TAF

Journal of Administrative and Business Studies

JABS

2022, **8**(2): 17-26

PRIMARY RESEARCH

# The influence of travel agency employees' characteristics on the factor of performance (Konya example)

Ahmet Emre Bozkurt[1*], Dr. Şafak Ünüvar[2]

[1, 2] Selcuk University, Konya, Turkey

**Keywords**

Personality traits
Performance
Socio-demographic
Travel agency

**Received:** 18 January 2022
**Accepted:** 26 March 2022
**Published:** 19 May 2022

**Abstract**

This study investigated the relationships between demographic characteristics, personality traits, and job performances of travel agency employees using quantitative research methods. Personality traits are typically defined as people's descriptions of relatively stable patterns of behavior, thoughts, and emotions. Personality traits can be investigated in terms of the degree of each personality trait or interactions between personality traits. In this context, a questionnaire consisting of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ), ROCI-II questionnaire, Employee Performance Scale (EPS), and some socio-demographic questions was applied to 399 participants ranging from agency directors to hotel sales personnel working in travel agencies operating in the tourism sector in Konya. As a result of the study, it was determined that the average scores of the participants' personality scale and the performance of the employees showed statistical differences according to some socio-demographic characteristics. In addition, in the study, it was determined that there was a statistically significant and negative relationship between employee performance and personality traits.



## INTRODUCTION

The increasingly competitive environment and rapidly changing global way of life make people face significant opportunities and challenges. In this context, the firms are in constant search of more solutions as they want to maximize the returns of their employees while trying to motivate and integrate more and more individuals.

This, for them, is the way of adapting to external factors affecting them. In addition, the managerial functions of decision-making and executive oversight are also to be enhanced in this way.

In light of this, this study examines the effect of employees' characteristics on the factor of performance. It essentially investigates whether the socio-demographic traits of employees affect their performance and, if they do, what directions this effect takes. Statistical methods are employed to analyze the relationship between the personal characteristics of employees and their work performance.

### Personality

Personality is a general term concerning every individual. The word "personality," which was first used in 14th century England, with the meaning of "having humanitarian attributes," essentially refers to the intrinsic aspects of humans, such as cognition and realism. More modern descriptions of personality have arisen over time. In this context, personality can be seen set of characteristics attributed to each individual rather than a uniquely human term distinguishing us from other animals (Haslam, 2007). Terminologically, and personality can be defined as "consistent behavioral patterns and interpersonal processes" (Burger, 2010). Personality is a spiritual phenomenon that is unique to an individual, distinguishing them from others. Its components may be a person's general physical appearance, skills, intelligence, reactions, emotions, interests, and level of knowledge. Personality consists of intrinsic characteristics as well as the ones that are learned with experience. It is a set of relations that render individuals distinguished, consistent and predictable. It is formed by a combination of

*corresponding author: Ahmet Emre Bozkurt
†email: ahmetemrebozkurt@msn.com

genetic and developmental factors (Korkut, 2013).

Personality is the totality of all individual characteristics, which show themselves as behavioral reactions and attitudes. They ought to be consistent and predictable. The formation of these reactions and attitudes significantly influences an individual's functionality and integrity in society. Any deformity occurring at this point is regarded as a "personality disorder" and a symptom of a disease (Köroğlu & Bozuklukları, 2010). Genetic, structural, and environmental factors are significantly influential in the emergence of such personality disorders in individuals (Gonen, 2014). When it comes to the specifics of a personality, apart from the characteristics of an individual, the fact that other people interact and communicate with him or her also matters (Korkut, 2013). In addition, the physical and mental differences among people are also reflected in their behaviors and thoughts (Güney, 1998). Personality is the set of habits and patterns of character and behavior used to differentiate one in society. These aspects shape the individual's relationship with his or her surroundings (Mustafa Acar, 2002). Therefore, personality is constantly influenced by internal and external stimulants (Burger, 2010). In light of all this, it may well be argued that personality is one of the most crucial socio-cultural factors that affect one's life and career.

### Performance

The term performance is the degree to which an objective is fulfilled. According to this, performance shows to what degree an individual, group, or firm successfully achieves its goal with a particular business. Thus, performance is a function representing the relationship between employees' expectations and their actual deeds concerning the task they are assigned. Furthermore, employees' actions to carry out their roles can be seen as performance behavior (Argon & Eren, 2004; Başaran, 2000). According to one other definition, performance is a term that states what a working individual, group, or organization can achieve quantitatively and qualitatively to pursue a specific aim. The performance of an individual or a group is a measure of obtaining the pre-planned aim and standards concerning their initial goal. In that, the individual performance is of great value impacting the organizational performance. From the perspective of firms, the priority should be put on individual performances. This is because a firm can only be as good as the actual performance of its employees. According to one other perspective, the effectiveness of firms depends on that of employees. On the other hand, employees' effectiveness requires them to possess healthy, happy, and suitable personal characteristics concerning their jobs (Cemaloğlu, 2007; Shahbaz, Tiwari, Jam, & Ozturk, 2014). The individuals of health and adequate integration with their jobs would hence feel satisfied and play a vital role for their employers to succeed. Therefore, the preservation of the physical and socio-psychological conditions of individuals is crucially important. For this reason, firms need to have a good understanding of their employees' characteristics and take their socio-psychological states into account. Thanks to the efforts towards higher job satisfaction on the part of employers, more and more progress can be achieved in employees' performances (Farooq et al., 2011; Schoderbek, Rıchard, & John, 1991; Sevimli & İşcan, 2005). In this context, it is expressed that job satisfaction is one of the essential issues that affect the performance of employees (Örücü & Esenkal, 2005).

## METHOD

### Method of Research

The study is conducted as quantitative research. This method collects numerical data, which is required for an observable, measurable, and comparable formation of behaviors or perceptions towards objects and events (Keskin, 2017). Moreover, the relevant terms are examined by the use of descriptive research methods.

### Study Group of the Research

In this study, some material and timely constraints are applied. The research is limited to the employees of travel agencies in Konya city center and a few of its districts. 399 volunteers participated in the study, all actively working in the tourism sector. Personality characteristics, conflict resolution strategies, and employees' performances are assessed in the scope of this research.

### Data Collection

In this study, quantitative analysis is applied, which examines the proving of the relationships between variables. In addition, the personality characteristics, conflict resolution strategies, and performance levels of participating employees are assessed. The individual characteristics are studied with the EPQ, the validity and reliability of which are investigated by Karanci, DİRİK, and Yorulmaz (2007).

With the help of this questionnaire, workers' extroversion, neuroticism, psychoticism, and lying patterns are studied. In order to specify the conflict resolution strategies of individuals, the ROCI-II questionnaire, which was prepared by Rahim (1983), is used. Furthermore, to measure the performance levels, the four-phased EPS), which was used by Kirkman and Rosen (1999) and Sigler and Pearson (2000), is employed.

**ISSN:** 2414-309X
**DOI:**https://doi.org/10.20474/jabs-8.2.3

**Data Analysis**

The data gathered in the study is analyzed through SPSS 20.0. Frequency analysis for the discrete variables is conducted alongside a descriptive analysis of continuous variables. In the frequency analysis, the number (*n*) belonging to discrete variables and percentage (%) values; in the descriptive analysis, the number belonging to continuous variables, arithmetic averages, and standard deviation (X ± SD) values are used. In order to compare the continuous variables data with respect to different groups, parametric and non-parametric tests are applied. For this, before conducting the statistical analyses, the correspondence of data to the normal distribution of parametric tests, homogeneity of variance, and adequacy for hypotheses regarding the number of subjects is checked. Whether the data are distributed is typically examined by the use of Shapiro-Wilk tests. In conclusion, of these tests, it is expressed that some data are following normal distribution while some others are not.

These tests also show that skewness-kurtosis coefficients are to be between -1.5 and 1.5 (Fidell, Tabachnick, Mestre, & Fidell, 2013) or between -2.0 and 2.0 (George & Mallery, 2010) in order to qualify for normal distribution. Variance homogeneity, on the other hand, is studied with the use of the Levene test. It is subsequently shown that variance homogeneity is satisfied. To assess data that satisfy parametric test conditions, the Independent Samples t-test to compare numerical data of two independent groups and the One-Way ANOVA test to compare those of more than two are used. For non-parametric tests, the Mann-Whitney U test to compare two independent groups and the Kruskal-Wallis test to compare more than two are used. In order to test differences in point averages obtained by the sub-factors of the measurements used in the study, One-Way ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests are applied. In the light of these two tests, to compare variables that yield significant differences for three or more groups, "Turkey" multi-comparison (post-doc) tests are conducted by taking variance homogeneity into account. The Mann-Whitney U test is conducted to compare non-parametric variables yielding significant differences for three or more groups.

The relationship between measurements and their factors is tested with Pearson or Spearman correlation analysis. Subsequently, the scale, magnitude, and direction of relationships among variables are examined with the correlation coefficient (*r*). Linear regression analysis is used in the study to examine the effect of independent variables on the metrics. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value is researched to test the hypotheses of this analysis method. VIF value is bigger than 5 or 10 is a sign of multicollinearity (Büyükuysal & Öz, 2016). VIF values are analyzed, and no evidence of a multicollinearity problem is found. Moreover, the variables' autocorrelation is checked with the Durbin-Watson test, and the result is seen in a suitable interval. Therefore, the crucial hypotheses required for multicollinearity are verified, and the model is tested. The metrics used in the study are also checked for consistency and reliability, and the resulting scores of metrics and factors are assessed with Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha$) coefficient. While analyzing the result, the significance level is kept at 0.05, ensuring a 95% confidence level.

**FINDINGS**

Table 1 consists of the mean, standard deviation, and confidence levels of the metrics and their corresponding sub-factors used in the study.

**TABLE 1.** The reliability values of scale and factors

| Scale and Factors | Average | Standard Deviation | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|---|---|---|
| Eysenck Personality Scale | 11,31 | 3,70 | 0,721 |
| Extraversion | 4,41 | 1,89 | 0,813 |
| Neuroticism | 2,13 | 2,39 | 0,918 |
| Psychoticism | 0,62 | 1,55 | 0,922 |
| Lie (social desirability) | 3,99 | 1,97 | 0,798 |
| Conflict Resolution Scale | 106,56 | 11,30 | 0,819 |
| Inclusion | 29,32 | 3,63 | 0,768 |
| Compromise | 21,84 | 3,67 | 0,716 |
| Domination | 18,39 | 3,62 | 0,712 |
| Aversion | 20,67 | 4,33 | 0,706 |
| Coefficient of Agreement | 16,33 | 2,30 | 0,726 |
| Performance Scale | 17,26 | 2,34 | 0,797 |

**ISSN:** 2414-309X
**DOI:**https://doi.org/10.20474/jabs-8.2.3

Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) used in the study is shown as having 11,31 ± 3,70 mean with 0,721 confidence level, and the mean of extroversion is 4,41 ± 1,89 with 0,813 confidence level. Neuroticism averages of Eysenck sub-factors are calculated as 0,62 ± 1,55 with 0,918 confidence level, and the lying average is calculated as 3,99 ± 1,97 with a 0,798 confidence level. The average score of conflict resolution strategies is specified as 106,56 ± 11,30, while the confidence level being 0,819. Inclusion average, which is one of the sub-factors of conflict resolution strategies, is seen as 29,32 ± 3,63 with 0,768 confidence level, compromise as 21,84 ± 3,67 with 0,716 confidence level, domination as 18,39 ± 3,62 with 0,712 confidence level. On the other hand, the aversion average, another sub-factor, is shown to be 20,67 ± 4,33 with the 0,706 confidence level, and the coefficient of agreement is calculated as 16,33 ± 2,30 with the 0,726 confidence level. The average performance metrics in the study is 17,26 ± 2,34, with a 0,797 confidence level. In light of these values, metrics and factors are proved to be satisfying reliability conditions that are accepted in the literature. This state, as mentioned earlier, shows that the study has a "good" and "adequate" level of reliability. The socio-demographic characteristics of participating individuals are shown in Table 2.

**TABLE 2.** Demographics of the participants

| Demographic Traits | *N*(399) | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Gender | | |
| Female | 125 | 31,3 |
| Male | 274 | 68,7 |
| Age | | |
| 18-25 | 103 | 25,8 |
| 26-35 | 161 | 40,4 |
| 36-45 | 105 | 26,3 |
| 46+ | 30 | 7,5 |
| Marital Status | | |
| Married | 229 | 57,4 |
| Single | 170 | 42,6 |
| Education | | |
| Primary School Graduate | 43 | 10,8 |
| High School Graduate | 64 | 16,0 |
| College Graduate | 251 | 62,9 |
| Master's Degree | 41 | 10,3 |
| Place of Residence | | |
| City center | 214 | 53,6 |
| District | 185 | 46,4 |
| Title | | |
| Agency Director | 125 | 31,3 |
| Guide | 16 | 4,0 |
| Operation Executive | 48 | 12,0 |
| Ticket Sales Agent | 37 | 9,3 |
| Hotel Sales Personnel | 50 | 12,5 |
| Intern | 8 | 2,0 |
| Other | 67 | 28,8 |
| Income level | | |
| Low | 134 | 33,6 |
| Middle | 219 | 54,9 |
| High | 46 | 11,5 |
| Occupational Experience | | |
| Less than 1 year | 43 | 11,0 |
| 1-3 year(s) | 115 | 28,8 |

**ISSN:** 2414-309X
**DOI:**https://doi.org/10.20474/jabs-8.2.3

Table 2. Continue.....

| Demographic Traits | *N*(399) | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 4-6 years | 112 | 28,1 |
| 7-9 years | 44 | 11,0 |
| 10+ years | 84 | 21,1 |
| Work Experience | | |
| 1-5 year(s) | 182 | 45,6 |
| 6-13 years | 168 | 42,1 |
| 14+ years | 49 | 12,3 |
| Decision to work | | |
| Own decision | 333 | 85,2 |
| Family's decision | 17 | 4,3 |
| Other | 41 | 10,3 |

According to data presented in Table 2, 399 adults participated in the study, 125 (31,3%) of them being women and 274 (68,7%) of them being men. While 25,8% of the participants are between 18-25, 40,5% are 26-35, and 26.3% are 36-45 when classified by their ages. 7.5% of them, on the other hand, are above 45. When it comes to participants' marital status, it is seen that 57.4% of them are married while the remaining 42.6% are not. Moreover, 53.6% of them live in the city center while and 46.4% of them live in districts. In terms of education levels, it is observed that the last completed education of 10.8% of them is middle school, while 16.0% of them are in high school, 62.9% of them are graduates, and 10.3% of them hold Master's degree. 31.3% of the participants are agency directors, 4.0% of them are guides, 12.0% of them are operation executives. 9.3% of them are ticket sales agents, and 12.5% of them are hotel sales personnel.

Moreover, 2.0% of them are interns, and the remaining 28.8% have other positions. 33.6% of the participants are classified as having a low-income level, while 54.9% of them earned a middle level of income. Only 11.5% of the participants belonged to a category of high-level income. While 11,0% of participants have been working in the tourism sector for less than a year, that number was between 1 and 3 for 28.8% and between 4 and 6 for 28.1% of them. Furthermore, 11.0% of the participants have been in the sector for between 7 and 9 years and 21.1% for more than ten years. While the occupational experience of 45.6% of the participants is between 1 and 5 years, that of 42.1% of them is between 6 and 13 years. Only 12.3% of them are continuing in the same sector for 14 or more years. 85.5% of the participants stated that it was their own decision to be in their line of work, 4.3% of them stated that it was their families, and 10.3% of them cited other reasons.

### Findings of the Relationship between Personality Characteristics and Demographics of Employees

Table 3 explains the comparisons between Personality Characteristics Metric (PCM) and the demographics of the participants.

**TABLE 3.** The comparison between PCM and the demographics of the participants

| Variables | Groups | *N* | Average | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Female | 125 | 11,84 ± 4,49 | 0,006* |
| | Male | 274 | 11,06 ± 3,26 | |
| Age Groups | 18-25 | 103 | 11,69 ± 3,56 | 0,285 |
| | 26-35 | 161 | 10,86 ± 3,54 | |
| | 36-45 | 105 | 11,49 ± 4,17 | |
| | 46+ | 30 | 11,73 ± 3,10 | |
| Education Level | Primary School | 43 | 10,25 ± 2,57 | 0,012* |
| | High School | 64 | 11,84 ± 2,56 | |
| | College | 251 | 11,61 ± 3,84 | |
| | Master's | 41 | 9,73 ± 4,70 | |

**ISSN:** 2414-309X
**DOI:**https://doi.org/10.20474/jabs-8.2.3

Table 3. Continue.....

| Variables | Groups | *N* | Average | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marital Status | Married | 229 | 11,51 ± 3,12 | 0,151 |
| | Single | 170 | 11,04 ± 4,36 | |
| Place of Residence | City Center | 214 | 10,32 ± 3,99 | 0,000* |
| | District | 185 | 12,45 ± 2,96 | |

*$p < 0,05$

According to data shown in Table 3, the PCM average of women who participated in the study is 11,84 ± 4,49, while that of men is 11,06 ± 3,26. Thus, the PCM average for women is significantly higher compared with men ($p$ = 0,006). Examining the personality characteristics and age groups of participating individuals, those two yields no difference. Personality characteristics have similar average values in every age group ($p$ = 0,285). When it comes to education levels and personality characteristics, middle school graduates are shown to have a 10,25 ± 2,57 PCM average, while high school graduates have 11,84 ± 2,56, college graduates have 11,61 ± 3,84, and graduate school graduates have 9,73 ± 4,70 of that value. PCM values of individuals show statistical differences also when assessed according to their education levels. Individuals who last completed middle school or graduate school are observed to have a significantly lower PCM in comparison with high school and college graduates. PCM values of graduate school and middle school graduates, on the other hand, are pretty similar ($p$ = 0,012). The PCM average of married participants is 11,51 ± 3,12, and the PCM average of unmarried ones is 11,04 ± 4,36. Thus, personality characteristics are seemingly not affected by individuals' marital status, and there are no significant differences between groups on that front ($p$ = 0,151). The average PCM value of people living in the city center is recorded as 10,32 ± 3,99, while people living in the districts have that value at 12,45 ± 2,96. The average personality characteristic metrics of people living in city centers are significantly lower than people living in the districts ($p$ < 0,000). Comparisons of PCM values and occupational characteristics of participants are summarized in Table 4.

**TABLE 4.** The comparison of findings between personality characteristics and occupational characteristics of employees

| Variables | Groups | *N* | Average | *P* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title | Agency Director | 125 | 11,32 ± 3,23 | 0,000* |
| | Guide | 16 | 12,87 ± 1,85 | |
| | Operation Executive | 48 | 12,75 ± 3,90 | |
| | Ticket Sales Agent | 37 | 9,21 ± 2,81 | |
| | Hotel Sales Personnel | 50 | 11,52 ± 3,82 | |
| | Intern | 8 | 15,0 ± 0,53 | |
| | Other | 115 | 10,81 ± 4,12 | |
| Income Level | Low | 134 | 10,58 ± 3,87 | 0,031* |
| | Middle | 219 | 11,68 ± 3,64 | |
| | High | 46 | 11,63 ± 3,19 | |
| Work Experience | Less than 1 year | 44 | 11,75 ± 5,34 | 0,019* |
| | 1-3 years | 155 | 11,49 ± 3,29 | |
| | 4-6 years | 112 | 11,16 ± 3,49 | |
| | 7-9 years | 44 | 10,22 ± 2,96 | |
| | 10+ years | 84 | 11,60 ± 3,77 | |
| Occupational Experience | 1-5 years | 182 | 11,87 ± 4,02 | 0,001* |
| | 6-13 years | 168 | 11,10 ± 3,36 | |
| | 14+ years | 49 | 9,91 ± 3,18 | |
| Decision on Occupation | Own | 341 | 11,19 ± 3,81 | 0,654 |
| | Family's | 17 | 11,11 ± 3,31 | |

*$p < 0,05$

**ISSN:** 2414-309X
**DOI:**https://doi.org/10.20474/jabs-8.2.3

In the context of obtained findings; Employee Performance = 7,663 – 0,501* Psychoticism + 0,256* Lying + 1,293* Occupation Choice (Own) + 1,685* Location (City Center) + 0,895* Job Experience (6-13 years) + 0,567* Job Experience (14 or more years) is constructed as the aforementioned multicollinearity regression model. One unit decrease in the psychoticism values of individuals increases their level of performance by 50,1%. One unit increase in lying increases the performance score by 25,6%. The performance of people who made their own occupation decisions is 129,3% higher than that of people who were influenced by their family. City center residents have their performance 168,5% higher compared with people in districts. The performance of people who have been in tourism for 6-13 years is 89,5% higher than the performance of fewer than five years of sector experience. People who have been in the sector for more than 14 years show a 56,7% higher performance compared with people with less than five years of experience.

In the multicollinearity model that is constructed, the effect of parameters is statistically significant ($p < 0,005$). In the light of these data, city center residents, people who made their own decisions for their jobs, people with 6-13 years of occupational experience, and people with a lower level of psychoticism and a higher level of lying would seem to have the most efficient level of performance. With the model, 67,8% of the total variation is explained. The unexplained part stems from other parameters affecting performance other than the ones researched in this study.

**Findings of the Relationship between Demographics and Employee Performances**

Statistical comparisons of participants in terms of demographics and levels of performance are explained in Table 5.

**TABLE 5.** The findings of multicollinearity regression analysis about the performance of employees

| Performance | $\beta$ (95% GA) | $t$ | $p$ | $R^2$ | Model $p$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Constant term | 7,663 (6,886 – 8,440) | 19,393 | 0,000* | | |
| Psychoticism | -0,501 (-0,642 - 0,360) | -6,997 | 0,000* | | |
| Lying | 0,256 (0,142 – 0,371) | 4,394 | 0,000* | | |
| Occupation Decision (own) | 1,293 (-2,324 – 0,261) | -2,465 | 0,014* | 0,678 | 0,000* |
| Residence (city center) | 1,685 (1,252 – 2,119) | 7,643 | 0,000* | | |
| Job Experience (6-13 years) | 0,895 (0,572 – 1,217) | 5,469 | 0,000* | | |
| Job Experience (14+ years) | 0,567 (0,065 – 1,069) | 2,220 | 0,027* | | |

*$p < 0,05$

According to these findings, the average level of performance of women is 17,47 ± 2,25, and the average level of performance of men is 17,16 ± 2,39. The performance scores of the two genders are pretty similar, with no statistically significant difference between them ($p = 0,272$).

When it comes to age groups and employee performances, there are remarkable differences. For example, people who are between 36 and 45 have significantly higher performance scores compared with all the other age groups.

People who are between 26 and 35, on the other hand, have significantly higher levels of performance compared with people who are 45 and above ($p < 0,005$).

Comparing the education levels and personality characteristics, middle school graduates have an average performance level of 17,37 ± 1,78, while high school graduates have that at 17,56 ± 2,45, college graduates have it at 17,43 ± 2,07, graduate school graduates have the same value at 15,63 ± 3,46.

People who possess a graduate school degree have a significantly higher performance level compared with people of all other education levels ($p = 0,013$).

The average performance level of married people in the study is 17,19 ± 2,12, and for unmarried, it is 17,34 ± 2,51. Employee performance is not affected by marriage, with no statistically significant difference seen between the two groups ($p = 0,987$).

The average level of performance for people in the city center is 18,04 ± 2,40, while the same value for district residents is 16,35 ± 1,92. Employee performance of people in the city center is significantly higher compared with district people ($p < 0,005$).

The comparison between employee performance metrics and occupational characteristics of participants is summarized in Table 6.

**ISSN:** 2414-309X
**DOI:**https://doi.org/10.20474/jabs-8.2.3

**TABLE 6.** The comparison between demographics and levels of performance of employees

| Variables | Groups | *n* | Average | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Female | 125 | 17,47 ± 2,25 | 0,272 |
| | Male | 274 | 17,16 ± 2,39 | |
| Age Groups | 18-25 | 103 | 16,99 ± 2,03 | 0,000* |
| | 26-35 | 161 | 17,21 ± 2,49 | |
| | 36-45 | 105 | 17,99 ± 2,09 | |
| Age Groups | 46+ | 30 | 15,90 ± 2,65 | 0,000* |
| | Master's | 41 | 15,63 ± 3,46 | |
| Education Level | Primary School | 43 | 17,37 ± 1,78 | 0,007* |
| | High School | 64 | 17,56 ± 2,45 | |
| | College | 251 | 17,43 ± 2,07 | |
| Marital Status | Married | 229 | 17,19 ± 2,12 | 0,987 |
| | Single | 170 | 17,34 ± 2,51 | |
| Place of Residence | City Center | 214 | 18,04 ± 2,40 | 0,000* |
| | District | 185 | 16,35 ± 1,92 | |

*$p < 0,05$

According to Table 7, there are statistically significant differences between the titles of employees and their performances. Performance scores of agency directors, on average, are significantly lower than the scores of guides, operation executives, ticket sales agents, and hotel sales personnel, while it is higher than that of interns. The average employee performances of guides and hotel sales personnel are significantly higher than that of ticket sales agents and operation executives. Furthermore, the average performance of interns is significantly lower compared with other personnel ($p < 0,000$). While the average performance score of low-income people is 17,64 ± 2,43, this number is 17,24 ± 2,20 and 16,23 ± 2,51 for middle-income and high-income people respectively. Performance levels of low-income people are observed as significantly higher than middle and high-income employees. On the other hand, middle-income people have performance levels significantly higher than high-income people ($p = 0,001$).

Average performance level with less than a year of work experience is significantly lower than all the other more experienced categories' ($p < 0,000$).

The average performance score of people with 1 to 5 years of sector experience is 16,80 ± 2,17 for people with 6 to 13 years, it is 17,36 ± 2,59, and for 14 or more years, it is 18,59 ± 1,35. People with 14 or more years of such experience have, on average, higher performance levels compared with people with less of it ($p < 0,000$).

While the people who made their own decisions to have their current jobs have their performance level average at 17,46 ± 2,12, people whose families made them choose their jobs have it at 16,17 ± 1,81. People with family influence, in this regard, have significantly lower performance levels compared with others ($p = 0,007$).

### Findings of Personality Characteristics and Employee Performances

The relationship between personality characteristics and performance levels of participants is explained in Table 7.

**TABLE 7.** The comparison between performance metrics and occupational characteristics of employees

| Variables | Groups | *N* | Average | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title | Agency Director | 125 | 16,85±1,99 | 0,000* |
| | Guide | 16 | 18,68 ± 2,02 | |
| | Operation Executive | 48 | 17,64 ± 2,11 | |
| | Ticket Sales Agent | 37 | 17,67 ± 1,74 | |
| | Hotel Sales Personnel | 50 | 18,20 ± 2,03 | |
| | Intern | 8 | 14,75 ± 1,16 | |
| | Other | 115 | 16,97 ± 2,86 | |

**ISSN:** 2414-309X
**DOI:**https://doi.org/10.20474/jabs-8.2.3

Table.7 Continue.....

| Variables | Groups | *N* | Average | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Income Level | Low | 134 | 17,64 ± 2,43 | 0,001* |
| | Middle | 219 | 17,24 ± 2,20 | |
| | High | 46 | 16,23 ± 2,51 | |
| Work Experience | Less than 1 year | 44 | 15,79 ± 1,87 | 0,000* |
| | 1-3 years | 155 | 17,49 ± 2,21 | |
| | 4-6 years | 112 | 16,97 ± 2,71 | |
| | 7-9 years | 44 | 17,88 ± 2,04 | |
| | 10+ years | 84 | 17,76 ± 2,04 | |
| Occupational Experience | 1-5 years | 182 | 16,80 ± 2,17 | 0,000* |
| | 6-13 years | 168 | 17,36 ± 2,59 | |
| | 14+ years | 49 | 18,59 ± 1,35 | |
| Decision on Occupation Choice | Own | 341 | 17,46 ± 2,12 | 0,007* |
| | Family's | 17 | 16,17 ± 1,81 | |

*$p < 0,05$

When Table 7 is examined, it is observed that there is a significant but negative correlation ($p$ = 0,039) between employee performance and personality characteristics. According to this, a unit increase in personality characteristics decreases employee performance by 0,103 units ($r$ = 0,103). The sub-domains of employee performance and personality characteristics positively correlate with the extroversion factor with a coefficient of 0,083. However, this correlation is not statistically significant ($p$ = 0,097). There is a negative correlation between neuroticism and employee performance, with a coefficient of 0,142. Neuroticism, one personality characteristic, decreases employee performance on a statistically significant level ($p$ = 0,005). Among the participants in the study, employee performances and psychoticism have shown a negative correlation with a coefficient of 0,331. A unit decrease in psychoticism increases the performance level by 0,331. This relationship is statistically significant as well ($p < 0,005$). There is a positive correlation between lying and performance with a coefficient of 0,215. Lying seems to be increasing employee performance, a relationship that is also statistically significant ($p < 0,005$).

## CONCLUSION

According to the findings in the study, the PCM of participants shows statistical differences with employee performances as some social and demographic qualities of people change. For instance, women have, on average, stronger personality characteristic metrics. Middle school and graduate school graduates, on the other hand, have lower personality characteristic metrics compared with high school and college graduates. City center residents as well are observed to have a lower personality characteristic metric compared with people of districts. Another point is that people of low income have a significantly lower PCM compared with other income groups. People with less work history have a higher PCM, and more time spent in the sector is also lowering the metric, as mentioned above. People between 26 and 45 have a higher level of performance, while graduate school alumni have a lower level of performance. Employee performance of city center people is higher than district residents, while the job titles also majorly affect performance. There are statistical differences between personality characteristics and the titles of people. The level of performance on the part of low-income people is higher than people with middle and high levels of income. People who have been working for less than a year have a lower performance score compared with more experienced employees. People who have been continuing in the same line of work for 14 or more years have higher average performance than those who are not that experienced. People who choose their jobs under the influence of their families have a lower level of performance in comparison with people who make their own decision.

Moreover, it is determined that there is a statistically significant negative correlation between personality characteristics and employee performance. The performance variable is remarkably negatively affected by psychoticism while lying shows a notable positive correlation with that variable.

## REFERENCES

Argon, T., & Eren, A. (2004). *İnsan kaynakları yönetimi*. Ankara, Turkey: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Başaran, I. E. (2000). *Eğitim yönetimi nitelikli okul*. Ankara, Turkey: Feryal Matbaacılık.

**ISSN:** 2414-309X
**DOI:**https://doi.org/10.20474/jabs-8.2.3

Burger, J. M. (2010). *Personality belmont*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Büyükuysal, M. Ç., & Öz, İ. İ. (2016). Çoklu doğrusal bağıntı varlığında en küçük karelere alternatif yaklaşım: Ridge regresyon. *Düzce Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *6*(2), 110-114.

Cemaloğlu, N. (2007). Örgütlerin kaçınılmaz sorunu: Yıldırma. *Bilig Dergisi*, *42*, 111-126.

Farooq, A. J., Rauf, A. S., Husnain, I., Bilal, H. Z., Yasir, A., & Mashood, M. (2011). Combined effects of perception of politics and political skill on employee job outcomes. *African Journal of Business Management*, *5*(23), 9896-9904. doi:https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM11.1059

Fidell, S., Tabachnick, B., Mestre, V., & Fidell, L. (2013). Aircraft noise-induced awakenings are more reasonably predicted from relative than from absolute sound exposure levels. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *134*(5), 3645-3653. doi:https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4823838

George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *Spss for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. London, UK: Pearson.

Güney, S. (1998). *Davranış bilimleri ve yönetim psikolojisi terimler sözlüğü*. Ankara, Turkey: Ocak Yayınları.

Gonen, G. (2014). *The relationship between perceived parental attitudes and cognitive distortions and personality structures of university students* (Masters thesis). İzmir, Turkey: Dokuz Eylül University.

Haslam, N. (2007). *Introduction to personality and intelligence*. California, CA: Sage Publications.

Karanci, A. N., DİRİK, G., & Yorulmaz, O. (2007). Eysenck kişilik anketi-gözden geçirilmiş kısallmış formu'nun (EKA-GGK) türkiye'de geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, *18*(3), 1-8.

Keskin, U. (2017). Sosyal bilimler araştırma yöntemleri kitaplarının İhmal edilen unsuru olarak felsefe. *Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *7*(14), 437-456.

Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. (1999). Beyond self-management: Antecedents and consequences of team empowerment. *Academy of Management journal*, *42*(1), 58-74. doi:https://doi.org/10.5465/256874

Korkut, C. (2013). *Examination of personality traits of karate trainers in terms of various variables* (Master's thesis). İstanbul, Turkey: Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences.

Köroğlu, E., & Bozuklukları, S. B. K. (2010). *Kişilik bozuklukları*. Ankara, Turkey: HYB Basım Yayın.

Mustafa Acar, m. D. (2002). *Sosyal bilimler sözlüğü*. Ankara, Turkey: Vadi yayınları.

Örücü, E., & Esenkal, F. (2005). Konaklama işletmelerinde iş gören tatminini etkileyen faktörler bandirma ve erdek örneği. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *8*(14), 141-166.

Rahim, M. A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*(2), 368-376. doi:https://doi.org/10.5465/255985

Schoderbek, P., Rıchard, A., & John, C. (1991). *Management*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Sevimli, F., & İşcan, Ö. F. (2005). Bireysel ve iş ortamina ait etkenler açisindan iş doyumu. *Ege Academic Review*, *5*(1), 55-64.

Shahbaz, M., Tiwari, A. K., Jam, A. F., & Ozturk, L. (2014). Are fluctuations in coal consumption per capita temporary? Evidence from developed and developing economies. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *33*, 96-101. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.01.086

Sigler, T. H., & Pearson, C. M. (2000). Creating an empowering culture: Examining the relationship between organizational culture and perceptions of empowerment. *Journal of Quality Management*, *5*(1), 27-52. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1084-8568(00)00011-0

**ISSN:** 2414-309X
**DOI:**https://doi.org/10.20474/jabs-8.2.3