olan öğrenciler babacan liderlik stilini tercih etmişlerdir. Ayrıca Makyavelizm puanları yüksek olan öğrenciler görev-odaklı liderlik stilini tercih etmişlerdir. Aynı şekilde dışadönüklük, deneyime açıklık ve sorumluluk puanları yüksek olan çalışan yetişkinler dönüşümcü liderlik stilini tercih etmişlerdir. Narsisizm puanı yüksek çalışan yetişkinler,

dönüřümcü ve görev-odaklı liderlik tarzlarını tercih etmişlerdir. Benzer şekilde, uyumluluk konusunda yüksek puan alan çalışan yetişkinler, ilişki-odaklı liderlik stilini tercih etmişlerdir. Bulgular, gelecekteki arařtırmalar için önerilerle birlikte teorik katkıları ve pratik çıkarımları ile ilgili olarak tartışılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Büyük Beş kişilik, Makyavelizm, narsisizm, personel seçim yöntemleri, bana benzer etkisi, liderlik tercihleri.





To my dear family and O.H. ...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my very valuable thesis advisor Aslı GÖNCÜ KÖSE, for her support. She always helped me during my master's thesis. Her achievements and leadership qualities have always amazed me. When I consulted with my dear teacher Aslı, she always supported and motivated me. I have always had a quick and effective result from her; “I flew from point A to point Z,” so to speak. Her very understanding and guiding attitude enabled me to complete my master's thesis very happily and peacefully. Thanks to her, my academic career came to a very good point. I would like to thank her for guiding me and providing motivation, in short, for everything she has added to my life.

I would like to thank my very valuable teacher, Prof. Dr. Vesile ŞENTÜRK CANKORUR, who supported and motivated me at the start of my graduate career.

I wish to show my gratitude to the members of my thesis committee, Prof. Dr. Ali DÖNMEZ and Dr. Instructor Member Veysel Mehmet ELGİN, for generously offering their time and also for their valuable recommendations and contributions.

The very dear members of my family, my father, mother, and sister, supported me at every moment. I would like to thank them for being the biggest supporters in my academic career and life, as I feel their love and energy at all times. They have been my guides in every aspect of my life. I feel very lucky to have such a family. Happily, I am with you, we are together and so glad I have you.

I would like to thank Oğuzhan Helvacı for his sacrifices, who provided me with both the "food" motivation and the "spiritual" motivation at every moment of my graduate life. He always supported me and always believed in me. Since he is my “soul mate”, when I felt inadequate, he immediately completed me and became my source of motivation. He helped me write this thesis much more effectively with my dreams/our dreams. Good luck to you, my precious, I love you...

I am very happy to have spent two wonderful years with Tülüce TOKAT. I will miss our excitement when we panicked and called each other all the time and when we critiqued for hours and then got to work. I'm glad we completed everything with you, my friend. Thank you so much for everything you add to my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF NONPLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZET	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 EFFECTS OF THE BIG FIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS, MACHIAVELLIANISM, AND NARCISSISM ON PREFERENCES FOR PERSONNEL SELECTION METHODS AND LEADERSHIP PREFERENCES	3
1.1.1 Personnel Selection Methods	3
1.1.2 Effects of the Big Five Personality Traits on Preferences for Selection Methods.....	4
1.1.3 Effects of Machiavellianism and Narcissism on Preferences for Different Selection Methods	6
1.2 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUBORDINATES’ PERSONALITY TRAITS AND LEADER PERSONALITY TRAITS	7
1.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUBORDINATES’ PERSONALITY TRAITS AND PREFERENCES FOR DIFFERENT LEADERSHIP STYLES	8
CHAPTER II	
STUDY 1 METHOD	11
2.1 PARTICIPANTS AND THE PROCEDURE	11
2.2 MEASURES	12
2.2.1 The Big Five Scale	13
2.2.2 The Dirty Dozen Dark Triad (Machiavellianism and Narcissism	

Subscales)	13
2.2.3 Managerial Personality Preference Scale	13
2.2.4 Leadership Type Preferences Scale	16
2.2.5 Personnel Selection and Placement Methods Preference Scale	16
2.2.6 Demographic Information Form	16
CHAPTER III	
STUDY 1 RESULTS	17
3.1 OVERVIEW	17
3.2 DATA SCREENING AND DATA CLEANING FOR STUDY 1	17
3.3 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS	
AMONG THE VARIABLES	17
CHAPTER IV	
OVERVIEW FOR STUDY 2	29
CHAPTER V	
STUDY 2 METHOD	30
5.1 PARTICIPANTS AND THE PROCEDURE	30
CHAPTER VI	
STUDY 2 RESULTS	32
6.1 DATA SCREENING AND DATA CLEANING	32
6.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS	
AMONG THE STUDY VARIABLES	32
CHAPTER VII	
GENERAL DISCUSSION	45
7.1 MAIN FINDINGS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR	
FUTURE RESEARCH	45
7.2 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS	53
7.3 LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	54
REFERENCES	56
APPENDICES	65
APPENDIX A. APPROVAL OF THE SOCIAL AND HUMANITIES	
ETHICS COMMITTEE OF CANKAYA UNIVERSITY	65
APPENDIX B. THE STUDY SURVEY	66
CURRICULUM VITAE	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Participants of Study 1	12
Table 2: Results of the Pilot Study	15
Table 3: Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Scores, Skewness and Kurtosis Values of the Study Variables	18
Table 4: Correlations among the Personality Traits and Preferences for Selection Methods	20
Table 5: Correlations among Demographics, the Evaluators' Personality Traits, Preferences for Different Leadership Styles and Leader Personality Traits	24
Table 6: Demographic Characteristics of the Participants of Study 2	31
Table 7: Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Scores, Skewness and Kurtosis Values of Study Variables	33
Table 8: Correlations Among the Personality Traits and Preferences for Selection Methods	35
Table 9: Bivariate Correlations among Personality Traits and Preferences for Leadership Styles and Leader Traits	41
Table 10. Summary of the Hypotheses and the Results of Study 1 and Study 2	44

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

HRM	: Human Resources Management
PL	: Paternalistic Leadership
R-O leadership	: Relationship-Oriented Leadership
TL	: Transformational Leadership
T-O leadership	: Task-Oriented Leadership



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Personnel selection is the most important unit in Human Resources Management (HRM) units which maintain recruitment and selection processes in line with the interests of both the company and the individuals (Kaynak 2002: 125). Personnel selection is needed for choosing the right personnel for the right job (Cascio, 2003: 256). Individuals' job performance shows diversity and differences in performance and this situation partially depends on personality factors (e.g., Viswesvaran et al. 2001:63). Different methods such as paper-pencil tests, interviews, and cognitive ability tests are used to measure individual differences. Özcan (2006: 55) stated that hiring individuals by examining individual differences is the most effective method for both the institution and individuals. Kenger and Organ (2017: 152) state that a person who is chosen correctly is someone who is sufficient in terms of knowledge, skills, and abilities and is likely to work with his/her colleagues and manager in harmony. If the right personnel are not selected, the organization suffers both financial and performance losses. Wrong choices or selection decisions also harm one's own career. In summary, choosing the right personnel for the right job puts both the organization and the individuals in an advantageous position in the competitive business environment.

In the literature, there are many written and verbal methods related to personnel selection (e.g., general cognitive ability tests, personality tests, work samples, etc.). The organizations may use these tests in line with its own needs (Arvey & Campion 1982: 281). According to research conducted in recent years, recruitment tests are mainly used to assess personality traits as well as the knowledge, skills, and experiences of the person (Highhouse et al. 2016: 188). According to a survey conducted in 2003, 30% of American companies apply personality tests before evaluating the performance of job applicants (Heller 2005: 74). Moreover, more than 40% of Fortune 100 companies conduct personality tests when recruiting (Erickson 2004: 25). Another study reported that almost all of the UK's leading large companies

use personality testing in selection (Faulder 2005: 25). It is apparent that personality is one of the most essential features in selection processes. One of the aims of this study is to examine different personnel selection methods that are preferred by individuals with different personality traits.

On the other hand, one of the main factors affecting the behavior and attitudes of an individual in the workplace is the leader or supervisor and his/her behaviors. Some leaders mainly try to motivate and inspire their followers regarding work activities and goals (e.g., transformational leadership) (Bass 1985: 191), while other leaders mainly emphasize the emotional needs of their subordinates (e.g., paternalistic leadership) (Farh & Cheng 2000: 84). Similarly, while some leaders focus on their relationship with their followers (e.g., relationship-oriented leaders), some leaders focus on their followers' task performance (e.g., task-oriented leaders) (Bass 1990a: 195). Leader/manager preferences of individuals in the institutions they work for may differ according to the values, needs, and motivations of them (Shalit et al. 2009: 458; Miner, 1978: 284). For example, Sahraee and Abdullah (2018: 1925) found that individuals who were open to innovation, development and learning, as well as extroverted and energetic, preferred transformational leaders. Consistently, I suggest that personality characteristics are likely to affect leadership style or behavior preferences. Another aim of this study is to reveal the effects of various personality traits on preferences for leaders with different characteristics.

Although there are many studies on personnel selection, the number of studies that focused on the effects of personality traits on preferences for recruitment processes and manager traits is quite limited. The main purpose of this study is to contribute to the literature by examining the effects of the Big Five personality traits, Machiavellianism, and narcissism on preferences for different personnel selection methods (i.e., interview, general cognitive ability test, personality test, performance in work samples, references, and resumes) among two different samples (i.e., university students and working adults). In addition, according to a study which examined the "similar to me" effect, people prefer to work with people who are similar to themselves (Bagues & Perez-Villadoniga 2012: 12). The second aim of the present research is to examine the effects of personality traits mentioned above on individuals' preferences for managers with similar or different traits as well as compatible vs. incompatible leadership styles (i.e., TL, PL, R-O and T-O leadership styles).

1.1 EFFECTS OF THE BIG FIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS, MACHIAVELLIANISM, AND NARCISSISM ON PREFERENCES FOR PERSONNEL SELECTION METHODS AND LEADERSHIP PREFERENCES

1.1.1 Personnel Selection Methods

Personnel selection is one of the key tasks of HRM units (Aksakal & Dağdeviren 2010: 905). There are different personnel selection methods used to recruit and select the right person for the right job. The interview is a method of obtaining objective and subjective information verbally about the applicant. In this process, applicants also get information regarding the institution (Çiftçi & Öztürk 2013: 146). The most common type of interview involves face-to-face interaction, but it can also be conducted via mail, email, or telephone depending on the preferences of the institution (Silverman 1993:405; Atkinson & Silverman 1997: 304). Another widely used personnel selection method is personality tests. Personality tests were first used in the First World War to create personality inventories, to determine and measure the personality traits required for special tasks (Youngman 2017: 261). Today, personality tests, which are performed independently of job performance in personnel selection processes, have become one of the most preferred methods among selection methods because of their fast results and low cost (Piotrowski & Armstrong 2006: 489). Personality tests are called "measures of personality at work" in personnel selection. The purpose of naming it as such is to determine the compatibility of the job position with the personality trait (Salgado et al. 2003: 1 ; Anderson et al. 2004: 487).

Cognitive ability tests, which is another widely used selection method, are used in personnel selection processes and for measuring job performance, as well as measuring individual differences (Schmidt & Hunter 2004: 162; Bertua et al. 2005: 387). These tests are used to measure the applicant's verbal and numerical knowledge, reading comprehension, and general mathematics level (Outtz 2002: 161). Borman and Motowidlo (1997: 99) state that the best measurement tools of task performance are the cognitive ability tests. Reference letters is also one of the most popular selection methods (Dany & Torchy 1994: 21). A reference letter is a document that contains the information an about applicant's qualifications, abilities, knowledge, and skills written by another person (e.g., the former supervisor or employer). There are two types of reference letters; specific references and employment references. Specific references

give specific information about the person and about the character of the applicant; and employment references are given by the person responsible for the applicant's previous job (his/her supervisor or teammates in the unit he/she works for) (Akoğlan 1998: 26).

Another selection method is evaluating the curriculum vitae or resumes. A curriculum vita includes the detailed information of the individual's professional life, academic success, and work experience (Cañibano & Bozeman 2009: 86). It has been defined as the first stage of the personnel selection system (Dipboye & Jackson 1999: 229). Evaluating resumes or curriculum vitae are a practical and simple method of selection. The critical point in evaluating the curriculum vitae is that the evaluator should be objective and non-discriminative (Kang, et al. 2016: 469). The most important task of the evaluators is to decide which candidates would be given more consideration in the evaluation process and which candidates would be rejected (Cole et al. 2005: 321). The last method focused in the present study is work sample test. Callinan and Robertson (2000: 248) state that work sample test is a type of applied test in which the job applicant performs a task given under the same conditions at actual work. Work sample test can be used as a predictor of future performance in personnel selection (Ployhart et al. 2006: 499).

1.1.2 Effects of the Big Five Personality Traits on Preferences for Selection Methods

It is accepted that the personality of the individual has five main personality dimensions: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (emotional instability) (Elaheh 2011: 836). Individuals who score high in openness to experience are imaginative, sensitive, open to innovations and different experiences in their lives. Individuals who score low on this dimension have traditional, stereotypical thoughts and their view of events is more realistic. The most important feature that distinguishes individuals who are highly open to experience from others is that they are creative and curious (McCrae & John 1992: 175).

Individuals who score high in extraversion reflect a happy and friendly mood towards other people, they are energetic and they enjoy social interaction. Individuals who score low on extraversion are generally reserved and passive. Individuals who score high on agreeableness show a positive attitude towards other individuals, they are helpful, sensitive, and willing to cooperate. Individuals who score low on this

dimension are generally irritable, uncooperative and nonadaptive (Roccas et al. 2002: 789). Individuals who score high on conscientiousness work with a sense of duty, do the given job on time, and behave honestly. Individuals who score low on this dimension tend to be irresponsible, unable to control their impulses, unable to complete work, and inattentive. The most distinctive feature of these individuals is their need for success and the determination. Individuals with a high neuroticism (or emotional instability) score have feelings of anxiety, restlessness, guilt, and anger. Individuals who score low in this dimension are generally calm and balanced (Kraczla 2017: 77).

Individuals with high score on neuroticism are expected to prefer individual tests and recruitment methods that do not involve social interaction since they would not be comfortable in situations that involve high levels of social interaction. On the other hand, it is predicted that individuals with high score on openness to experience, agreeableness, and extraversion would prefer selection methods that involve high level of social interaction compared to individuals with low scores on these characteristics. It is expected that individuals who score high on conscientiousness would not have any problems in conveying the information accurately and genuinely. Therefore, I predict that they would be more likely to prefer the most complex selection method in which they can convey the highest level of information about themselves. Consistently, the first set of hypotheses of the present study are generated as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Conscientiousness is positively associated with preferences for all selection methods; however, the selection method most preferred by individuals with high conscientiousness is the most complex selection process (including both subjective and objective methods).

Hypothesis 2: Openness to experience, agreeableness, and extraversion are positively associated with preference for subjective methods such as interviews, personality tests, and reference letters.

Hypothesis 3: Extraversion is negatively related to the preference for objective methods.

Hypothesis 4a: Neuroticism is positively associated with the preference for objective methods.

Hypothesis 4b: Neuroticism is negatively associated with preference for subjective methods.

1.1.3 Effects of Machiavellianism and Narcissism on Preferences for Different Selection Methods

In the present study, I focused on the two of the Dark Triad personality traits: Machiavellianism and narcissism. Machiavellianism is characterized by a cold, manipulative tendency (Grams & Rogers 2010: 71). Individuals who score high in this dimension have attitudes of cheating, exploitation for their own benefit, manipulation, and deception (Jones & Kavanagh 1996: 511 Zettler & Solga 2013: 545). Individuals who score high on Machiavellianism tend to think that every means to a desirable end is justifiable. In addition, previous studies showed that career commitment is high among these people due to their ambition and perseverance (Zettler et al. 2011: 20).

Individuals who score high on narcissism sees himself/herself as more valuable and important than others; they continuously seek admiration, attention, and approval from others (Timuroglu & Iscan 2008: 240). Research showed that narcissism causes people to be perceived more positively in job interviews (Grijalva & Harms 2014: 108). Individuals who score high on narcissism are likely to try to display their perfectionist attitudes in the work settings (Timuroglu & Iscan 2008: 240). In addition, these individuals may exploit others for attention.

Machiavellianism and narcissism have a few things in common. The first one is tendency for manipulation. The second is giving low level of importance to others and low level of empathy. The final similarity is arrogance and a cold attitude in human relations (Mchoskey 1995: 755).

Individuals with a high score on Machiavellianism are expected to prefer subjective personnel selection methods that involve a high level of social interaction and high probability of manipulation, as they tend to manipulate others. On the other hand, individuals with high score on narcissism expect very good performance from themselves and believe that they will successfully complete all methods. Therefore, it is expected that there will not be a significant difference in preference for various personnel selection methods.

Hypothesis 5a: Machiavellianism is positively related to preference for subjective methods such as interviews, personality tests, reference letters.

Hypothesis 5b: Machiavellianism is negatively associated with preference for objective methods such as general cognitive ability tests and performance in work samples.

Hypothesis 6: Narcissism is positively associated with preferences for all selection methods; however, the selection method most preferred by individuals with high narcissism is the most complex selection process (including both subjective and objective methods).

1.2 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUBORDINATES' PERSONALITY TRAITS AND LEADER PERSONALITY TRAITS

Thielmann et al. (2020: 172) found that individuals tended to prefer management and leadership styles close to their own personality traits. However, especially the "similar to me effect" (Banal-Estañol et al. 2021: 2) and the reflections of individuals on the leadership style preferences for their managers in work life have been the subject of very few studies. Yet, consistent with the above mentioned finding, the social identity theory (SIT) of leadership (Hogg 2001: 184) suggests that individuals are likely to prefer leaders who are highly prototypical members of their in-groups in terms of values, norms, and attitudes. According to SIT of leadership, the more compatible the leaders are with the group prototype, the more positively the followers perceive their leaders (Fielding & Hogg 1997: 39). Many studies provided support for the proposition of the SIT of leadership that the prototypical members were more likely to be endorsed as leaders than non-prototypical members, especially by followers who were highly identified with their group (e.g., Hogg & van Knippenberg 2003:1). In addition, leader-group prototypicality was positively associated with perceived leadership effectiveness (e.g., Pierro et al. 2007: 504 ; Hogg, 2001: 184; Hogg et al. 2012: 258). Traditional assessments of leader-group prototypicality include questions regarding perceived similarity of the leader with other group members including the evaluator. More specifically, individuals who perceive high level of similarity between the target (i.e., the leader) and themselves are expected to report high levels of leader-group prototypicality. Consistent with the "similar to me effect" and the SIT of leadership, I expect individuals to prefer leaders or supervisors who are highly similar to themselves in many aspects including norms, values, attitudes, personality, and behaviors (e.g., Smith & Hogg 2008: 337). In line with the theoretical propositions and the related findings revealed by previous research, I suggest that individuals are likely to prefer managers with leadership styles that comply with their own dominant personality traits.

Hypothesis 7a: Extraversion is positively related to a preference for an extraverted leader.

Hypothesis 7b: Neuroticism is positively related to a preference for a neurotic leader.

Hypothesis 7c: Conscientiousness is positively related to a preference for a conscientious leader.

Hypothesis 7d: Openness to experience is positively related to a preference for a leader who is open to experience.

Hypothesis 7e: Agreeableness is positively related to a preference for an agreeable leader.

Hypothesis 7f: Machiavellianism is positively related to a preference for a Machiavellian leader.

Hypothesis 7g: Narcissism positively related to a preference for a narcissistic leader.

1.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUBORDINATES' PERSONALITY TRAITS AND PREFERENCES FOR DIFFERENT LEADERSHIP STYLES

The first leadership style investigated in the present study is the paternalistic leadership (PL) style (Aycan 2006: 445). Managers with PL style try to create a family atmosphere in the workplace, behave like an older family figure (e.g., father/mother/older sibling), protect and watch over their subordinates from outside criticisms, but expect loyalty and obedience in return. They also emphasize hierarchy and status quo in their relationships with their subordinates and do not want their authority to be questioned.

The second leadership style included in the present research is the task-oriented (T-O) leadership style (Forsyth 2010: 280). The main characteristics of T-O leaders include identifying the work-related goals and roles of group members, making detailed work plans, and discovering new ways to complete work (Ergün 2016: 203). For a T-O manager, performance is more important than forming and maintaining harmonious and close interpersonal relationships the in workplace.

Another leadership style investigated in the present study is the relationship-oriented (R-O) leadership style (Fiedler 1967:150). A leader or manager with an R-O leadership style establishes strong communication with his/her subordinates and shows sensitivity and concern for to subordinates' needs (Avcı & Topaloğlu 2009: 1).

Therefore, their priority is maintaining harmonious interpersonal relationships rather than performance.

The last leadership style examined in the present study is transformational leadership (TL) (Bass & Avolio 1993: 112). TL includes four dimensions which are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Bass & Avolio 1995: 5). Managers with TL style use strong rhetoric to inspire their subordinates, they motivate them and increase their commitment to the vision and mission of the organization (Landrum et al. 2000: 150). At the same time, they become role models by making individual sacrifices to achieve organizational goals and encourage their subordinates to develop different solutions to routine problems by providing intellectual stimulation.

Considering the different characteristics of leadership styles included in the present study, individuals with high scores on agreeableness and extraversion, who prefer to have harmonious and close relationships with others, are expected to prefer R-O and PL styles. In addition, individuals with high extraversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness scores are expected to prefer to work with managers who endorse TL style. Moreover, individuals with high scores on neuroticism and conscientiousness are expected to prefer T-O leadership style.

Hypothesis 8a: Agreeableness and extraversion are positively related to preference for R-O and PL styles.

Hypothesis 8b: Extraversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness are positively associated with preference for TL style.

Hypothesis 8c: Neuroticism and conscientiousness are positively related to preference for T-O leadership style.

Individuals with a high score for Machiavellianism strongly aim to achieve their specific self-interests and goals (Christie & Gies 1970: 198). In addition, these individuals have goal orientation and determination to win (Jones & Paulhus 2009: 93). Rehman and Shahnawaz (2021: 79) found that there was a positive relationship between Machiavellianism and task-oriented leadership. That is, individuals who scored high on Machiavellianism were more likely to be T-O leaders themselves. Consistently, I expect individuals who score high on Machiavellianism to prefer a T-O leadership approach to achieve the goal they want to achieve.

At least to my knowledge, there is no previous study on how the Machiavellian and narcissistic personality traits of individuals predict the preferences for the four

leadership styles (PL, T-O leadership, R-O leadership, and TL styles) examined in the present study. In line with the relevant literature and the above-mentioned theoretical propositions, individuals with Machiavellianism are expected to prefer managers with task-oriented leadership styles like themselves. In addition, it is predicted that they are more like to prefer PL and R-O leadership styles that are more open to manipulation. On the other hand, individuals who score high on narcissism is expected to prefer TL, PL, and R-O leadership styles, which offer the opportunity to renew their self-confidence, and they are expected not to prefer the T-O leadership style.

Hypothesis 9a: Machiavellianism is positively related to preferences for PL and R-O leadership styles.

Hypothesis 9b: Machiavellianism is negatively related to preferences for T-O leadership styles.

Hypothesis 10a: Narcissism is positively related to preferences for TL, PL, and R-O leadership styles.

Hypothesis 10b: Narcissism is negatively related to preference for T-O leadership style.

CHAPTER II

STUDY 1 METHOD

2.1 PARTICIPANTS AND THE PROCEDURE

Data were collected from approximately 460 university students. The online study questionnaire was prepared by using the Qualtrics program and data were collected online due to pandemic conditions. Participation in the research was voluntary. The researchers shared general information about the research and survey link on their social media accounts and professional online networks (e.g., LinkedIn), and the participants were reached by snowball sampling method. The duration of the questionnaire for the students lasted an average of 15 minutes. The months in which the data were collected are between September and November. Before the study, participants were presented with a consent form containing general information about the purpose of the study and information that they could withdraw at any stage of the study.

According to the results of the initial analyses, 40 out of 460 participants filled out 70% to 77% of the questionnaire, and the data of these participants were excluded from the data set. A total of 440 (21 of whom did not complete the demographic information form) university students from Turkey formed the final sample. Among 419 participants who filled out the demographics form 310 (67.4%) were female, 100 (21.7%) were male, and nine (2%) of them did not want to specify gender. In total, students from 122 different universities and 93 different departments participated in the study. The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 51, and most of the participants were young adults ($M = 24.0$, $SD = 5.979$). The demographic characteristics of the sample were presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Participants of Study 1

Gender		
	Male	21.7
%	Female	67.4
Age		
	M	24.00
	SD	5.979
GPA		
	3.50 out of 4.00 and above	27.4
%	Between 3.00-3.49 out of 4.00	37.8
	Between 2.00-3.00 out of 4.00	24.8
	Below 2.00 out of 4.00	1.1
Mother's Education Level		
	Primary education	45.7
%	High school	21.5
	University	21.5
	Master	2.2
	Doctorate	2
Father's Education Level		
	Primary education	30.7
%	High school	24.5
	University	31.1
	Master	3.5
	Doctorate	1.3
Income		
	Less than 2.825.90 TL	7.4
%	2.825.90 TL - 4.000 TL	16.3
	4.000 TL - 6.000 TL	20.0
	6.000 TL - 8.000 TL	17.0
	8.000 TL-10.000	12.8
	More than 10.000 TL	17.

2.2 MEASURES

The questionnaire package included the Big Five Personality Scales, the Dark Triad Personality Scale, the Managerial Personality Preference Scale, the Leadership Style Preferences Scale, the Personnel Selection and Placement Methods Preference Scale, and the Demographic Information Form.

2.2.1 The Big Five Scale

The Five Factor Inventory (BFI) developed by Benet-Martinez and John (1998: 729) and adapted to Turkish by Sümer and Sümer (2005) was used to measure the Big Five personality traits. The scale consists of 44 items. Participants give their answers using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from “1 = strongly disagree” to “5 = strongly agree”. Basım et al. (2015: 82) reported Cronbach's alpha values as .75 for extraversion, .65 for agreeableness, .70 for conscientiousness, .70 for neuroticism (emotional instability) and .69 for openness to experience. The internal reliability coefficients of the extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience subscales were .89, .66, .75, .78, and .80, respectively, in the present study.

2.2.2 The Dirty Dozen Dark Triad (Machiavellianism and Narcissism Subscales)

Machiavellianism and narcissism subscales of the Dirty Dozen Dark Triad developed by Jonason and Webster (2010: 420) and adapted to Turkish by Atılgan and Yaşlıoğlu (2018: 725) was used. The scale measures each dimension (i.e., Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and narcissism) with 4 items and consists of a total of 12 items. Participants give their answers using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Atılgan and Yaşlıoğlu (2018: 725) reported Cronbach's alpha internal reliability coefficients of Machiavellianism and narcissism subscales as .85 and .83, respectively. The internal reliability coefficients of Machiavellianism and narcissism subscales were .78 and .62 in the present study.

2.2.3 Managerial Personality Preference Scale

Managerial personality preference scale which consisted of seven personality traits (i.e., Machiavellianism, narcissism, openness to experience, conscientiousness, neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness) was developed by the researchers for the present study. In each item, the target personality trait was described in 3 or 4 sentences (ranging between 41-53 words) in the form of a narrative in which a manager introduces himself/herself. Participants indicated the extent to which they prefer each manager using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = I definitely would not prefer to work with this manager, 7 = I would definitely prefer to work with this manager). In order to assess the construct validity of the scale, a pilot study was conducted with 20 participants. Participants in the pilot study were presented a survey sheet that included 2 different columns. Definitions of seven personality traits were presented in the first column. In the second column, there

were descriptions of seven different individuals. Participants were asked to match the personality traits presented in the first column with the definitions presented in the second column. Demographics part of the pilot survey included gender and age information. Among 20 participants 11 were women and nine were men, the age range of the participants was between 22 and 49 ($M = 31.75$, $SD = 6.50$).

The results of the pilot study revealed that all participants answered the question of Machiavellianism correctly, the percentage of agreement was 100%. The number of people who answered the narcissism question correctly was 18, the number of people who answered incorrectly was 2, and the percentage of agreement was calculated as 90%. The number of people who answered the extraversion question correctly was 16, the number of people who answered incorrectly was 4, and the percentage of agreement was found to be 80%. The number of people who answered the agreeableness question correctly was 18, the number of people who answered incorrectly was 2, and the percentage of agreement was calculated as 90%. The number of people who answered the neuroticism question correctly was 17, the number of people who answered incorrectly was 3, and the percentage of agreement was calculated as 85%. The number of people who answered the question openness to experience correctly is 19, the number of people who answered incorrectly is 1, the percentage of agreement is calculated as 95%. All participants answered the conscientiousness question correctly, that is, the percentage of agreement was calculated as 100%. The average inter-rater agreement was 91.43 % (please see Table 2) revealing that personality descriptions prepared for the current study appropriately represented the personality traits they were intended to represent.

Table 2: Results of the Pilot Study

	Machiavellianism	Narcissism	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Neuroticism	Openness to experience	Conscientiousness	Mean of agreement/disagreement
Percentage of agreement	100	90	80	90	85	95	100	91.43
Percentage of disagreement	0	10	20	10	15	5	0	8.57

2.2.4 Leadership Type Preferences Scale

The scale, created by Ehrhart and Klein (2001: 153), consists of 3 separate paragraphs or vignettes describing T-O, R-O, and TL styles. It was adapted to Turkish by Göncü-Köse (2019). Göncü-Köse (2019) also added another vignette representing the PL style to the scale. Participants were asked how much they prefer each manager using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = I do not prefer to work with this manager, 7 = I would definitely prefer to work with this manager).

2.2.5 Personnel Selection and Placement Methods Preference Scale

In the scale created by the researchers, eight different selection methods (formed by different combinations of subjective and objective methods) were presented to the participants. The resume method is the standard (by default) method included in every procedure. The first selection procedure includes the resume and the interview (a subjective method) technique. The second selection procedure includes the resume and the general cognitive ability test (an objective method). The third selection procedure included the resume and the personality test (a method that is objective but may not be performance-related depending on the job). The fourth selection procedure includes the resume, the interview (a subjective method) and the personality test (an objective method but may not be performance-related depending on the job). The fifth selection procedure includes the resume, the general cognitive ability test (an objective method) and the personality test (a subjective method). The sixth selection procedure includes the resume, the general cognitive ability test (an objective method), and the work samples test (an objective method). The seventh selection procedure includes the resume, the interview (a subjective method) and the reference letter (a subjective method). The eighth selection procedure includes all six techniques used in other procedures. Respondents were asked to think that they were applying for a job and to rank the presented eight selection methods using a scale ranging from “1 = my first choice” to “8 = my last choice”.

2.2.6 Demographic Information Form

The demographic information form included the questions regarding the participants' gender, age, university, department, class, CGPA, education level of the parents, and monthly familial income.

CHAPTER III

STUDY 1 RESULTS

3.1 OVERVIEW

This section includes the detailed information regarding the analyzes of the data. First, data cleaning and screening processes explained. Second, bivariate correlations among the study variables are presented and interpreted. In the last section, the results of the hypothesis testing are presented. All of the data analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS), version 26.0.

3.2 DATA SCREENING AND DATA CLEANING FOR STUDY 1

In the final data set that included data of 440 participants, there were 33,120 data points. Apart from demographic data, a total of 168 (0.3%) missing data were found in 33,120 data points. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), when the data set contains missing values less than 5%, the mean replacement method can be used in order to handle the missing data. Therefore, missing values in the data set were handled with the series mean replacement method.

Next, outlier analysis was performed, and to detect multivariate outliers in the data, Mahalanobis distance was used. These analyses revealed that 33 participants were multivariate outliers, and they were excluded from the data set. Therefore, the final sample included 409 participants.

3.3 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS AMONG THE VARIABLES

Means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum, skewness, and kurtosis values of study variables are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Scores, Skewness and Kurtosis Values of the Study Variables

Variables	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Extraversion	3.26	0.81	1.00	5.00	0.00	-0.63
Machiavellianism	2.39	0.90	1.00	5.00	0.52	-0.16
Conscientiousness	3.62	0.58	1.89	5.00	-0.10	-0.29
Openness to experience	3.80	0.54	1.70	5.00	-0.32	0.23
Agreeableness	3.58	0.51	1.67	4.78	-0.32	0.55
Neuroticism	3.11	0.71	1.13	4.75	-0.08	-0.36
Narcissism	3.47	0.73	1.00	5.00	-0.50	0.31
Preference for Neurotic Leader	2.10	1.63	1	7	1.66	1.99
Preference for Agree. Leader	4.91	1.70	1	7	-0.69	-0.38
Preference for a leader who is open to experience	5.69	1.60	1	7	-1.45	1.49
Preference for Cons. Leader	5.70	1.59	1	7	-1.48	1.59
Preference for Extra. Leader.	4.94	1.65	1	7	-0.62	-0.36
Preference for Mach. Leader	2.57	1.81	1	7	1.02	0.02
Preference for Nars. Leader	2.60	1.82	1	7	0.90	-0.31
Preference for PL	4.42	1.85	1	7	-0.31	-0.93
Preference for T-O Leader	4.31	1.84	1	7	-0.26	-0.96
Preference for R-O Leader	5.14	1.77	1	7	-0.89	-0.10
Preference for TL	5.66	1.67	1	7	-1.50	1.53
Valid (Listwise)	460					

Note. The Big Five personality scale and narcissism and Machiavellianism scales are rated on a 5-point Likert type scale. Managerial Personality Type Preference Scale is rated on a 7-point Likert type scale. Leadership Type Preferences Scale is rated on a 7- point Likert type scale.

Bivariate correlations among the study variables are presented in Table 4. Age was positively correlated with extraversion, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and agreeableness ($r = .15, p < .01$; $r = .16, p < .01$; $r = .12, p < .05$; $r = .12, p < .05$; respectively). On the other hand, age was negatively correlated with neuroticism, Machiavellianism, narcissism, preference for a neurotic leader, and an extraverted leader ($r = -.10, p < .01$; $r = -.16, p < .01$; $r = -.18, p < .01$; $r = -.10, p < .05$; $r = -.17, p < .01$; respectively).

Gender was positively associated with CGPA, Machiavellianism and openness to experience ($r = .12, p < .05$; $r = .21, p < .01$; $r = .10, p < .05$; respectively). That is, males reported higher levels of CGPA, Machiavellianism, and openness to experience than females. On the other hand, gender was negatively related to conscientiousness, preference for an extraverted leader, and a R-O Leader ($r = -.16, p < .01$; $r = -.14, p <$

.01; $r = -.11$, $p < .05$; respectively). More specifically, females reported higher levels of conscientiousness, preference for an extraverted leader, and a R-O Leader than males.

CGPA was negatively correlated with conscientiousness and preference for a supervisor with TL style ($r = -.18$, $p < .01$; $r = -.12$, $p < .05$; respectively).

There was a positive correlation between SES and Machiavellianism ($r = .11$, $p < .05$); that is, as income increased, Machiavellianism score also increased.



Table 4: Correlations among the Personality Traits and Preferences for Selection Methods

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
1.Age	1																		
2.Gender	.19**	1																	
3.CGPA	.08	.12*	1																
4.Extraversion	.15**	.03	-.02	-															
5.Conscientiousness	.16**	-.16**	-.18**	.22**	-														
6.Openness to experience	.12*	.10*	-.02	.37**	.19**	-													
7.Agreeableness	.12*	-.09	-.04	.20**	.31**	.14**	-												
8. Neuroticism	-.10*	-.08	.08	-.30**	-.33**	-.20**	-.40**	-											
9.Machiavellianism	-.16**	.21**	.02	.13**	-.33**	-.00	-.35**	.18**	-										
10. Narcissism	-.18**	-.05	-.00	.15**	-.17**	-.03	-.12**	.23**	.47**	-									
11.Resume + Interview (Organization 1)	-.06	.01	-.09	-.05	.08	.08	.01	.04	-.04	.02	-								
12.Resume+ Cognitive Test (Organization 2)	-.04	.05	.00	.05	.12*	.04	-.01	.02	.05	-.03	.36**	-							
13.Resume + Personality Test (Organization 3)	-.11*	.03	-.08	-.02	.09	-.01	.05	-.02	-.03	-.06	.36**	.52**	-						

Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01. Gender was coded as “1” for females and “2” for males.

Table 4: Continued

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
14.Resume + Interview + Personality Test (Organization 4)	-.04	-.00	.02	-.08	-.02	-.05	-.09	.06	-.01	-.08	.30**	.22*	.48**	-				
15.Resume + Cognitive Test + Personality Test (Organization 5)	.02	-.01	.06	.04	.00	-.02	.03	.03	.00	-.03	-.14**	.23*	.33**	.41**	-			
16.Resume + Cognitive Test + Work Sample Test (Organization 6)	.03	.01	.09	.05	-.05	-.01	.03	.10*	.11*	.03	-.14	.06	-.07	.15**	.45**	-		
17.Resume + Interview + Reference Letter (Organization 7)	-.02	.07	.06	-.04	-.01	-.02	-.05	.06	-.03	-.03	.19**	.02	-.06	.17**	-.04	.22**	-	
18.All Methods (Organization 8)	.06	.07	.08	-.02	-.16**	-.12**	.13**	.13**	.10*	.03	-.39**	-.29**	-.32**	.02	.17**	.35**	.26**	-

Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01. Gender was coded as “1” for females and “2” for males.

Conscientiousness was positively correlated with preference for organization 2 (which used the resume and the cognitive ability test) ($r = .12, p < .01$). On the other hand, conscientiousness was negatively correlated with organization 8 (which used all selection methods) ($r = -.10, p < .05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 which stated that conscientiousness would be positively associated with preferences for all selection methods; however, the selection method most preferred by individuals with high conscientiousness would be the most complex selection process was partially supported.

Openness to experience was negatively correlated with organization 8 (which used all selection methods) ($r = -.12, p < .05$). However, openness to experience was not significantly correlated with preference for organization 7 and organization 3 (which used the interview, the personality test, and the reference letter methods). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 which stated that openness to experience, agreeableness, and extraversion would be positively associated with preference for subjective methods such as interviews, personality tests, and reference letters was not supported.

Agreeableness was positively correlated with organization 8 (which used all selection methods) ($r = .13, p < .01$). However, agreeableness was not significantly correlated with preference for organization 7 and organization 3 (which used the interview, the personality test, and the reference letter methods). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

As expected, neuroticism was found to be positively correlated with organization 6 (which used the the cognitive ability test, and the work sample test methods) ($r = .10, p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 4a which stated that neuroticism would be positively associated with the preference for objective methods was supported. Moreover, neuroticism was positively correlated with organization 8 (all selection methods) ($r = .13, p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 4b which stated neuroticism would be negatively associated with preference for subjective methods was not supported.

Similarly, Machiavellianism was positively correlated with preference for organization 8 (which used all selection methods) ($r = .10, p < .05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 5a which stated that Machiavellianism would be positively related to preference for subjective methods such as interviews, personality tests, reference letters was partially supported. Contrary to Hypothesis 5b, Machiavellianism was positively correlated with preference for organization 6 (which used the cognitive

ability test, and the work sample test methods ($r = .11, p < .05$). For this reason, Hypothesis 5b which stated that Machiavellianism would be negatively associated with preference for objective methods such as general cognitive ability tests and performance in work samples was not supported.

Finally, extraversion and narcissism were not correlated with any selection methods. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 6 were not supported.



Table 5: Correlations among Demographics, the Evaluators' Personality Traits, Preferences for Different Leadership Styles and Leader Personality Traits

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.Age	-												
2.Gender	.19**	-											
3.CGPA	-.08	.12*	-										
4.Mothers' E. L.	-.10*	-.01	-.04	-									
5.Fathers' E. L.	-.03	.07	.06	.57**	-								
6.SES	.21**	.10*	-.10*	.35**	.31**	-							
7.Extraversion	.15**	.03	-.02	.00	.02	.13**	(.89)						
8.Neuroticism	-.10*	-.08	.08	.04	.08	-.06	-.30**	(.78)					
9.Conscientiousness	.16**	-.16**	-.18**	-.03	-.08	-.02	.22**	-.33**	(.75)				
10.Openness to experience	.12*	.10*	.02	.04	.04	-.02	.37**	-.00	.19**	(.80)			
11. Agreeableness	.12*	-.09	-.04	-.09	-.09	-.04	.20**	-.35**	.31**	.14**	(.66)		
12.Machiavellianism	-.16**	.21**	.02	.09	.11*	.12*	.13**	.18**	-.33**	-.00	-.35**	(.78)	
13. Narcissism	-.18**	-.05	-.00	.01	-.01	.01	-.15**	.47**	-.17**	-.03	-.12**	.23**	(.62)

Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01. Gender was coded as "1" for females and "2" for males.

Table 5: Continued

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14.Preference for Neurotic Leader	-.10*	.01	.05	.08	.03	-.02	-.09	.08	-.08	-.01	.03	.00	-.04
15.Preference for Agree. Leader	.01	-.08	-.01	-.06	-.07	-.02	-.07	.05	.01	-.10*	.11*	-.08	-.03
16.Preference for a leader who is open to experience.	-.06	-.05	-.04	-.01	-.04	-.03	-.07	.02	.03	.07	.04	-.06	.01
17. Preference for Cons. Leader	-.04	-.09	-.08	-.03	-.07	.05	-.09	-.01	.07	-.14**	.08	-.08	.00
18. Preference for Extra. Leader.	-.17**	-.14**	.03	.01	.01	-.04	.13**	-.01	.07	.04	.05	.01	.12**
19. Preference for Mach. Leader	-.06	.05	.06	.02	.06	.04	.02	.07	-.13**	-.07	-.07	.30**	.11*
20. Preference for Nars. Leader	-.07	-.01	.01	-.02	-.03	.02	.08	-.01	-.04	-.01	.06	.12**	.17**
21. Preference for PL	-.02	-.04	.05	-.07	-.02	-.01	-.07	-.01	-.07	-.18**	.11*	-.03	.04
22.Preference for T-O Leader	-.06	.01	.02	.09	.07	-.02	-.06	.04	-.06	.03	-.10*	.11*	.04
23.Preference for R-O Leader	-.02	-.11*	.00	-.07	-.02	-.06	-.10*	.09	-.01	-.06	.03	-.03	.03
24.Preference for TL	-.01	-.10	-.12*	.04	.03	.03	-.03	.01	.09	-.06	.04	-.08	-.01

Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01. Gender was coded as “1” for females and “2” for males.

Table 5. Continued

Variables	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
14.Preference for Neurotic Leader	-										
15. Preference for Agree. Leader	.05	-									
16. Preference for a leader who is open to experience.	-.14**	.29**	-								
17. Preference for Cons. Leader	-.24**	.30**	.43**	-							
18. Preference for Extra. Leader.	-.08	.29**	.30**	.30**	-						
19.Preference for Mach. Leader	.17**	-.01	-.15**	-.08	-.04	-					
20.Preference for Nars. Leader	.21**	.00	-.18**	-.10*	.05	.27**	-				
21. Preference for PL	.05	.16**	-.04	.06	.13**	.04	.07	-			
22.Preference for T-O Leader	.07	.05	.08	.08	.06	.15**	.17**	.05	-		
23.Preference for R-O Leader	-.02	.24**	.18**	.12**	.18**	.01	.04	.20**	.03	-	
24.Preference for TL	-.09*	.24**	.28**	.23**	.19**	.03	-.03	.14**	.14**	.25**	-

Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01. Gender was coded as “1” for females and “2” for males.

Bivariate correlations between demographics, the evaluators' personality traits, preferences for different leadership styles and leader personality traits are presented in Table 5.

As expected, extraversion was positively correlated with preference for an extraverted leader ($r = .13, p < .01$). For this reason, Hypothesis 7a was supported. Contrary to Hypothesis 8a, extraversion was negatively correlated with preference for a R-O leader ($r = -.10, p < .05$). Hypothesis 8a stated that agreeableness and extraversion are positively related to preference for R-O and PL style was not supported. Moreover, extraversion was not significantly correlated with preference for TL style. Therefore, Hypothesis 8b stated that Extraversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness are positively associated with preference for TL style was not supported.

Neuroticism was not correlated with neurotic leader. Hypothesis 7b stated that Neuroticism is positively related to a preference for a neurotic leader was not supported. Moreover, neuroticism was positively correlated with preference for a Machiavellian leader, preference for narcissistic leader, and as expected, preference for a T-O leader ($r = .30, p < .01$ $r = .12, p < .01$ $r = .11, p < .05$; respectively). Hypothesis 8c stated that neuroticism and conscientiousness are positively related to preference for T-O leadership style was partially supported.

Conscientiousness was not correlated with conscientious leader. Hypothesis 7c stated that Conscientiousness is positively related to a preference for a conscientious leader was not supported. Also, Conscientiousness was negatively correlated with preference for a Machiavellian leader ($r = -.13, p < .01$). However, conscientiousness was not significantly correlated with preference for a supervisor with TL and T-O leadership styles. Therefore, Hypothesis 8b was not supported. Similarly, Hypothesis 8c stated that neuroticism and conscientiousness are positively related to preference for T-O leadership style was not supported.

Similarly, openness to experience was not correlated with preference for a leader who is open to experience. Hypothesis 7d stated that openness to experience is positively related to a preference for a leader who is open to experience was not supported. In addition, openness to experience was negatively correlated with preference for an agreeable leader, preference for a conscientious leader and preference for PL style ($r = -.10, p < .05$ $r = -.14, p < .01$ $r = -.18, p < .01$; respectively). However, openness to experience was not significantly correlated with preference for

TL style. Therefore, hypothesis Hypothesis 8b was not supported.

As expected, agreeableness was positively correlated with preference for an agreeable leader ($r = .11, p < .05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 7e stated that agreeableness is positively related to a preference for an agreeable leader was supported. In addition, agreeableness is positively related to preference for PL style ($r = .11, p < .05$). On the other hand, agreeableness was negatively correlated with preference for a T-O leader ($r = -.10, p < .05$). However, agreeableness was not significantly correlated with preference for a R-O leader. For this reason, Hypothesis 8a was partially supported.

As expected, narcissism was positively correlated with preference for a narcissistic leader ($r = .17, p < .01$). Hypothesis 7g stated that Narcissism positively related to a preference for a narcissistic leader was supported. Also, narcissism was positively correlated with extraverted leader, a Machiavellian leader and a narcissistic leader ($r = .12, p < .01$ $r = .11, p < .05$; respectively). However, narcissism was not significantly correlated with preference for TL, and R-O leadership styles. Hypothesis 10a stated that narcissism is positively related to preferences for TL, PL, and R-O leadership styles was not supported. Moreover, narcissism was not significantly correlated with T-O leadership style. Therefore, Hypothesis 10b stated that narcissism is negatively related to preference for T-O leadership style was not supported

Finally, Machiavellianism was not significantly correlated with the leadership type preferences. Therefore, Hypothesis 7f which stated that Machiavellianism would be positively related to a preference for a Machiavellian leader was not supported, Moreover, Hypothesis 9a which stated that Machiavellianism would be positively related to preferences for PL and R-O leadership styles and Hypothesis 9b which stated that Machiavellianism would be negatively related to preferences for T-O leadership styles were not supported.

CHAPTER IV

OVERVIEW FOR STUDY 2

The results of Study 1 are very important in terms of showing the preferences of the young population (i.e., university students) who will look for a job and who will start working in the near future, for the type of leadership and the methods of selecting personnel. However, the student sample of Study 1 also constitute a limitation since they have not actually look for a job yet. As a matter of fact, this may be the reason for hypotheses that were not confirmed or the findings which were the opposite of what was suggested. For example, contrary to my expectations, there was not a significant relationship between Machiavellianism and preference for PL and R-O leadership styles. Moreover, although I suggested a positive relationship between conscientiousness and preferences for all selection methods; the results showed that conscientiousness and preferences for all selection methods were negatively related. Taking into account the possibility that the relationships of Big Five personalities, Machiavellianism, and narcissism with preferences for different leadership styles and personnel selection methods may differ among working adults who have selection and working experience, I decided to replicate the Study 1 by collecting data from employees who have at least 2 years of work experience in Study 2. Furthermore, Study 1 showed that hypotheses related to the “similar-to-me effect” (i.e., Hypotheses, X, V, Y, and Z) were supported for the personality traits of extraversion, agreeableness, Machiavellianism, and narcissism. More specifically, participants who scored high on these traits were more likely to prefer leaders who have matching personality profiles. I expected that, the relationships of personality traits with preference for leaders with compatible personality profiles would be stronger among working adults with higher levels of work experience than university students.

CHAPTER V

STUDY 2 METHOD

5.1 PARTICIPANTS AND THE PROCEDURE

The online study survey was prepared using the Qualtrics program due to pandemic conditions. The survey link was distributed using applications such as LinkedIn and Twitter. Participation was voluntary and aninformed consent was provided to the participants before the study survey. The item “I have been working for at least 2 years” was presented to the participants as the first item of the survey. After the participants answered “Yes”, they proceeded to the main survey. Of 479 participants 229 (47.8%) were female, 245 (51.1%) were male, and five (1.0%) specified that they did not want to specify their gender. Participants were working in the organizations operating in finance, metal, media, fast-moving consumer goods, durable consumer goods, textile, pharmaceutical, technology, education, automotive, construction, and materials sectors. The duration of the questionnaire for the working adults lasted an average of 15-20 minutes. The months in which the data were collected are between January and March. The demographic characteristics of the participants of the Study 2 are presented in Table 6. The ages of the participants ranged from 23 to 65 and most of the participants were relatively young adults ($M = 38.32$. $SD = 8.752$). Participants’ average tenure (in months) were calculated as 107.59 ($SD = 90.35$).

Table 6: Demographic Characteristics of the Participants of Study 2

Age		
	<i>M</i>	38.32
	<i>SD</i>	8.752
Gender		
	Male	51.1
%	Female	47.8
Education Level		
	Primary education	6
	Secondary school	4
%	High school	4.8
	University for 2 years	4.4
	University	48.4
	Master	28.6
	Doctorate	12.7
Tenure (Months)		
	<i>M</i>	107.59
	<i>SD</i>	90.35
Sector		
	Public	44.1
%	Private	50.7
	Civil Society Organization	2.1
	Other	3.1
Blue vs. White Collars		
	White-collar worker	83.9
%	Blue-collar worker	16.1
Work Domain		
	Finance	5.4
	Metal	1.5
	Media	4.0
%	Fast-moving consumer goods	2.9
	Durable consumer goods	1.9
	Textile	.8
	Pharmaceutical	13.2
	Technology	5.4
	Education	28.6
	Automotive	2.1
	Construction and materials	6.9
	Other	27.3
Income		
	Less than 4.000 TL	4.0
	4.000 TL - 6.000 TL	13.4
%	6.000 TL - 8.000 TL	16.7
	8.000 TL - 10.000 TL	13.4
	10.000 TL - 12.000 TL	14.0
	More than 12.000 TL	38.6

CHAPTER VI

STUDY 2 RESULTS

6.1 DATA SCREENING AND DATA CLEANING

There were 1064 participants in total. 484 of the participants completed the 100% of the study survey. After calculating the Mahalanobis distance, 5 participants were identified as multivariate outliers and their data were excluded from the data set. Therefore, the main analyses were performed with data provided by 479 participants.

6.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS AMONG THE STUDY VARIABLES

The means, standard deviations, minimum, maximum, kurtosis, and skewness values of the study variables are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Scores, Skewness and Kurtosis Values of Study Variables

Variables	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Agreeableness	3.77	0.47	2.11	4.89	-0.44	0.31
Extraversion	3.44	0.78	1.13	5.00	-0.27	-0.55
Conscientiousness	3.85	0.56	1.78	5.00	-0.49	0.22
Neuroticism	2.73	0.66	1.25	5.00	0.24	-0.21
Openness to Experience	3.91	0.47	2.00	5.00	-0.40	0.54
Machiavellianism	1.85	0.82	1.00	5.00	0.96	0.39
Narcissism	3.12	0.84	1.00	5.00	-0.21	-0.25
Preference for PL	3.36	2.0	1	7	0.39	-1.16
Preference for T-O Leader	4.01	1.9	1	7	-0.04	-1.18
Preference for R-O Leader	5.36	1.7	1	7	-1.04	0.20
Preference for TL	5.81	1.5	1	7	-1.46	1.65
Preference for Mach. Leader	2.06	1.5	1	7	1.47	1.39
Preference for Nars. Leader	2.07	1.4	1	7	1.51	1.61
Preference for Extra. Leader	4.67	1.6	1	7	-0.42	-0.55
Preference for Neurotic Leader	1.68	1.1	1	7	2.22	5.52
Preference for Agree. Leader	5.20	1.5	1	7	-0.75	0.00
Preference for Open. Leader	5.95	1.2	1	7	-1.43	2.29
Preference for Cons. Leader	5.76	1.3	1	7	-1.34	1.83
Valid N (Listwise)	479					

Bivariate correlations among the personality traits and preferences for selection methods are presented in Table 8.

Openness to experience was negatively correlated with preference for organization 6 (which use the cognitive ability test, and the work sample test methods) ($r = -.15, p < .05$). As expected, openness to experience was significantly correlated with preferences for the interview, the personality test, and the reference letter methods. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 which proposed that openness to experience, agreeableness, and extraversion are positively associated with preference for subjective methods such as interviews, personality tests, and reference letters was supported.

Neuroticism was positively correlated with preference for organization 8 (which used all methods) ($r = .12, p < .05$). For this reason, Hypothesis 4a stated that neuroticism is positively associated with the preference for objective methods was partially supported. Contrary to Hypothesis 4b, neuroticism was positively correlated with preference for organization 4 (which used the interview, and the personality test methods) ($r = .15, p < .05$). Hypothesis 4b stated that neuroticism is negatively associated with preference for

subjective methods was not supported. Similarly, neuroticism was positively correlated with organization 7 (which used the the interview, and the reference letter) ($r = .12, p < .05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 4b was not supported. Moreover, neuroticism was negatively correlated with preference for organization 2 (which used and the cognitive ability test methods) ($r = -.10, p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 4b was not supported.

Contrary to Hypothesis 5b, Machiavellianism was positively correlated with preference for organization 6 (which used the cognitive ability test, and the work sample test methods) ($r = .10, p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 5b stated that Machiavellianism is negatively associated with preference for objective methods such as general cognitive ability tests and performance in work samples was not supported. Similarly contrary to Hypothesis 5a, Machiavellianism was negatively correlated with preference for organization 7 (which used the resume, the interview, and the reference letter methods) ($r = -.09, p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 5a stated that Machiavellianism is positively related to preference for subjective methods such as interviews, personality tests, reference letters was not supported.

Finally, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and narcissism were not correlated with preference for any of the organizations or selection methods. Hence, Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 6 were not supported.

Table 8: Correlations Among the Personality Traits and Preferences for Selection Methods

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
1.Age	-																			
2.Gender	.14**	-																		
3.Education Level	-.06	-.20**	-																	
4.Tot.Work Ten.	.64**	.06	-.06	-																
5.Agreeableness	.03	-.06	.05	.03	-															
6.Extraversion	.01	-.10*	.05	.03	.25**	-														
7.Conscientiousness	.19**	-.01	-.00	.16**	.27**	.24**	-													
8.Neuroticism	-.08	-.10*	-.04	-.04	-.38**	-.23**	-.36**	-												
9.Opennes to Experience	.01	-.03	.13**	.01	.22**	.37**	.28**	-.16**	-											
10.Machiavellianism	-.12*	.03	.10*	-.14**	-.30**	.04	-.27**	.12**	-.04	-										
11.Narcissism	-.24**	-.17**	.14**	-.16**	-.09*	.13**	.01	.09	.03	.46**	-									
12.Resume +Interview (Organization 1)	.03	.02	.03	.07	.04	.00	.00	-.01	.06	-.09	-.03	-								
13.Resume + Cognitive Test (Organization 2)	.01	-.05	.03	-.03	.03	-.02	-.02	-.10*	.01	.03	.03	.08	-							
14.Resume + Personality Test (Organization 3)	.05	-.10*	.03	.02	-.01	-.03	-.06	-.02	-.01	-.04	-.02	.14**	.38**	-						

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. Gender was coded as “1” for females and “2” for males.

Table 8: Continued

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
15.Resume + Interview + Personality Test (Organization 4)	.03	-.04	-.02	.03	-.08	-.04	-.06	.15 ^{***}	-.01	.02	-.01	.21 ^{**}	.09	.29 ^{**}	-				
16.Resume + Cognitive Test + Personality Test (Organization 5)	.07	-.01	-.09	.00	-.00	-.01	-.08	.02	-.08	.04	-.01	-.18 ^{**}	.41 ^{**}	.36 ^{**}	.29 ^{**}	-			
17.Resume + Cognitive Test + Work Sample Test (Organization 6)	.09	.08	-.03	.00	.05	-.00	.02	-.05	-.15 ^{**}	.10 [*]	.05	-.19 ^{**}	.29 ^{**}	.06	-.02	.37 ^{**}	-		
18.Resume + Interview + Reference Letter (Organization 7)	-.10 [*]	.01	-.08	-.02	-.04	-.03	-.04	.12 ^{**}	.06	-.09 [*]	-.03	.37 ^{***}	-.08	-.03	.16 ^{**}	-.21 ^{**}	-.17 ^{**}	-	
19.All Methods (Organization 8)	-.11 [*]	-.03	-.07	-.14 ^{**}	-.05	-.09	-.07	.12 ^{**}	-.07	-.03	.04	-.20 ^{**}	.00	-.07	.17 ^{**}	.23 ^{**}	.22 ^{**}	.17 ^{**}	-

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. Gender was coded as “1” for females and “2” for males.

Bivariate correlations among the personality traits and preferences for leadership styles and leader traits are presented in Table 9.

As expected, age was positively correlated with total current work tenure ($r = .63, p < .01$). That is, as age increased, tenure also increased. In addition, age was negatively correlated with Machiavellianism, narcissism, preference for TL, and preference for an extraverted leader ($r = -.12, p < .05$; $r = -.24, p < .01$; $r = -.10, p < .05$; $r = -.13, p < .01$; respectively).

Gender was positively correlated with preference for a neurotic leader and preference for a Machiavellian leader ($r = .14, p < .01$; $r = .09, p < .05$; respectively). That is, males reported higher levels of preference for neurotic and Machiavellian leaders than females. Gender was negatively associated with education level, extraversion, neuroticism, narcissism, preference for TL, preference for an extraverted leader, and preference for a leader who is open to experience ($r = -.20, p < .01$; $r = -.10, p < .05$; $r = -.10, p < .05$; $r = -.17, p < .01$; $r = -.14, p < .01$; $r = -.17, p < .01$; $r = -.14, p < .01$; respectively). More specifically, females reported higher levels of education level, traits of extraversion and narcissism, preference for TL, extraverted leaders and a leader who is open to experience than males.

Education level was positively correlated with openness to experience, Machiavellianism, narcissism, preference for TL, preference for an extraverted leader, and preference for a leader who is open to experience ($r = .13, p < .01$; $r = .10, p < .05$; $r = .14, p < .01$; $r = .13, p < .01$; $r = .14, p < .01$; $r = .12, p < .01$; respectively). That is, as the education level increased these personality traits and leader preferences also increased.

Total current work tenure was positively correlated with conscientiousness ($r = .16, p < .01$). On the other hand, total current work tenure was negatively related to Machiavellianism, narcissism, and preference for an extraverted leader ($r = -.14, p < .01$; $r = -.16, p < .01$; $r = -.13, p < .01$; $r = .13, p < .01$; respectively).

As expected, extraversion was positively correlated with a preference for an extraverted leader ($r = .26, p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 7a which stated that extraversion would be positively related to a preference for an extraverted leader was supported. Similarly, as expected, extraversion was positively correlated with a preference for TL style ($r = .13, p < .01$). For this reason, Hypothesis 8b which stated that extraversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness would be positively associated with preference for TL style was supported. However, extraversion was not

related to preferences for R-O leadership and PL styles. Therefore, Hypothesis 8a which stated that agreeableness and extraversion would be positively related to preference for R-O and PL styles was not supported. Similarly, extraversion was positively correlated with preference for a leader who is open to experience ($r = .18$, $p < .01$).

As expected, neuroticism was positively correlated with preference for a neurotic leader ($r = .12$, $p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 7b which stated that Neuroticism would be positively related to a preference for a neurotic leader was supported. However, neuroticism was not related to preferences for T-O leadership style. For this reason, Hypothesis 8c which stated that neuroticism and conscientiousness would be positively related to preference for T-O leadership style was not supported. Furthermore, neuroticism was negatively correlated with preference for an agreeable leader and preference for a conscientious leader ($r = -.13$, $p < .01$; $r = -.11$, $p < .05$).

As expected, conscientiousness was positively correlated with preference for a conscientious leader ($r = .28$, $p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 7c which stated that conscientiousness would be positively related to a preference for a conscientious leader was supported. Similarly, as expected, conscientiousness was positively correlated with preference for TL style ($r = .16$, $p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 8b supported. However, conscientiousness was not related to a preferences for T-O leadership style. Therefore, Hypothesis 8c was not supported. Surprisingly, conscientiousness was positively correlated with preference for a leader who is open to experience ($r = .14$, $p < .01$). On the other hand, conscientiousness was negatively correlated with a preference for a neurotic leader and preference for a Machiavellian leader ($r = -.15$, $p < .01$; $r = -.12$, $p < .05$; respectively).

Similarly, as expected, openness to experience was positively correlated with preference for a leader who is open to experience ($r = .25$, $p < .01$). Hypothesis 7d which stated that openness to experience would be positively related to a preference for a leader who is open to experience was supported. Specifically, as expected, openness to experience was positively correlated with preference for TL style ($r = .10$, $p < .05$). For this reason, Hypothesis 8b was also supported. Openness to experience was also positively correlated with preference for an extraverted leader and preference for an agreeable leader ($r = .14$, $p < .01$; $r = .14$, $p < .01$; respectively). On the other hand, openness to experience was negatively correlated with preference for PL style,

preference for a T-O leader, preference for a Machiavellian leader, and preference for a narcissistic leader ($r = -.10, p < .05$; $r = -.11, p < .05$; $r = -.12, p < .05$; $r = -.09, p < .05$; respectively).

As expected, agreeableness was found to be positively related to preference for an agreeable leader ($r = .26, p < .01$). For this reason, Hypothesis 7e which stated that agreeableness would be positively related to a preference for an agreeable leader was supported. Similarly, agreeableness was found to be positively correlated with preference for a R-O leader ($r = .16, p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 8a which stated that agreeableness and extraversion would be positively related to preference for R-O and PL styles was partially supported. Surprisingly, agreeableness was found to be positively related to preference for TL style, preference for an extraverted leader, preference for a leader who is open to experience, and preference for a conscientious leader ($r = .18, p < .05$; $r = .17, p < .01$; $r = .19, p < .01$; $r = .11, p < .05$; respectively). Agreeableness was only negatively correlated with preference for a Machiavellian leader ($r = -.12, p < .05$).

As expected, Machiavellianism was positively correlated with preference for a Machiavellian leader preference ($r = .34, p < .01$). Hence, Hypothesis 7f which stated that Machiavellianism would be positively related to a preference for a Machiavellian leader was supported. However, Machiavellianism was not related to preference for PL and R-O leadership styles. Therefore, Hypothesis 9a stated that Machiavellianism would be positively related to preferences for PL and R-O leadership styles was not supported. Similarly, Machiavellianism was not related to preference for T-O leadership style. Hence, Hypothesis 9b which stated that Machiavellianism would be negatively related to preferences for T-O leadership styles was not supported. Surprisingly, Machiavellianism was positively correlated with preferences for a neurotic leader and preference for a narcissistic leader ($r = .20, p < .01$; $r = .19, p < .01$; respectively).

Specifically, as expected, narcissism was positively correlated with a preference for a narcissist leader ($r = .29, p < .01$). Hence, Hypothesis 7g which stated that narcissism would be positively related to a preference for a narcissistic leader was supported. Narcissism was positively correlated with preference for PL style and preference for TL style ($r = .24, p < .01$; $r = .19, p < .01$; respectively). Therefore, Hypothesis 10a which stated that narcissism would be positively related to preferences for TL, PL, and R-O leadership styles was partially supported. Contrary to Hypothesis

10b, narcissism was positively correlated with preference for a T-O leader ($r = .11, p < .05$). Surprisingly, narcissism was positively correlated with preference for an extraverted leader, preference for a leader who is open to experience, preference for a conscientious leader, and preference for a Machiavellian leader a ($r = .21, p < .01; r = .11, p < .05; r = .13, p < .01; r = .25, p < .01$; respectively).



Table 9: Bivariate Correlations among Personality Traits and Preferences for Leadership Styles and Leader Traits

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Age	-										
2. Gender	.13**	-									
3. Education Level	-.06	-.20**	-								
4. Total Current Work Tenure	.63**	.06	-.06	-							
5. Agreeableness	.04	-.06	.05	.03	(.66)						
6. Extraversion	.01	-.10*	.05	.03	.25**	(.88)					
7. Conscientiousness	.19**	.01	-.00	.16**	.27**	.24**	(.76)				
8. Neuroticism	-.08	-.10*	-.04	-.04	-.38**	-.23**	-.36**	(.79)			
9. Openness to Experience	.01	-.03	.13**	.01	.22**	.37**	.28**	-.16**	(.77)		
10. Machiavellianism	-.12*	.03	.10*	-.14**	-.30**	.04	-.27**	.12**	-.04	(.76)	
11. Narcissism	-.24**	-.17**	.14**	-.16**	-.09*	.13**	.01	.09	.03	.46**	(.67)

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. Gender was coded as “1” for females and “2” for males.

Table 9. Continued

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12. Preference for PL	-.08	.04	-.02	.01	.09	.06	.04	-.03	-.10*	.07	.24**
13. Preference for T-O Leader	-.03	.09	.03	-.02	-.06	-.03	.00	-.06	-.11*	.03	.11*
14. Preference for R-O Leader	-.07	-.03	-.07	-.01	.16**	.01	.03	-.08	.01	-.07	.05
15. Preference for TL	-.10*	-.14**	.13**	-.04	.18**	.13**	.16**	-.08	.10*	-.01	.19**
16. Preference for Extra. Leader.	-.13**	-.17**	.14**	-.13**	.17**	.26**	.02	-.03	.14**	.05	.21**
17. Preference for Neurotic Leader	-.06	.14**	-.01	-.01	-.04	-.06	-.15**	.12**	-.05	.20**	.07
18. Preference for Agree. Leader	.06	-.01	.01	.07	.26**	.08	.08	-.13**	.14**	-.07	.06
19. Preference for Open. Leader	-.08	-.14**	.12**	-.06	.19**	.18**	.14**	-.08	.25**	-.01	.11*
20. Preference for Cons. Leader	-.06	-.09	.01	-.09	.11*	.08	.28**	-.11*	.06	-.08	.13**
23. Preference for Mach. Leader	-.07	.09*	.04	-.05	-.12*	-.03	-.12*	.02	-.12*	.34**	.25**
24. Preference for Nars. Leader	-.08	.05	.05	-.04	-.04	.03	-.05	.01	-.09*	.19**	.29**

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. Gender was coded as “1” for females and “2” for males.

Table 9. Continued

Variables	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
14. Preference for PL	-										
15. Preference for T-O Leader	.18**	-									
16. Preference for R-O Leader	.23**	.06	-								
17. Preference for TL	.17**	.10*	.14**	-							
18. Preference for Extraverted Leader	.22**	.10*	.23**	.30**	-						
19. Preference for Neurotic Leader	.21**	.17**	-.07	-.03	-.02	-					
20. Preference for Agreeable Leader	.14**	.01	.34**	.22**	.30**	-.06	-				
21. Preference for Open. Leader	.07	-.00	.24**	.36**	.32**	-.10*	.41**	-			
22. Preference for Conscientious Leader	.07	.13**	.07	.39**	.24**	-.11*	.25**	.40**	-		
23. Preference for Machiavellian Leader	.22**	.19**	.02	.02	.06	.43**	.05	-.06	-.14**	-	
24. Preference for Narcissist Leader	.32**	.22**	-.01	.10*	.15**	.44**	.01	-.04	.02	.45**	-

Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01. Gender was coded as “1” for females and “2” for males.

Table 10. Summary of the Hypotheses and the Results of Study 1 and Study 2

Hypothesis	Study 1 Results	Study 2 Results
1: Conscientiousness is positively associated with preferences for all selection methods; however, the selection method most preferred by individuals with high conscientiousness is the most complex selection process (including both subjective and objective methods).	S~*	NS
2: Openness to experience, agreeableness, and extraversion are positively associated with a preference for subjective methods such as interviews, personality tests, and reference letters.	NS	NS
3: Extraversion is negatively related to the preference for objective methods such as cognitive ability testing, and work sample tests.	NS	NS
4a: Neuroticism is positively associated with the preference for objective methods such as cognitive tests, work ability testing.	S	NS*
4b: Neuroticism is negatively associated with a preference for subjective methods such as interviews and reference letters.	NS	NS*
5a: Machiavellianism is positively related to preference of subjective methods such as interview, personality test, reference letter.	NS	NS*
5b: Machiavellianism is negatively associated with preference for objective methods such as general cognitive ability testing and performance in work samples.	NS*	NS
6: Narcissism is positively associated with preferences for all selection methods; however, the selection method most preferred by individuals with high narcissism is the most complex selection process (including both subjective and objective methods).	NS	NS
7a: Extraversion is positively related to preference for an extraverted leader.	S	S
7b: Neuroticism is positively related to a preference for a neurotic leader.	NS	S
7c: Conscientiousness is positively related to preference for a conscientious leader.	NS	S
7d: Openness to experience is positively related to preference for a leader who is open to experience.	NS	S
7e: Agreeableness is positively related to preference for an agreeable leader.	S	S
7f: Machiavellianism is positively related to preference for a Machiavellian leader.	S	S
7g: Narcissism is positively related to a preference for a narcissistic leader.	S	S
8a: Agreeableness and extraversion are positively related to preference for R-O leadership and PL styles.	S~	S~
8b: Extraversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness are positively associated with preference for TL style.	NS	S
8c: Neuroticism and conscientiousness are positively related to preference for T-O leadership style.	NS	NS
9a: Machiavellianism is positively related to preference for PL and R-O leadership styles.	NS	NS
9b: Machiavellianism is negatively related to preference for T-O leadership style.	NS*	NS
10a: Narcissism is positively related to preference for PL, TL, and R-O leadership styles.	NS	S~
10b: Narcissism is negatively related to preference for T-O leadership style.	NS	NS*

* Correlation was found to be significant in the opposite direction, not in the expected direction.

CHAPTER VII

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present study is expected to contribute to the literature by examining the effects of various personality traits including the Big Five as well as Narcissism and Machiavellianism on preferences for different leadership styles (i.e., PL, TL, R-O, and T-O leadership styles) and personnel selection methods. While the sample of Study 1 consisted of university students, the sample of Study 2 consisted of individuals who had been in working for at least two years. Some of the hypotheses of Study 1 in which the sample was university students were not supported. Therefore, I wanted to conduct Study 2 with working adults and compare the results of the two studies.

7.1 MAIN FINDINGS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Hypothesis 1 suggested that conscientiousness would be positively associated with preferences for all selection methods; however, the selection method most preferred by individuals with high conscientiousness was predicted to be the most complex selection process (including both subjective and objective methods). Although only in the student sample, conscientiousness was positively related to preference for cognitive ability tests as we expected, conscientiousness was not significantly associated with preference for other selection methods in the working adult sample. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported in the student sample and it was not supported in the working adult sample. Moreover, contrary to Hypothesis 1, conscientiousness was negatively related to preference for the most complex selection method except for cognitive ability tests among the student sample. One reason for this finding may be that young individuals (i.e., university students) with a high level of conscientiousness may think that they will feel obligated to work harder and prepare more when they choose the most complex selection method; therefore, they may be less likely to prefer the most complex procedure over the other selection methods.

Hypothesis 2 suggested that openness to experience, agreeableness, and extraversion would be positively associated with preference for subjective methods such as interviews, personality tests, and reference letters. Openness to experience was negatively associated with all selection methods in the student sample. Moreover, openness to experience was negatively related to preference for work sample tests in the working adult sample. It is plausible to suggest that young (i.e., student) participants who score high on openness to experience might have thought that the traditional selection methods included in the present study were outdated. Therefore, future researchers are encouraged to assess preferences for more up-to-date selection methods which may include those using artificial intelligence (AI), especially among young adults. On the other hand, individuals with a high level of openness to experience in the adult sample are likely to be familiar with traditional selection methods, and they might think that the work sample test which involves doing a limited part of a job according to the given instructions as a selection method that prevent them to use their creativity. One practical implication of the findings is that the face validity of and preference for traditional selection methods may be at low levels, especially for the jobs that require creativity and innovation and for individuals who score high on openness to experience. Consistently, human resources specialists and subject matter experts may benefit from using more creative and up-to-date selection methods and measurements when hiring for jobs that require creativity and openness to experience as specific personality traits.

Contrary to the propositions of Hypothesis 2 and 3, results showed that extraversion was neither positively related to preference for subjective methods nor it was negatively related to preference for objective methods. Indeed, agreeableness and extraversion did not affect preferences for selection methods. Few related studies in the field showed that students with high extraversion preferred face-to-face learning styles because they liked to establish partnerships with others (Harrington & Loffredo, 2009). Consistently, Murphy (2021) showed that individuals with a high level of extraversion prefer to receive face-to-face feedback from their managers. In addition, such individuals were found not to prefer e-mail feedback over personal feedback because it was more rigid and limited. Chamorro-Premuzic and colleagues (2005: 247) showed that students with a high level of agreeableness preferred oral exams and face-to-face group tasks. The authors argued that the reason for their findings might be the fact that agreeable individuals could express themselves more in social environments

and had good communication skills. In another study, it was reported that individuals with a high level of agreeableness experienced more discomfort in performance appraisals because they sought social approval in the evaluation process (LaBat 2018: 58). Therefore, although extraversion and agreeableness were not significantly associated with preferences for specific personnel selection methods, agreeableness and extraversion may affect preferences for working and performance appraisal methods.

Hypothesis 4a suggested that neuroticism would be positively associated with the preference for objective methods such as cognitive ability and work sample tests. Similarly, Hamburger and Ben-Artzi (2000: 444) stated that individuals with a higher level of neuroticism preferred objective methods because they had difficulty in expressing themselves and they generally feel anxious and restless. In addition, neurotic individuals may prefer these types of tests because they require fewer interpersonal interactions. Hypothesis 4a was supported in Study 1 which included the student sample. However, contrary to expectations, neuroticism was negatively associated with the preference for the cognitive tests, and it was not significantly associated with the preference for the work sample tests in the working adult sample (Study 2). One of the reasons for these contradictory results may be that working adults may not be highly familiar with the cognitive ability tests which are recently started to be used in personnel selection procedures in Turkey. Therefore, they may prefer more traditional selection methods than cognitive ability tests. Furthermore, since the average tenure in the working adult sample was around eight years, they may not have encountered such methods before. On the contrary, the students are more likely to be familiar with objective methods such as cognitive tests as well as work sample tests than working adults.

Hypothesis 4b suggested that neuroticism would be negatively associated with a preference for subjective methods such as interviews and reference letters. However, neuroticism was not significantly associated with preference for the interview and reference letters as the selection methods in the student sample. Moreover, contrary to expectations, neuroticism was positively associated with a preference for reference letters and interviews as the selection methods in the working adult sample. Taking the findings regarding Hypothesis 4a and 4b into consideration, it is plausible to suggest that working adults, whose mean age is higher than those in the student sample, might have preferred traditional and highly familiar selection methods (i.e., reference letters

and interviews) over up-to-date, less familiar selection procedures (i.e., cognitive ability tests) independent of their content. Future studies are suggested to replicate the findings in the following years in order to examine whether increased familiarity with the new selection methods changes individuals' preferences for these methods as well as the relationships of personality traits with preferences with different selection procedures.

Hypothesis 5a suggested that Machiavellianism would be positively related to a preference for subjective methods such as interviews, personality tests, and reference letters. However, Machiavellianism was not significantly related to preference for subjective selection methods among the student sample. Moreover, contrary to expectations, Machiavellianism was negatively associated with the preference for subjective methods among the working adult sample. Therefore, Hypothesis 5a was not supported in both studies. One reason for the finding that working adults who scored high on Machiavellianism did not prefer subjective methods may be related to the negative recruitment and selection experiences that these individuals had. More specifically, Machiavellian individuals might have interview or personality test experiences that they have failed to fake their adverse traits and attitudes. Similarly, Machiavellian individuals may not receive very good reference letters from their previous workplaces because of their negative characteristics such as not caring about ethical values and not showing empathy. Therefore, these methods may not be preferred in the working adult sample, as they are the methods that have the potential to reveal Machiavellian individuals' deficits and reflect their bad aspects in the next workplace.

Hypothesis 5b suggested that Machiavellianism would be negatively associated with a preference for objective methods such as general cognitive ability tests and performance in work samples. Contrary to expectations, Machiavellianism was positively associated with a preference for objective methods among the student sample. However, Machiavellianism was not significantly associated preference for objective methods among the working adult sample. One explanation may be that the young individuals (i.e., university students) with high levels of Machiavellian tendencies, who do not have experience in actual recruitment selection processes, may think that if they need to, they will be able to easily deceive even the objective tests during selection processes. Elmas (2018: 38) argues that individuals who score high on Machiavellianism may easily lie and cheat to get the rewards. In addition,

individuals who high scored on Machiavellianism have a high level of tendency to take risks (Czibor et al. 2017: 221) and university students' preference for objective methods may also be related to their risk-taking attitudes.

Hypothesis 6 suggested that narcissism would be positively associated with preferences for all selection methods; however, the selection method most preferred by individuals with high narcissism was suggested to be the most complex selection process (including both subjective and objective methods). Hypothesis 6 was not supported in both studies. More specifically, narcissism was not significantly related to preference for any of the selection methods. It is widely known that individuals who score high on narcissism generally feel and think that they are more “special” and “unique” than others (DuBRIN 2012: 15; Çimşir & Tümlü 2021: 524). They may have a general tendency to devalue all selection methods which -they think- are not “good enough” to evaluate their superior talents, skills, and abilities. This attitude may result in a general indifference towards and non-preference for different personnel selection systems.

In line with Hypotheses 7a, 7b, 7c, 7d, and 7e the findings revealed that “similar to me” effect worked for extraversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and agreeableness to some extent. Hypotheses 7a and 7e were supported while Hypotheses 7b, 7c, and 7d were not supported in the student sample (i.e., Study 1). Moreover, Hypotheses from 7a to 7e were supported in the working adult sample (i.e., Study 2). First of all, in the student sample, individuals who scored high on neuroticism might not prefer a neurotic manager, like themselves. It is an understandable result that when two neurotic individuals work together, a tense and negative work atmosphere is likely to exist. However, it is interesting to find that young individuals who score high on conscientiousness do not prefer conscientious leaders or managers; similarly, those who score high on openness to experience in the student sample do not prefer a supervisor who is highly open to experience. Individuals who score high on conscientiousness are responsible people, they act in a planned manner, strive for success, and are individuals with self-discipline in general (Sansone et al. 1999: 701). Therefore, it would be a more accurate result for such individuals to prefer managers with features like themselves. On the other hand, individuals who scored high on openness to experience should have preferred managers who have extraordinary ideas (Leung & Chiu 2008: 376). Actually, in the working adult sample, all of the hypotheses proposed in line with the "similar to me" effect were supported.

Consistently, the literature shows that when the personality traits and values of the employees are compatible with the manager's personality traits, the employee is happy both at the job and in the working environment (Vianen et al. 2011: 906). One plausible explanation for not finding support for some of these hypotheses in the student sample is that young people who are highly conscientious and open to experience may not have a schema of leader or manager suitable for their personalities. Moreover, the leading figures such as politicians and famous business people observed by these young people who have not yet participated in business life may not be compatible with their dominant personality traits of conscientiousness and openness to experience, especially in Turkey. Therefore, it may be normal that they know more clearly what they do not want, but they do not know what they prefer in terms of leader personality, since they do not encounter much with the leader profiles suitable for their own dominant traits of conscientiousness and openness to experience.

Hypotheses 7f and 7g were supported in both studies. As expected, these results show that individuals who have dark traits (i.e., Machiavellianism and narcissism) want to work with individuals, especially with managers, like themselves. Although there are significant relationships in both samples, it is promising that the relationships of Machiavellianism and narcissism with preferences for managers with Machiavellianism and narcissism are weaker in the student sample. Consistently, Kay and Saucier (2020: 155) focused on the "similarity-attraction effect" and found that individuals with the dark triad personality traits preferred individuals with the dark triad characteristics like themselves. That is, an individual who scored high on Machiavellianism preferred a Machiavellian individual and an individual who scored high on narcissism preferred the other a narcissist individual as a partner. These findings may also have implications for leadership preferences in the broader contexts and at the societal level. Future studies are suggested to examine the effects of the dark triad personality traits on preferences for dark leadership styles in other contexts such as politics and on actual behaviors such as voting.

Hypothesis 8a suggested that agreeableness and extraversion would be positively related to preference for R-O leadership and PL styles. Hypothesis 8a was partially supported in both samples. Agreeableness was positively associated with the preference for the PL style in the student sample. However, agreeableness was not associated with the preference for the R-O leadership style in the student sample. On the other hand, extraversion was not associated with a preference for PL style in the

student sample. Moreover, extraversion was negatively associated with a preference for the R-O leadership style in the student sample. In addition, agreeableness was positively associated with a preference for the R-O leadership style in the working adult sample. However, agreeableness was not associated with a preference for the PL style in the working adult sample. Finally, extraversion was not significantly related to preferences for the R-O leadership and PL styles. One important point is that while young agreeable adults with no work experience were likely to prefer paternalistic leaders, older agreeable adults with work experience were likely to prefer R-O leaders as their managers. One plausible explanation is that in contrast to university students in the Study 1 sample, individuals in the working adult sample (i.e., Study 2) were likely to have actual experience with managers who have the PL style since the PL style is highly prevalent among managers in Turkey (e.g., Göncü et al. 2014: 1). Although managers with the PL style create a family atmosphere in the workplace and form individualized relationships with subordinates, they may also create conflicts within the group because of their attempt to maintain the status quo and hierarchy. Therefore, highly agreeable individuals in the working adult sample might have chosen the R-O leadership style, which emphasizes harmony and interpersonal relationships rather than performance, and that “does not have the negative aspects of PL” over the PL style. On the other hand, highly extravert individuals in the student sample were less likely to prefer R-O leaders as their managers. It may be argued that extroverted young individuals may expect their supervisors or managers to be highly dominant and active and they might have evaluated the R-O leadership style as more passive and less enthusiastic than they desired.

Hypothesis 8b suggested that extraversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness would be positively associated with preference for TL style. Hypothesis 8b was not supported in the student sample while it was fully supported in the working adult sample. The characteristics of transformational leaders or managers are very compatible with the expectations of individuals who score high on these three personality traits. To illustrate, subordinates who are highly open to experience are expected to be highly satisfied with the intellectually stimulating attitudes and behaviors (e.g., encouraging “thinking out of the box”) of a manager with TL style. Moreover, subordinates who score high on conscientiousness are likely to appreciate the self-sacrificing behaviors of a manager with TL style, whereas subordinates who score high on extraversion are likely to endorse inspiring and socially supportive

behaviors performed by such a manager. One reason for not finding the expected positive relationships among the student sample may be that the student sample (i.e., Study 1) might not imagine a truly transformational manager in the real life. In other words, the transformational leader presented in the vignette might not have seemed very realistic to the student sample. On the other hand, individuals who have been in working life for a long time may have encountered such managers and experienced subordinate-leader fit. It is also possible that participants in the adult sample who scored high on extraversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness and did not meet a manager with TL style in real life might perceive that a supervisor with TL style would be a perfect fit for their personal traits and attitudes. In both cases, participants in Study 2 might have preferred the manager with TL style.

In line with the propositions of Hypothesis 8c, 9b, and 10b, neuroticism, conscientiousness, and narcissism were not associated with preference for the T-O leadership style in the student sample (i.e., Study 1). Contrary to expectations, Machiavellianism was positively associated with a preference for the T-O leadership style in the student sample. In addition, neuroticism, conscientiousness, and Machiavellianism were not associated with a preference for the T-O leadership style in the working adult sample. On the other hand, narcissism was positively associated with a preference for the T-O leadership style in the working adult sample. Moreover, individuals who scored high on Machiavellianism in the student sample and individuals who scored high on narcissism in the working adult sample preferred to work with a manager with a T-O leadership style. One explanation may be related to the common features of Machiavellianism and narcissism, namely the lack of empathy and high levels of achievement and self-promotion motivation. In general, T-O leaders are less concerned with interpersonal relationships and more focused on task achievement compared to the leaders with other styles. These characteristics of T-O leaders may be compatible with the interests of both young individuals with high Machiavellianism and older, experienced working adults with high narcissism tendencies. The former group may prefer T-O leaders because such a manager may open the way for their success by providing work-related guidance to them. The latter group may prefer T-O leaders since they have experiences related to the contributions of T-O leaders to subordinates' self-achievements and work-related self-esteem in business life. Yet, these speculations need further empirical support. More specifically, moderating effects of age and work experience in the relationships of

Machiavellianism and narcissism with a preference for T-O leadership style should be investigated in future studies.

Hypothesis 9a suggested that Machiavellianism would be positively related to preference for PL and R-O leadership styles. However, this hypothesis was not supported in Study 1 and Study 2. The non-significant relationships of Machiavellianism with preferences for PL and R-O leadership styles may be explained by the lack of empathy and caring attitudes of individuals with high levels of Machiavellianism (Sutton & Keogh 2001: 137; Andreou 2004: 297; Lau & Marsee 2012: 355). More specifically, Machiavellians, who lack empathy and do not prefer to have intimate relationships with others, may prefer supervisors with PL and R-O leadership styles only when they serve their interests. Therefore, future studies may benefit from investigating the moderating effects of contextual variables in the relationship of Machiavellianism with preferences for PL and R-O leadership styles.

Hypothesis 10a suggested that narcissism would be positively related to preferences for PL, TL, and R-O leadership styles. Narcissism was not significantly associated with preferences for PL, TL, and R-O leadership styles in the student sample. Moreover, Hypothesis 10a was partially supported in the working adult sample. Narcissism was associated with the preferences for TL and PL style in the working adult sample. As stated before, narcissism was also positively associated with a preference for the T-O leadership style in the working adult sample. Consistent with the above-mentioned argument, it is likely that working adults with high narcissism tendencies prefer leaders or supervisors who provide them assistance and guidance for personal achievements at work, such as T-O and transformational leaders, as well as those who protect them from criticisms such as paternalistic leaders, rather than supervisors who provide them close interpersonal relationships in the workplace.

7.2 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

It is suggested that the findings of this study will contribute to the practice by revealing the effects of different personality traits on different leadership style preferences, leader personality traits and personnel selection methods. Two studies were carried out. In Study 1, the preferences of the leader types and their personnel selection methods reflected the general views of the university students. Likewise, in Study 2, the preferences of leader types and personnel selection methods consist of the preferences of working adults who are already in business life. The results of this

study, in general, showed the methods preferred by students with different personality traits in their personnel selection systems when entering the business life, considering the differences between the two samples. First, the findings showed that university students, new recruits, would prefer objective methods. Second, the findings showed that working sample would prefer subjective methods in the personnel selection system. The other finding of the study showed which leadership type individuals with different personality traits would prefer. In the working sample of these findings, it has been reported that extraverted, participant who is open to experience, conscientious, and narcissistic individuals will prefer TL style. In addition, Machiavellian individuals who were students at the university preferred the T-O leadership style. In addition, a common finding was found for both university student sample and work sample. In both samples, it has been determined that they prefer to work with leaders who have the same characteristics as their personal characteristics in their working life. These findings are of great importance in the recruitment processes by HR. First of all, the harmony of the applicant's personality with his supervisor in the unit he will work with will bring harmony in the workplace. At the same time, in the recruitment processes carried out by HR, the method that the applicant (university student or current employee) will be effective is among the findings of this study.

7.3 LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

None of the studies are without limitations and despite its theoretical and practical contributions, the current study also has some limitations. First, the data of the study were collected from students and working adults living in Turkey. Therefore, the generalizability of the findings is limited to the Turkish cultural contexts and the current study should be replicated in different cultural and organizational settings. Secondly, only four leadership styles were examined in the present study. The leadership styles that people prefer may not be compatible with the leadership styles investigated in the present research. Another limitation is that university students from every class participated in Study 1. The fact that the students who have just started to university and the students who are close to graduation may be different both in terms of knowledge and experience may have influenced the results in Study 1.

In conclusion, the main purpose of the study was to investigate effects of the evaluators' personality traits (i.e., the Big Five personality traits, Machiavellianism, and narcissism) on the preferences for various personnel selection procedures,

leadership styles, and leader personality traits. Study 1 was conducted with university students. Some of the hypotheses that were expected to be confirmed in Study 1 were not confirmed. For this reason, Study 2 was conducted with a working adult sample using the same measurement tools. After the two studies were conducted, the results of the university student and working adult samples were compared. A brief summary of the results of the present study showed that the hypotheses regarding the "similar to me" effect was fully supported in the working adult sample. However, it was not supported in Study 1 which included university students who had not yet work experience. In other words, in the working adult sample, people stated that they would prefer leaders like themselves. In addition, in general, the results of the individuals who scored high on the Big Five personality, Machiavellianism, and narcissism scores differ in terms of personnel selection system method preferences and leadership type preferences in both samples. As among the first attempts, the present research has made both theoretical and practical contributions because it examined the effects of seven different personality traits on preferences for personnel selection methods, leadership type preferences, as well as managerial personality traits with newly developed measures. I hope that the present research and the newly developed measures inspire future studies for conducting relevant studies with improved methodology and guide practitioners in personnel selection and promotion processes.

REFERENCES

- AKOĞLAN M. (1998), “Turizm Sektöründe İnsan Kaynakları Seçim Yöntemleri”, *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 9, pp. 26-30.
- AKSAKAL E. & DAĞDEVİREN M. (2010), “Anp ve Dematel Yöntemleri Ile Personel Seçimi Problemine Bütünleşik Bir Yaklaşım”, *Gazi Üniversitesi Mühendislik Mimarlık Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. 25, No.4, pp. 905-913.
- ANDERSON N., LIEVENS F., VAN- DAM K. & RYAN A.M. (2004), “Future Perspectives on Employes Selection: Key Directions for Future Research and Practice”, *Applied Psychology*, Vol. 53, No. 4, pp. 487-501. Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School of Business.
- ANDREOU E. (2004), “Bully/Victim Problems and Their Association with Machiavellianism and Self-Efficacy in Greek Primary School Children”, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 74, pp. 297-309.
- ARVEY R. D. & CAMPIO J. E. (1982), “The Employment Interview: A Summary and Review of Recent Research”, *Personel Psychology*, Vol. 35, pp. 281-322.
- ATKINSON P. & SILVERMAN D. (1997), “Kundera's Immortality: The Interview Society and The Invention of Self.”, *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 3, pp. 304-325.
- AVCI U. & TOPALOĞLU C. (2009), “Hiyerarşik Kademelere Göre Liderlik Davranışlarını Algılama Farklılıkları: Otel Çalışanları Üzerinde Bir Araştırma”, *Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, Vol. 11, No.16, 1-20.
- AYCAN Z. (2006), “Paternalism: Towards Conceptual Refinement and Operationalization”, *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology: Understanding people in context*. pp. 445–466.
- BAGUES M. & PEREZ-VILLADONIGA M.J. (2012), “Do Recruiters Prefer Applicants with Similar Skills? Evidence from A Randomized Natural Experiment”, *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* Vol. 82, pp. 12–20.

- BANAL-ESTAÑOL A., MACHO-STADLER I. & PÉREZ-CASTRILLO D. (2021), “Similar-to-me Effects in The Grant Application Process: Applicants, Panelists, and The Likelihood of Obtaining Funds”, *Economics Working Paper Series* No. 1801, pp. 1-32.
- BASS B. (1990a), *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, (3rd ed.), New York: The Free Press.
- BASS B.M. & AVOLIO B. J. (1993), “Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture”, *Public Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 112-121.
- BASS B.M. & AVOLIO B.J. (1995), *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual Leader Form, Rater and Scoring Key for MLQ* (Form 5xShort). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- BASS B. M. (1985), *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- BASIM H.N. YELOĞLU H.O. & ÇETİN F. (2015), “Psikolojik Dayanıklılığın Açıklanmasında Beş Faktör Kişilik Özelliklerinin Rolü: Bir Kanonik İlişki Analizi”, *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, Vol.75, No. 30. Pp. 81-92
- BENET- MARTINEZ V. & JOHN O. P. (1998), “Los Cinco Grandes Across Cultures and Ethnic Groups: Multitrait Multimethod Analyses of The Big Five In Spanish And English”, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 75, No.3, pp. 729-750.
- BERTUA C. ANDERSON N. & SALGADO J. F. (2005), “The Predictive Validity Of Cognitive Ability Tests: A UK Meta-Analysis”, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 78, pp. 387–409.
- BORMAN W. C. & MOTOWIDLO S. J. (1997), “Task Performance And Contextual Performance: The Meaning For Personnel Selection Research”, *Human Performance*, Vol. 10, pp. 99–109.
- CALLINAN M. & ROBERTSON I. T. (2000), “Work Sample Testing”, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 248- 260.
- CAÑIBANO C. & BOZEMAN B. (2009), “Curriculum Vitae Method In Science Policy And Research Evaluation: The State-Of-The-Art”, *Research Evaluation*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 86-94.
- CASCIO W.F. (2003), *Managing Human Resources: Productivity, quality of work life, profits*, 6th ed., Boston: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

- CHAMORRO-PREMUZIC T., FURNHAM A., DISSOU G. & HEAVEN P. (2005), "Personality And Preference For Academic Assessment: A Study With Australian University Students", *Learning and Individual Differences*, Vol. 15, pp. 247 – 256.
- CHRISTIE R. & GEIS F.L. (1970), *Studies In Machiavellianism*. NY Academic Press, New York.
- COLE M.S., STAFFORD J.O. & FEILD H. S. (2005), "Validity of Resume' Reviewers' Inferences Concerning Applicant Personality Based on Resume' Evaluation", *International Journal Of Selection And Assessment*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 321-324.
- CZIBOR A., SZABO Z. P., JONES D. N., ZSIDO A.N., PAAL T., SZIJJARTO L., CARRE J. R. & BERECZKEI T. (2017), "Male And Female Face Of Machiavellianism: Opportunism Or Anxiety?", *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 117, pp. 221–229.
- ÇİFTÇİ M. & ÖZTÜRK U. C. (2013), "Yetkinlik Bazlı Personel Seçme Faaliyetleri Ve Türkiye'deki Büyük Ölçekli İşletmelerin İşgören Seçme Modeli Tercihlerindeki Eğilimler", *Selçuk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Vol. 25, pp. 146-171.
- ÇİMŞİR E. & TÜMLÜ G. Ü. (2021), "The Roles Of Latent Perfectionism Classes In Academicians' Tendencies Toward Workaholism, Useless Superiority Effort, And Narcissism", *The Journal of General Psychology*, Vol.149, No. 4, pp.524-549.
- DANY F. & TORCHY V. (1994), *Recruitment and Selection in Europe Policies, practices and methods 1*. Chapter: Book Policy and Practice in European Human Resource Management. 1st Edition. Routledge Press.
- DIPBOYE R.L. & JACKSON S.L. (1999), "Interviewer Experience And Expertise Effects", *The Employment Interview Handbook*, pp. 229–292.
- DUBRIN A. J. (2012), *Narcissism in the Workplace: Research, Opinion And Practice*. Edward Elgar Publishing, pp.1-20.
- EHRHART M. G. & KLEIN K. J. (2001), "Predicting Followers' Preferences For Charismatic Leadership: The Influence Of Follower Values And Personality", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 153- 179.

- ELAHEH H. (2011), "The Relationships Between Personality Traits And Students' Academic Achievement", *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 29, pp. 836 – 845.
- ELMAS. T. (2018), *Karanlık Üçlü Ve Örgütsel Dışlanma Arasındaki İlişki Üzerine Bir Araştırma Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, pp. 1-106
- ERGÜN E. (2016), "Yöneticilerin Görev Ve Çalışan Odaklı Liderlik Davranışları Ve Hemşirelerin İş Tatmini, Örgütsel Bağlılığı Ve İş Stresi Arasındaki İlişki", *Florence Nightingale Hemşirelik Dergisi*, Vol.23, No.3, pp.203-214.
- ERICKSON, P. B. (2004), "Employer Hiring Tests Grow Sophisticated In Quest For Insight About Applicants", *Knight Ridder Tribune Business News*, Vol. 1.
- FARH J.L. & CHENG B.S. (2000), *A Cultural Analysis Of Paternalistic Leadership In Chinese Organizations*. 1st Ed. Palgrave Macmillan London. Chapter: Management and organizations in the Chinese context.
- FAULDER L. (2005), "The Growing Cult Of Personality Tests", *Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 6.
- FIEDLER F. (1967), *A Theory Of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- FIELDING K. S. & HOGG M. A. (1997), "Social Identity, Self-Categorization, And Leadership: A Field Study Of Small Interactive Groups", *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Vol. 1, pp. 39-51.
- FORSYTH D. R. (2010), *Group Dynamics*, 5th ed., Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- GÖNCÜ A. (2014), "Personality Measurement And Faking: An Integrative Framework", *Çankaya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol. 11, No.1, pp. 1-12.
- GÖNCÜ-KÖSE A. (2019), *Effects Of Individualism-Collectivism On Leadership Style Preferences In Different Contexts: Mediating Role Of Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. Paper presented at the 16th European Congress of Psychology, Moskow, Russia.
- GÖNCÜ-KÖSE A. & EKREN B. (2019), "An Investigation Of The Differences In The Dark Triad And The Big Five Personality Traits Across Majors", *Kalem Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 465-484.
- GRAMS W. C. & ROGERS R. W. (2010), "Power and Personality: Effects of Machiavellianism, Need for Approval, and Motivation on Use of Influence Tactics", *The Journal of General Psychology*, Vol. 117, No.1. pp.71-82.

- GRIJALVA E. & HARMS P.D. (2014), “Narcissism: An Integrative Synthesis And Dominance Complementarity Model”, *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp 108-127.
- HAMBURGER Y.A. & BEN-ARTZI E. (2000), “The Relationship Between Extraversion And Neuroticism And The Different Uses Of The Internet”, *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 16, pp. 444-449.
- HARRINGTON R. & LOFFREDO D. A. (2009), “MBTI Personality Type And Other Factors That Relate To Preference For Online Versus Face-To-Face Instruction”, *Internet and Higher Education*, Vol. 13, pp. 89–95.
- HELLER, M. (2005), “Court Ruling That Employer's Integrity Test Violated ADA Could Open Door To Litigation”, *Workforce Management*, Vol. 84, No. 9, pp. 74–77.
- HIGHHOUSE, S., DOVERSPIKE, D. & ROBERT M. G. (2016), *Essentials of Personnel Assessment and Selection*, 2nd ed., Published by Routledge
- HOGG, M.A. (2001) “A Social Identity Theory of Leadership”, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 184-200.
- HOGG M. A. & VAN KNIPPENBERG D. (2003), “Social Identity And Leadership Processes In Groups. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.)”, *Advances In Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 35, pp. 1-52.
- HOGG M.A., VAN KNIPPENBERG D. & RAST D. E. III. (2012), “The Social Identity Theory Of Leadership: Theoretical Origins, Research Findings, And Conceptual Developments”, *European Review of Social Psychology*, Vol. 23, pp. 258–304.
- JONES G. E. & KAVANAGH M. J. (1996), “An Experimental Examination Of The Effects Of Individual And Situational Factors On Unethical Behavioral Intentions In The Workplace”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 15, No.5, pp. 511-523.
- JONES D. N. & PAULHUS D. L. (2009), *Machiavellianism*. Chapter 7. M.R. Leary & R.H. Hoyle (Eds.), Individual differences in social behavior. New York.
- JONASON P.K. & WEBSTER G.D. (2010), “The Dirty Dozen: A Concise Measure of the Dark Triad”, *Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 420-432.
- KANG S.K., DECELLES K.A., TILCSIK A. & JUN S. (2016), “Whitened Résumés: Race And Self- Presentation In The Labor Market”, *Administrative Science Quarterly* Vol. 61, No. 3, pp. 469-502.

- KAY C.S. & SAUCIER G. (2020), "Insert a Joke About Lawyers: Evaluating Preferences For The Dark Triad Traits In Six Occupations", *Personality, and Individual Differences*. Vol. 159, pp. 155-189.
- KAYNAK T. (2002), *Human Resources Management*, Nobel Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- KENGER M. D. & ORGAN A. (2017), "Banka Personel Seçiminin Çok Kriterli Karar Verme Yöntemlerinden Entropi Temelli Aras Yöntemi Ile Değerlendirilmesi", *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 152-170.
- KRACZLA M. (2017), "Personality Profiling According To The Big Five Model By P.T.Costa And R.R. Mccrae: Comparison Analysis Of Managers And Specialists." *Regional Formation And Development Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 22, pp.77-91.
- LABAT L. R. (2018), *The Dreaded Performance Appraisal: Can the Process Ever be Comfortable? A Dissertation Submitted to The Graduate School at the University of Missouri – St. Louis In Partial Fulfillment Of The Requirements For The Degree Doctor Of Philosophy In Psychology With An Emphasis In Industrial And Organizational Psychology*, pp. 2-103.
- LANDRUM E. N., HOWELL P. W. & PARIS L. (2000), "Leadership For Strategic Change", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 150-156.
- LAU K.S.L. & MARSEE M.A. (2012), "Exploring Narcissism, Psychopathy, and Machiavellianism in Youth: Examination of Associations with Antisocial Behavior and Aggression", *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, Vol. 22, pp. 355–367.
- LEUNG A.K.Y. & CHIU C.Y. (2008), "Interactive Effects of Multicultural Experiences and Openness to Experience on Creative Potential", *Creativity Research Journal*, Vol. 20 No.4, pp. 376-382.
- MCHOSKEY J. (1995), "Narcissism and Machiavellianism", *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 77, pp. 755-759.
- MCCRAE R. R. & JOHN O. P. (1992), "An Introduction to The Five-Factor Model and Its Applications", *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 60, No. 2, pp. 175–215.
- MURPHY M. (2021), "Extraverted and Introverted Assistants: Differences in and The Importance of Downward Feedback", Bachelor's Thesis Degree Programme in Multilingual Management Assistants.

- OUTTZ J. L. (2002), "The Role of Cognitive Ability Tests in Employment Selection", *Human Performance*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 161–171.
- ÖZCAN D. (2006), "Personel Seçim Sürecinin Etkinliğinde Psikoteknik Testlerin Rolü." Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Çalışma Ekonomisi Ve Endüstri İlişkileri Anabilim Dalı İnsan Kaynakları Programı Yüksek Lisans Tezi, pp. 1-108.
- PIERRO A., CICERO L., BONAIUTO M. & KNIPPENBERG D.V. (2007), "Leader Group Prototypicality and Resistance to Organizational Change: The Moderating Role of Need for Closure and Team Identification", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 16, pp. 503–516
- PIOTROWSKI C. & ARMSTRONG T. (2006), "Current Recruitment and Selection Practices: A National Survey Of Fortune 1000 Firms", *North American Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 489-496.
- PLOYHART R.E., SCHNEIDER B. & SCHMITT N. (2006), "Staffing Organizations: Contemporary Practice and Theory", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol.60, No. 2, pp. 499-540
- REHMAN U. & SHAHNAWAZ M.G. (2021), "Machiavellianism and Task-Orientated Leadership: Moderating Effect of Job Autonomy", *Leadership, Education, Personality: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, Vol. 3, pp. 79–85
- ROCCAS S., SAGIV L., SCHWARTZ S. H. & KNAFO A. (2002), "The Big Five Personality Factors and Personal Values", *Society for Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 28, No. 6, pp. 789-801.
- SAHRAEE R. & ABDULLAH H.B. (2018), "Employees' Personality Preferences and Their Impact on the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Organisational Commitment", *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 1925 - 1939.
- SALGADO J.F., ANDERSON N.R., MOSCOSO S. & FRUYT F. (2003), "Validity Generalization of GMA Tests Across Countries in The European Community", *European Journal Of Work And Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 12, No.1, pp. 1–17
- SANSONE C., WIEBE D.J. & MORGAN C. (1999), "Self-Regulating Interest: The Moderating Role of Hardiness and Conscientiousness", *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 67, No. 4, pp.701-733.

- SCHMIDT F. L. & HUNTER J. E. (2004), "General Mental Ability in the World of Work: Occupational Attainment and Job Performance", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol.86, pp.162-173.
- SHALIT A., POPPER M. & ZAKAY D. (2009), "Followers' Attachment Styles and Their Preference for Social Or For Personal Charismatic Leaders", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 5, pp. 458-472.
- SILVERMAN D. (1993), *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. "Beginning Research". Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction. 2nd ed., Londres: Sage Publications
- SMITH J. R. & HOGG M. A. (2008), *Social Identity and Attitudes*. In W. Crano & R. Prislin (Eds.), *Attitudes and Attitude Change*, pp. 337-360. New York: Psychology Press.
- SUTTON J. & KEOGH E. (2001), "Components of Machiavellian Beliefs in Children: Relationships with Personality", *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 30, No.1, pp. 137-148.
- SÜMER N. & SÜMER H. C. (2005), Beş Faktör Kişilik Özellikleri Ölçeği.
- TABACHNICK B. G., & FIDELL L. S. (2007) *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.). Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education
- THIELMANN I., HILBIG B. E. & ZETTLER I. (2020), "Seeing Me, Seeing You: Testing Competing Accounts of Assumed Similarity In Personality Judgments", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 118, No. 1, pp. 172–198.
- TİMUROĞLU M.K. & İŞCAN Ö.F. (2008), "İşyerinde Narsisizm ve İş Tatmini İlişkisi / The Relation Between Job Satisfaction and Narcissism at Work Place", *İktisadi İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 240-264
- TOPLU-YAŞLIOĞLU D. & ATILGAN Ö. (2018), "Karanlık Üçlü Ölçeği: Türkçeye Uyarlama, Güvenilirlik Ve Geçerlilik Çalışması", *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 725-739.
- YOUNGMAN J.F. (2017), "The Use and Abuse of Pre-Employment Personality Tests", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 60, pp. 261-269.
- VAN KNIPPENBERG, D. & HOGG M. A. (2003), "A Social Identity Model of Leadership Effectiveness in Organizations", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 25, pp. 243-296.

- VIANEN A.E.V., SHEN C.T. & CHUANG A.A. (2011), "Person–Organization and Person–Supervisor Fits Employee Commitments In A Chinese Context", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 32, pp. 906–926.
- VISWESVARAN C.& ONES D. S. (2001), *Personality Psychology in The Workplace*, pp. 63–92. American Psychological Association
- ZETTLER I., FRIEDRICH N. & HILBIG B. E. (2011), "Dissecting Work Commitment: The Role of Machiavellianism", *Career Development International*, Vol.16, pp. 20–35.
- ZETTLER I. & SOLGA M. (2013), "Not Enough for a 'Dark' Trait? Linking Machiavellianism to Job Performance", *European Journal of Personality*, Vol. 27, pp. 545-554.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. APPROVAL OF THE SOCIAL AND HUMANITIES ETHICS COMMITTEE OF CANKAYA UNIVERSITY



ÇANKAYA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
REKTÖRLÜK



Sayı : E-90705970-050.99-99981
Konu : Etik Kurul Raporu

01.03.2022

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi : a) 10.12.2021 tarihli ve E-22374944-100-94333 sayılı yazı.
b) 23.02.2022 tarihli ve E-90705970-605-99648 sayılı yazı.

Enstitünüz Psikoloji Anabilim Dalı Psikoloji Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Fatmanur Esmâ ÇİL'in, "Büyük Beşli Kişilik Özellikleri ile Makyavelizm ve Narsisizmin Personel Seçim Süreçleri ve Yönetici Tipi Tercihlerine Etkisi" başlıklı tezi için hazırladığı anketin etik ilkelere uygunluğunun değerlendirilmesi talebi, Üniversitemiz Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinizi ve ilgiliye bilgi verilmesini rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. Can ÇOĞUN
Rektör

Ek: 28.01.2022 tarih ve 72 sayılı Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulu Proje Onay Formu

Bu belge güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Belge Doğrulama Kodu: 49D75715-CB2D-4422-B65E-72A13E7DFCD7

Belge Doğrulama Adresi: <https://www.turkiye.gov.tr/cankaya-universitesi-ebys>

Adres: Çankaya Üniversitesi Eskişehir Yolu 29. Km. Yukarıyurtçu Mahallesi Mimar Sinan
Caddesi No:4 06790, Etimesgut/ANKARA
Telefon No: 0 (312) 233 10 00/1134 / 0 (312) 284 45 00 / 134 Faks No: 0 (312) 233 11 49 / 0
(312) 286 96 31
e-Posta: yaren@cankaya.edu.tr İnternet Adresi: <http://www.cankaya.edu.tr>
KEP Adresi: cankayauniversitesi@hs01.kep.tr

Ayrıntılı bilgi için: İshak YAREN
Memur
Telefon No: 0312 233 1139



BÖLÜM 1. BÜYÜK BEŞLİ KİŞİLİK ÖZELLİKLERİ ÖLÇEĞİ

Her cümlenin yanında o cümledeki ifadelerin sizi ne kadar tanımladığına ilişkin “1 = KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM ile 5 = KESİNLİKLE KATILIYORUM” arasında değişen bir ölçek vardır. Lütfen, her ifadeyi dikkatle okuyup sizi ne kadar tanımladığını o derecenin altındaki kutu içine işaretleyiniz.

		Boyut ve Numara	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum		Kararsızım		Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
1	Konuşkan	Dışadön.1	1	2	3	4	5
2	Başkalarında hata arayan	Uyumluluk.1 T	1	2	3	4	5
3	İşi tam yapan	Dürüstlük.1	1	2	3	4	5
4	Bunalımlı, melankolik	Nevrotiklik.1	1	2	3	4	5
5	Orijinal, yeni görüşler ortaya koyan	D. Açıklık.1	1	2	3	4	5
6	Çekingen	Dışadön.2 T	1	2	3	4	5
7	Yardımsever ve çıkarıcı olmayan	Uyumluluk.2	1	2	3	4	5
8	Umursamaz	Dürüstlük.2 T	1	2	3	4	5
9	Rahat, stresle kolay baş eden	Nevrotiklik.2 T	1	2	3	4	5
10	Çok değişik konuları merak eden	D. Açıklık.2	1	2	3	4	5
11	Enerji dolu	Dışadön.3	1	2	3	4	5
12	Başkalarıyla sürekli didişen	Uyumluluk.3 T	1	2	3	4	5
13	Güvenilir bir çalışan	Dürüstlük.3	1	2	3	4	5
14	Gergin olabilen	Nevrotiklik.3	1	2	3	4	5
15	Maharetli, derin düşünen	D. Açıklık.3	1	2	3	4	5
16	Heyecan yaratabilen	Dışadön.4	1	2	3	4	5
17	Affedici bir yapıya sahip	Uyumluluk.4	1	2	3	4	5
18	Dağınık olma eğiliminde	Dürüstlük.4 T	1	2	3	4	5
19	Çok endişelenen	Nevrotiklik.4	1	2	3	4	5
20	Hayal gücü yüksek	D. Açıklık.4	1	2	3	4	5
21	Sessiz bir yapıda	Dışadön.5 T	1	2	3	4	5
22	Genellikle başkalarına güvenen	Uyumluluk.5	1	2	3	4	5
23	Tembel olma eğilimde olan	Dürüstlük.5 T	1	2	3	4	5
24	Duygusal olarak dengede, kolayca keyfi kaçmayan	Nevrotiklik.5 T	1	2	3	4	5
25	Keşfeden, icat eden	D. Açıklık.5	1	2	3	4	5
26	Atılgan bir kişiliğe sahip	Dışadön.6	1	2	3	4	5
27	Soğuk ve mesafeli olabilen	Uyumluluk.6 T	1	2	3	4	5
28	Görevi tamamlayıncaya kadar sabır gösterebilen	Dürüstlük.6	1	2	3	4	5
29	Dakikası dakikasına uymayan	Nevrotiklik.6	1	2	3	4	5
30	Sanata ve estetik değerlere önem veren	D. Açıklık.6	1	2	3	4	5
31	Bazen utangaç, çekingen olan	Dışadön.7 T	1	2	3	4	5
32	Hemen hemen herkese karşı saygılı ve nazik olan	Uyumluluk.7	1	2	3	4	5
33	İşleri verimli yapan	Dürüstlük.7					
34	Gergin ortamlarda sakin kalabilen	Dürüstlük.7 T	1	2	3	4	5
35	Rutin işleri yapmayı tercih eden	D. Açıklık.7 T	1	2	3	4	5
36	Sosyal, girişken	Dışadön.8	1	2	3	4	5
37	Bazen başkalarına kaba davranabilen	Uyumluluk.8 T	1	2	3	4	5
38	Planlar yapan ve bunları takip eden	Dürüstlük.8	1	2	3	4	5
39	Kolayca sinirlenen	Nevrotiklik.8	1	2	3	4	5
40	Düşünmeyi seven, fikirleri geliştirebilen	D. Açıklık.8	1	2	3	4	5
41	Sanata ilgisi çok az olan	D. Açıklık.9 T	1	2	3	4	5
42	Başkalarıyla işbirliği yapmayı seven	Uyumluluk.9	1	2	3	4	5
43	Kolaylıkla dikkati dağılabilen	Dürüstlük.9 T	1	2	3	4	5
44	Sanat, müzik ve edebiyatta çok bilgili olan	D. Açıklık.10	1	2	3	4	5

BÖLÜM 2. MAKYAVELİZM VE NARSİZM ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda çeşitli durumlara ilişkin ifadeler bulunmaktadır. İfadeleri değerlendirirken sizin tutumunuza en uygun seçeneği, verilen beş basamaklı ölçeği kullanarak belirtiniz.

1	2	3	4	5
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

1	İstediklerimi elde etmek için insanları manipüle edebilirim.	MAK1
2	İstediklerimi elde etmek için hile ve yalana başvurduğum olmuştur	MAK2
3	İstediklerimi elde etmek için insanlara iltifat edebilirim.	MAK3
4	Kendi amaçlarıma ulaşabilmek için insanları kullanabilirim.	MAK4
5	Başkalarının bana hayranlık duymasını isteyebilirim.	NARS1
6	Başkalarının beni dikkate almasını isteyebilirim.	NARS2
7	Prestij ve statü sahibi olma eğilimindeyim.	NARS3
8	Başkalarından bana iltimas göstermesini bekleme eğilimindeyim.	NARS4

BÖLÜM 3. YÖNETİCİDE KİŞİLİK TİPİ TERCİHİ ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda 7 farklı yöneticinin kişilikleriyle ilgili ifadeleri yer almaktadır. Lütfen, tanımlanan kişinin gireceğiniz işte doğrudan bağlı bulunacağınız yönetici olacağını farz ediniz ve her bir yöneticiyi:

a) “1 = BU YÖNETİCİYLE ÇALIŞMAYI KESİNLİKLE TERCİH ETMEM, 7 = BU YÖNETİCİYLE ÇALIŞMAYI KESİNLİKLE TERCİH EDERİM” ölçeğini kullanarak değerlendiriniz.

1) İleride işime yarabileceğini düşündüğüm için, insanlarla çatışmaktan kaçınırım. Önemli insanları kendi tarafınıza çekmek için her şeyi yapabilirsiniz. Bence insanların istediklerini elde etmek için başkalarına iltifat etmeleri veya onları manipüle etmeleri normaldir. Diğer insanların hakkımızdaki her şeyi bilmelerine gerek yoktur, bu nedenle onlardan bazı şeyleri saklamak gerekir. Planlarımız başkalarından önce kendi yararımıza olmalıdır. (*Makyevelizm – 53 kelime*)

Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih etmem						Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih ederim
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2) Diğer insanlara göre daha özel biri olduğumu ve insanların bana daha ayrıcalıklı davranmaları gerektiğini düşünüyorum. Prestij ve statü sahibi olmak benim için önemlidir. Başkalarının bana hayranlık duyması hoşuma gider. Bulduğum

ortamlarda lider olmak ve dikkate alınmak benim için çok önemlidir ve beni mutlu eder. (*Narsisizm - 45 kelime*)

Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih etmem						Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih ederim
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3) Genel olarak hayattan zevk almasını çok iyi bilirim. Bence hayatımıza heyecan katmak, yaşam kalitemizi artırır. Tanıdığım insanların çoğundan daha fazla enerjiye sahibim. Diğer insanlarla ilişki içerisinde olabileceğim etkinlikleri tercih ederim. Tanımadığım bir ortama girdiğim zaman enerjik ve atılgan bir tutum sergilerim ve girdiğim ortamlarda genelde en konuşkan kişi benimdir. (*Dışadönüklülük – 50 kelime*)

Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih etmem						Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih ederim
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4) Bazen kolay bir şekilde endişeli bir ruh haline girip, tam anlamıyla mutlu olamayacağımı hissederim. Bir şeylerin kötü gitmesi ihtimaline karşı sürekli endişelenirim ve strese girebilirim. Bir anım bir anıma uymayabilir. Gergin ortamlarda rahat davranmam ve sakin kalmam pek mümkün olmaz. İşler kötü gittiğinde hemen keyfim kaçır. (*Nevrotiklik- 47 kelime*)

Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih etmem						Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih ederim
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5) Çoğu insanın iyi niyetle hareket ettiğini düşünürüm. Hatalar karşısında genelde affetme eğilimi gösterir ve olumlu düşünmeye gayret ederim. Diğer insanların hislerini göz önünde bulundurmaya ve ihtiyacı olan insanlara yardımcı olmaya çalışırım. Yalnız çalışmak yerine başkalarıyla işbirliği içinde çalışmayı tercih ederim. (*Uyumluluk- 41 kelime*)

Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih etmem						Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih ederim
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6) Yeni bir şeyler öğrenmek hoşuma gider. Sorunlara farklı çözümler getirmek için alternatif bakış açıları arar ve sunarım. Sanatsal etkinlikler oldukça ilgimi çeker

ve bu etkinliklere katılmaktan keyif alırım. Herkesin kendine özgü bir bakış açısı olduğunu kabul eder ve buna saygı duyarım. İşte ve günlük yaşamda yeni şeyler denemekten keyif alırım. (*Deneyime açıklık – 51 kelime*)

Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih etmem						Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih ederim
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7) Geleceğe yönelik plan yapmayı severim. Üzerinde çalıştığım, ulaşmak istediğim uzun vadeli birçok hedefim vardır. Çalışkanımdır ve verilen işi hakkıyla yaparım. Dikkatim kolay kolay dağılmaz, işime konsantre olmakta zorlanmam. Temiz, düzenli ve sabırlıyım. Karar vermeden önce tüm seçenekleri dikkatli bir şekilde değerlendirir, öyle karar veririm. (*Dürüstlük – 45 kelime*)

Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih etmem						Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih ederim
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

BÖLÜM 4. LİDERLİK TİPİ TERCİHLERİ

Aşağıda 4 farklı yöneticinin kişilikleriyle ilgili ifadeleri yer almaktadır. Lütfen, tanımlanan kişinin gireceğiniz işte doğrudan bağlı bulunacağınız yönetici olacağını farz ediniz ve her bir yöneticiyi:

a) “**1 = BU YÖNETİCİYLE ÇALIŞMAYI KESİNLİKLE TERCİH ETMEM, 7 = BU YÖNETİCİYLE ÇALIŞMAYI KESİNLİKLE TERCİH EDERİM**” ölçeğini kullanarak değerlendiriniz.

1) Ben başarılı bir lider ve yöneticiyim çünkü iş yerinde aile atmosferini oluşturmak benim için önem taşır. Çalışanlarıma bir aile büyüğü gibi davranmaya çalışırım. Her bir çalışanımı yakından tanırım ve çalışanlarıma iş ve özel hayatlarındaki durumları ile içtenlikle ilgilenirim. Çalışanlarıma düşün ve cenaze gibi önemli törenlerinde bulunmaya çalışırım, onlara öğüt verir ve onların kişisel problemlerinde maddi ve manevi desteğimi esirgemem. Çalışanlarım bilirler ki onlardan sadakat ve hürmet beklerim ve gerektiğinde çalışanların kurumun iyiliği için kişisel tacizler ve fedakârlıklar yapmaya istekli olmalarını beklerim. Son olarak, iş yerinde hiyerarşi düzen ve çalışanlarımdan buna uygun olarak davranmasını beklerim. Başarılı bir lider ve yönetici olduğuma inanmamın başka bir sebebi çalışanlarıma için en iyi olanın ne

olduğunu bilmem ve hiç kimsenin iş yerinde benim otoritemi sorgulamasına fırsat verecek durumlar yaratmamamdır.

Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih etmem						Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih ederim
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2) Ben başarılı bir lider ve yöneticiyim çünkü en büyük önemi görevlerin tamamlanmasına veririm. Çalışanlarımın sahip oldukları becerilerle görevlerini en iyi şekilde yerine getirebilmeleri için onlara rehberlik eder, görevlerini yapılandırmasını sağlar ve gerekli kaynakları sunarım. Çalışanlarımla olan ilişkilere ve onları ne şekilde motive edeceğime odaklanmak yerine görevlere ve performansa odaklanırım. İş yerinde düzeni sağlar, çalışanlarımın performans hedeflerin koymalarına ve yüksek performans göstermelerine yardım ederim. Bu şekilde, çalışanlarıma kişisel başarılarımı kişiler arası ilişkilerden ya da çalışma grubunun uyumundan daha fazla önemseydiğimin mesajını veririm.

Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih etmem						Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih ederim
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3) Ben başarılı bir lider ve yöneticiyim çünkü çalışanlarımla olan kişisel ilişkilere odaklıyım. Çalışanlarımla iyi ilişkiler kurmak ve devam ettirmek en büyük önceliğimdir. Çalışanlarıma nazik davranırım, onlara saygı duyar ve aramızdaki ilişkiyi korumaya çalışırım. İş yerinde çalışanlarımla olan iletişimi önemser ve her söylediklerini dinlerim. Çalışanlarıma ve yaptıkları işlere güvenirim. Kuruma olan katkıları için çalışanlarımla takdir eder, çalışanlarımın kuruma olan katkılarını dikkate alır ve bu katkılarından dolayı onları ödüllendiririm. Kişiler arası ilişkilere görev ve performanstan daha fazla vurgu yaparım.

Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih etmem						Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih ederim
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4) Ben başarılı bir lider ve yöneticiyim çünkü bir görev ve vizyon duygum vardır. Çalışanlarımın kuruma aidiyet hislerini geliştirmeye çalışırım. Misyon ve vizyonun tanımladığı hedeflere ulaşmaları için ekstra çaba sarf etmeleri için onları cesaretlendiririm. Çalışanlarımın kişisel gelişimlerine ve özgüvenlerine katkıda bulunmaya çalışırım. Zorlayıcı problemlerin çözümünde yeni yaklaşımlar üstlenmeleri için çalışanlarımı cesaretlendiririm ve gerekli olan özgün ve inovatif yollar geliştirmeleri için onları yönlendirir ve motive ederim. Lider olarak çalışanlarımın morallerini yükseltmeye ve onları umutlandırmaya çalışırım. Etkileyici ve motive edici konuşmalar yaparım. Bu yolla çalışanlarımı hem kişisel gelişimleri hem de çalışma grubunun gelişimi için harekete geçme konusunda teşvik ederim.

Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih etmem						Bu yöneticiyle çalışmayı kesinlikle tercih ederim
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

BÖLÜM 5. ELEMAN SEÇME VE YERLEŞTİRME YÖNTEMLERİ TERCİHİ ANKETİ

Lütfen, bölümünüzden mezun olduğunuzu ve iş başvuruları yaptığımızı düşününüz. Aşağıda yer alan ve her biri farklı eleman seçme ve yerleştirme yöntemleri uygulayan sekiz kuruma yönelik tercih sıranızı “1 = İlk tercihim” ve “8 = Son tercihim” arasında değişen ölçeği kullanarak belirtiniz (Study 1).

Lütfen, aşağıda yer alan ve her biri farklı eleman seçme ve yerleştirme yöntemleri uygulayan sekiz kuruma yönelik tercih sıranızı “1 = İlk tercihim” ve “8 = Son tercihim” arasında değişen ölçeği kullanarak belirtiniz (Study 2).

Kurum 1	Kurum 2	Kurum 3	Kurum 4	Kurum 5	Kurum 6	Kurum 7	Kurum 8
Özgeçmiş + Mülakat	Özgeçmiş + Genel Bilişsel Yetenek Testi	Özgeçmiş + Kişilik Testi	Özgeçmiş + Mülakat + Kişilik Testi	Özgeçmiş + Genel Bilişsel Yetenek Testi + Kişilik Testi	Özgeçmiş + Genel Bilişsel Yetenek Testi + İş Örneklerindeki Performans	Özgeçmiş + Mülakat + Referans Mektubu	Özgeçmiş + Genel Bilişsel Yetenek Testi + İş Örneklerindeki Performans + Mülakat + Referans Mektubu + Kişilik Testi
Tercih Sırası:	Tercih Sırası:	Tercih Sırası:	Tercih Sırası:	Tercih Sırası:	Tercih Sırası:	Tercih Sırası:	Tercih Sırası:

Özgeçmiş

: Standart yöntem

Mülakat

: Öznel yöntem

Genel Bilişsel Yetenek Testi

: Nesnel yöntem

Kişilik Testi

: Nesnel ancak yapılan işe bağlı olarak performansla ilişkili olmayabilecek bir yöntem

İş Örneklerindeki Performans

: Nesnel yöntem

Referans Mektubu

: Öznel yöntem

BÖLÜM 6. DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU (Study 1)

1. Yaşınız....
2. Cinsiyetiniz
 - Erkek
 - Kadın
 - Belirtmek istemiyorum
3. Okulunuz....
4. Sınıfınız....
5. Not ortalamanız...
6. Annenizin eğitim durumu (mezun olduğu son okul/aldığı son derece):
 - İlköğretim
 - Lise
 - Üniversite
 - Yüksek lisans
 - Doktora
7. Babanızın eğitim durumu (mezun olduğu son okul/aldığı son derece):
 - İlköğretim
 - Lise
 - Üniversite
 - Yüksek lisans
 - Doktora
8. Hanenize giren yaklaşık aylık gelir:
 - 4.000 TL'den az
 - 4.000 TL - 6.000 TL
 - 6.000 TL - 8.000 TL
 - 8.000 TL - 10.000 TL
 - 10.000 TL - 12.000 TL
 - 12.000 TL'den fazla

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU (Study 2)

Yaşınız....

1. Cinsiyetiniz

- Erkek
- Kadın
- Belirtmek istemiyorum

2. En son aldığınız eğitim derecesi

- İlköğretim
- Ortaokul
- Lise
- 2 yıllık yüksekokul
- Üniversite (4 yıllık)
- Yüksek lisans
- Doktora

3. Çalıştığınız sektör

- Kamu
- Özel
- Sivil Toplum Kuruluşu (STK)
- Diğer (Lütfen açıklayınız)

.....

4. Lütfen aşağıdaki seçeneklerden size uygun olanı seçiniz:

- Mavi Yakalı Çalışanım
- Beyaz Yakalı Çalışanım

5. Kurumunuzun faaliyet gösterdiği iş kolu:

- Finans
- Metal
- Medya
- Hızlı Tüketim Malları
- Dayanıklı Tüketim Malları
- Tekstil

- Sağlık ve İlaç
- Teknoloji
- Eğitim
- Otomotiv
- İnşaat Malzeme
- Diğer (Lütfen Belirtiniz)

.....

6. Kaç yıldır mevcut işyerinizde çalışıyorsunuz? (Lütfen yıl ve ay olarak belirtiniz. Örneğin, 3 yıl 0 ay veya 2 yıl 7 ay gibi). Belirtilen kutulara sadece sayısal veriler girmeniz yeterlidir.

- Yıl.....
- Ay.....

7. Hanenize giren yaklaşık aylık gelir:

- 4.000 TL'den az
- 4.000 TL - 6.000 TL
- 6.000 TL - 8.000 TL
- 8.000 TL - 10.000 TL
- 10.000 TL - 12.000 TL
- 12.000 TL'den fazla

ARAŞTIRMAMIZA KATILDIĞINIZ İÇİN ÇOK TEŞEKKÜR EDERİZ :)