

Relationship between Personality, Justice and Ethics in Managers and Workers

Orhan Mollasalih^a, Nermin Gürhan^b

Abstract

In the present study, we aimed to define the leadership traits by comparing the temperament and character traits, ethical manners and perception of organisational justice of employees and managers. The study, which was performed in the design of relational survey model, used socio-demographic data form, ethical manners scale, organisational justice scale, organisational culture scale, and Temperament and Character Inventory. The study sample consisted of 331 employees employed by sub-contractors, 249 employees working under permanent employment contract and 56 employees in manager positions. The managers had significantly high average scores in the sub-dimensions of justice and responsibility of Ethical Manners Scale and in all the sub-dimensions of the Organisational Justice Scale ($p < 0.05$ for each). While harm avoidance ($p < 0.001$), novelty seeking ($p = 0.001$), persistence ($p = 0.001$) and responsibility ($p < 0.001$) scores were significantly higher in managers, anticipatory worry ($p = 0.041$), fear of uncertainty ($p < 0.001$), sentimentality ($p = 0.008$) and spiritual acceptance ($p = 0.002$) subscale scores were significantly lower. It is one of the rare studies in which both temperament and character traits in leadership are examined in detail and the relationship between these traits and justice and ethical behaviors.

Keywords: Leadership, Worker, Personality, Justice, Ethics, Temperament

INTRODUCTION

Increasing the performance and productivity and efficiency in institutions and organizations in line with diversifying human needs is a major challenge we can only tackle through effective human resource management. In a time of rapid changes across the world, we now need leadership structures and human resources of diverse characters. In the core of all these needs, on the other hand, character and temperament play a role of essential importance (Brown & Treviño 2006; Martin et al. 2009; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck 2009).

Personality is a term that encompasses the whole range of behaviours (interest fields and abilities, way of speaking, appearance etc.) one displays when adapting to one's environment (Robbins & Judge 2012). Ethics is an important aspect of the close correlation between personality and management. As a result, the notion of ethical management has become a central issue and a major area of interest for researchers. Besides having ethical norms, ethical management should

be equipped with other complementing factors such as sufficient knowledge and abilities, and ability and authority to secure the trust of people (Mayer et al. 2009). Even though there has been an ever-increasing number of studies that have examined the correlation between ethical leadership and personality, research has failed to provide a clear insight into this correlation. While some studies have reported that ethical leadership may be correlated with adaptability, sense of responsibility, and neuroticism, some other researchers have argued that neuroticism has no correlation with ethical leadership. Sub-dimensions of personality such as openness to experience and extroversion, on the other hands, are still subject to considerable debate within the scientific community (Brown & Treviño 2006; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck 2009).

Research on personality and organisational conduct has reported that personality is the most important factor that guides the behaviours of individuals. Seen from this point of view, it follows that personality is closely correlated both with organisational performance and attitudes of employees. Most studies in the field have only focused on the leadership dimension, with character and temperament dimensions that have been addressed as subjects of secondary

^aMBA, Near East University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, KKTC, orhanmollasalih@hotmail.com

^bTokat Gaziosmanpaşa University Faculty of Health Science, Nursing Department
Bahadır Genç, Dr Psychiatrist, Çaycuma State Hospital, Department of Psychiatry

importance (Brown & Treviño 2006; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck 2009; Robbins & Judge 2012). For these reasons, this study aimed to shine new light on the uncertain points between ethical leadership, organisational justice, organisational culture and character and temperament traits. Besides, it also sought to examine character and temperament traits in an integrated manner and also to treat the traits in a much-detailed way with the sub-dimensions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Method of the Study

The study was performed in cross-sectional descriptive design. The population of the study consisted of employees working in two local governments in Bursa. The study used relational survey model to examine the correlation between these employees' ethical manners, perception of organisational justice, working culture and personality traits. In this study, sociodemographic data form, ethical manners scale, organisational justice scale, organisational culture scale, and Temperament and Character Inventory were used.

Population and Sample of the Study

The two local governments involved in the study representing the 15 local governments in the region were selected through simple sampling method. The Municipality of Osmangazi, one of these local governments, employs 1002 employees, being 57 employees in managing positions, 584 employees employed under permanent employment contract and 418 employees employed by sub-contractors. On the other hand, 1555 employees are employed in the Municipality of Yıldırım, the second local government involved in the study, being 61 managers, 584 permanent employees and 910 employees working under sub-contractors. Thus, the study population consisted of these 2557 employees. After the approval and consents were obtained, the initial sample consisted of 750 employees who agreed to take part in the study and received the data collection forms. The final sample, on the other hand, consisted of 636

Materials of the Study

Sociodemographic Data Form, this form that was designed by the researchers based on the models available in the literature includes questions intended to canvass the responses concerning the socio-demographic variables such as age, gender, educational background and family type as well as variables regarding working life such as the unit,

working time and position. It includes 20 items.

Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI), that was developed by Cloninger et al. (1993) is a self-report scale. TCI was tested by Köse et al. (2004) in respect of validity and reliability in Turkish. It includes 240 items designed in true-false options. The temperament traits of the inventory include four dimensions, namely Novelty Seeking (NS) (40 items), Harm Avoidance (HA) (35 items), Reward Dependence (RD) (24 items) and Persistence (PS) (8 items). Cronbach alpha values were 0.74, 0.85, 0.60 and 0.62 respectively. The character traits, on the other hand, include three dimensions, being Self-directedness (SD) (44 items), cooperativeness (CO) (42 items) and Self-transcendence (ST) (33 items). Cronbach Alpha values were 0.83, 0.82 and 0.82 respectively.

Organisational Justice Scale (OJS) developed by Colquitt (2001) includes 20 questions. It is in five-point Likert design, with options between "Strongly Agree" (5 points) and "Strongly Disagree" (0 points). The scale consists of four sub-dimensions, being procedural justice (7 questions), distributive justice (4 questions), interpersonal justice (4 questions) and informational justice (5 questions). Procedural justice involves aspects such as being able to express one's opinion in procedures, procedures without bias and being able to protest against outcomes. Distributive justice is about the perceptions of employees whether the outcomes are fairly and adequately distributed. In interpersonal justice refers to behaviours between individuals (whether respectful, honourable, kind etc.). Informative justice, on the other hand, deals with the explanations about the operations done and the assumptions on whether such explanations are made on time and in a rational manner. High scores indicate high justice perception. The scale was tested by Ozmen et al. (2007) in terms of validity and reliability.

Organisational Culture Scale (OCS), that five-point Likert type developed by Kara (2006) includes 37 items, with options "Strongly Agree" (5 scores) and "Strongly Disagree" (1 score). It has four sub-dimensions which are Strength (7 questions), role (10 questions), Achievement (9 questions) and support (20 questions). The sub-dimension of "Strength" refers to relationship with the management, behaviours of managers and the type of relation between subordinates and superiors. The sub-dimension of "Role" deals with whether the works are carried out under certain standards. The sub-dimension of "Achievement", on the other hand, is about the rewarding of employees, supporting successful employees and

whether importance is attached to outcomes of works. The sub-dimension of "Support" evaluates whether there is a harmony between employees, whether they have a sense of responsibility for outcomes and whether the managers are open to proposals.

Ethical Manners Scale (EMS) that five-point likert type developed by Kara (2006) consists of 36 items and 4 sub-dimensions, with options ranging between "Strongly Agree" (5 scores) and "Strongly Disagree" (1 score). The scale has four sub-dimensions, being Tolerance (8 questions), Honesty (8 questions), Justice (9 questions) and Responsibility (11 questions). The sub-dimension of "Tolerance" refers to values such as sincerity between individuals, empathizing with other people and conscience. The sub-dimension of "Honesty" is about respect for human rights, impartial behaviour and abstaining from illegal and corruptive behaviours. The sub-dimension of "Justice" deals with aspects such as awarding the rewards based on merit, gender equality and equal application of rules for everybody. In the sub-dimension of "Responsibility", on the other hand, are evaluated aspects such as abiding by the regulations governing office hours, accountability for one's actions and ability to work in a team.

Collection of Data

The study data were collected by the researchers between May 2017 and May 2018 by means of data collection form and the scales used in the study. Participants filled in the forms and returned them to the researchers. Participants needed one hour on average to complete the forms.

Analysis of Data

The statistical program of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 23.0 was used to analyse study data. To analyse the qualitative data, descriptive statistical methods (percentage, numbers, average, standard deviation, median value etc.) were used. The normal distribution of data was tested by means of "Kolmogorov Smirnov" analysis. As the data did not follow a normal distribution, Mann Whitney U test, which is a non-parametric test, was used to compare the scores of dual group variables, and Kruskal Wallis test was used for the comparison of the scores in triple group variables. In case where significance was detected in the Kruskal Wallis test, Mann Whitney U test was applied to determine the difference between dual groups. The results were corrected using Bonferroni correction test. Predictor variables were evaluated in the

hierarchical multi-linear regression analysis in which the total score of ethical manners scale is accepted as dependent variable. Statistical significance value was set at $p < 0.05$.

Ethical Considerations

A research ethics application, including the aim and method of the study, was submitted to the Office of Ethics Board of Cyprus Near East University, and ethics approval of the board was obtained under the approval with reference number YDÜ/SB/2017/3. After being duly informed in detail about the study, the participants also gave their consent for the study.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. While, of the study subjects, 63.8% were in the age group of 35-49, 50.2% were men and 78.3% married, with 87.9% who expressed living in a nuclear family and 65.4% being high school graduates. On the other hand, 62.9% of the subjects expressed working on full-time basis, and 54.7% reported having been working in their current job for over 11 years. Regarding socio-economic condition, 49.8% said they had medium income.

Table 2 shows the scores obtained in OCS, OJS and EMS broken down by working positions. No significant difference was found between the overall score averages of the groups in ethical manners scale and organisational culture scale ($p=0.293$; $p=0.433$ respectively). The study found, however, a significant difference between the overall score averages obtained in the organisational culture scale ($p < 0.001$). The managers had higher average scores in the sub-dimensions of justice and responsibility of EMS when compared with those of the permanent employees and the ones working under sub-contractors (30.78 ± 7.60 ; 35.76 ± 9.47 respectively).

The evaluation of temperament characteristics according to working positions is shown in Table 3, while the evaluation of character traits is shown in Table 4. Based on data by groups, the study found a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of NS, HA, RD, PS and SD of the temperament and character inventory (Table 3, 4). Study results show that participants in manager positions had, when compared with other participants, significantly higher scores in the sub-scales of exploratory excitability, reflection, persistence, integrated conscience, creative self-forgetfulness and transpersonal identification (Table 3, 4). Apart from this, the study found, compared with other

participants, that the participants in manager positions had significantly lower scores in the sub-scales of anticipatory worry, fear of uncertainty, sentimentality and spiritual acceptance ($p=0.041$; $p<0.001$; $p=0.008$; $p=0.002$ respectively). The comparison of permanent employees and those employed by subcontractors revealed that the employees working under subcontractors had significantly higher scores in the sub-scales of extravagance, fear of uncertainty, self-forgetfulness and interpersonal identification (After Bonferroni correction, $p<0.001$; $p=0.004$; $p=0.012$; $p=0.015$ respectively).

Table 5 shows the results of hierarchical regression analysis in which the overall score emerging in EMS and OJS is used as dependent variable. The results regard the significance of regression analysis reveal that the study design was a significant predictor in both models with respect to EMS overall score ($p=0.006$; $p=0.003$ respectively). Another result is that the temperament trait of persistence was a significant predictor in the second model in which EMS was evaluated as a dependent variable ($p=0.001$). It follows from this that working in a managing position is the most second important variable on one's displaying of ethical manners following the temperament trait of persistence.

In respect of OJS overall score, the table shows that age, gender, working mode and working length are significant predictors in both models (Table 5). The results also reveal that the character trait of cooperativeness is a significant predictor also in the second model in which OJS was used as a dependent variable ($p=0.001$). We can conclude, based on this result, that working in a managing position, being employed over a longer period, younger age, being a woman and cooperativeness have an effect, in order of priority, on the prediction of organisational justice perception.

Discussion

The present study sought to investigate the effect of temperament and character traits of employees and managers on the organisational culture, organisational justice and ethical manners. It also aimed at determining the temperament and character traits of employees and managers. In our country, very few researchers, if any, have investigated the effect of character and temperament on organisational culture, organisational justice or ethical manners (Orsal & Karadag 2016; Taşdöven et al., 2012)

A study performed in 2012 reports that the temperament sub-dimensions of "reward

dependence and persistence", and cooperativeness, one of the character sub-dimensions, are significant predictors in terms of supportive leadership. (Taşdöven et al., 2012) The study suggests that temperament, probably an in-born aspect, and character that is supposedly a construct primarily influenced by environmental factors are important predictors on leadership, a result showing that leadership is a construct influenced by both in-born attributes and environmental factors. The results of the study performed by O'Connor and Jackson (2010) corroborate the findings of our study. The researchers have found that the sub-dimension of cooperativeness is a significant predictor on leadership. In our study, on the other hand, the participants in manager positions had significantly higher scores in all the sub-dimensions of temperament traits (NS, HA, RD and PS) when compared with permanent employees and those working under subcontractors, a result that also persisted after Bonferroni corrections. The study found, however, no significance in this sense in the context of character traits. Even though the results of our study regarding significance in the sub-dimensions of persistence and reward dependence match those observed in previous research, our study also found that the temperament traits of harm avoidance and novelty seeking are also significant traits for leaders. Based on these results, an analysis of the sub-dimensions of temperament and character inventory can provide important insights into the notion of leadership.

The analyses in our study showed that employees working in manager positions had significantly higher scores in the sub-scales of reflection and responsibility when compared with permanent employees and those employed by subcontractors, but that they had significantly lower scores in the sub-scales of anticipatory worry, fear of uncertainty, sentimentality and spiritual acceptance.

As a result of numerous studies which have attempted to provide insights into leadership characteristics, much of the current literature has paid particular attention to the notion of ethical leadership. Recent research has reported that ethical leadership behaviours have an effect on organisational justice perception, also showing that such behaviours do, directly and indirectly, change the employees' participation in work processes (Xu et al., 2016; Demirtas 2015) The analyses in our study provided evidence that, with respect to ethical manners, managers cared for responsibility and justice at a higher level than others. The study

also found that managers had a higher organisational justice perception in all the sub-dimensions and overall scores. A recent study reports that ethical leadership behaviours do have an increasing effect on the behaviours of employees with respect to organisational citizenship, an increase which, in turn, is influenced by the distributive justice perception in employees (Gao & He 2017) In conclusion, the study suggests that a good functioning in any organisation is closely related with the justice perception established by the manager personnel. The result of our study that working in a managing position is the most important predictor of organisational justice perception shows that there is a close correlation between justice perception and working in a manager position. These findings are also consistent to a great extent with those observed in previous research. Our study demonstrated that other important factors that had an effect on organisational justice perception were being employed over a longer period in the organisation, younger age, being a woman and the character trait of cooperativeness.

In our study, employees in permanent employment and those employed by subcontractors had similar results. The only diverging result was that employees in permanent employment had a higher level of tolerance compared to managers and those working under subcontractors. This may be attributed to the fact that the employees working under a subcontractor in private sector are more likely to suffer from job-related stress than those working under a permanent employment contract.

The result indicating more tolerance in permanent employees than managers may be attributed to the more reserved behaviour of manager personnel towards other employees to maintain their authority.

Conclusion

An ever-growing body of literature has investigated the notion of leadership. Leadership is a notion that is being investigated from numerous perspectives, and it is of great importance, in this respect, to define the temperament and character traits playing a role leadership in detail. In this respect, our study has found that managers have higher scores in the traits of reflection and responsibility, but that they have lower scores in the sub-scales of anticipatory worry, fear of uncertainty, sentimentality and spiritual acceptance. Besides, managers have a higher perception of organisational justice, a trait that is

closely related with cooperativeness. All these findings will provide important insights in respect of enhancing our understanding of leadership traits.

References

- [1] Brown, M. E., & Linda K. T. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 595-616. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004
- [2] Cloninger, C. R., Svrakic, D. M., & Przybeck, T. R. (1993). A psychobiological model of temperament and character. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 50, 975-990.
- [3] Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86, 386. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386
- [4] Demirtas, O. (2015). Ethical leadership influence at organizations: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126, 273-284. doi: 10.1007/s10551-013-1950-5
- [5] Gao, Y., & Wei H. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and employee organizational citizenship behavior: The pivotal roles of ethical leadership and organizational justice. *Management Decision*, 55, 294-309. doi: 10.1108/MD-05-2016-0284
- [6] Kara, Y. (2006). The Effect of Organizational Culture in Schools on Ethical Manners of School Executives. Master's Thesis, Istanbul University.
- [7] Köse, S., Sayar, K., Kalelioglu, Ü., Aydin N., Ak, İ., Kirpinar, İ., Reeves, R. A., Przybeck, T. R., & Robert, C. (2004). Turkish version of the Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI): Reliability, validity, and factorial structure. *Klinik Psikofarmakoloji Bülteni*, 14, 107-131.
- [8] Martin, G. S., Resick, C. J., Keating, M. A., & Dickson, M. W. (2009). Ethical leadership across cultures: a comparative analysis of German and US perspectives. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 18, 127-144. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8608.2009.01553.x
- [9] Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108, 1-13. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.04.002
- [10] O'Connor, P. J. & Jackson, C. J. (2010). Applying a psychobiological model of personality to the study of leadership. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 31, 185-197. doi: 10.1027/1614-0001/a000027
- [11] Orsal, O., & Karadag, E. (2016). Relationship

- Between Personality Traits and Leadership Behaviors: A Study on Business Students', *PressAcademia Procedia*, 2, 320-330. doi: 10.17261/Pressacademia.2016118652
- [12] Özmen, N.T., Arbak, Y. & Özer, P. S. (2007). An Inquiry About the Effect of Justice Value on Justice Perception. *Ege Academic Review*, 7, 17-33.
- [13] Robbins, SP, and TA Judge. 2012. *Organizational behavior* (Prentice Hall: New Jersey).
- [14] Taşdöven, H., Emhan, A. & Dönmez, M. (2012). Leadership Style and Temperament-Character Relationship: An Application in the Police Organization. *Journal of Management and Economics*, 19, 165-177.
- [15] Walumbwa, F. O. & Schaubroeck, J. (2009). Leader personality traits and employee voice behavior: mediating roles of ethical leadership and work group psychological safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 1275-86. doi: 10.1037/a0015848
- [16] Xu, A. J., Loi, R. & Ngo, Y. (2016). Ethical leadership behavior and employee justice perceptions: The mediating role of trust in organization. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 134, 493-504. doi: 10.1007/s10551-014-2457-4

Tables

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the participants

Variables	Subcontractors' Employees (n=331)	Permanent Employees (n=249)	Managers (n=56)
Age			
20-34	108 (32.6)	76 (30.5)	2 (3.6)
35-49	209 (63.1)	165 (66.3)	32 (57.1)
≥ 50	14 (4.2)	8 (3.2)	22 (39.2)
Gender			
Woman	154 (46.5)	144 (57.8)	19 (33.9)
Man	177 (53.5)	105 (42.2)	37 (66.1)
Civil Status			
Single	44 (13.3)	45 (18.1)	8 (14.3)
Married	263 (79.5)	187 (75.1)	48 (85.7)
Divorced	21 (6.3)	16 (6.4)	0 (0.0)
Family Type			
Nuclear Family	290 (87.6)	224 (90.0)	45 (80.4)
Extended Family	23 (6.9)	17 (6.8)	9 (16.1)
Fragmented Family	18 (5.4)	8 (3.2)	2 (3.6)
Educational Background			
≤ Primary school	9 (2.7)	6 (2.4)	0 (0.0)
High School	257 (77.6)	159 (63.9)	0 (0.0)
University	65 (19.6)	84 (33.7)	56 (100.0)
Working Mode			
Full Time	186 (56.2)	171 (68.7)	43 (76.8)
Part Time	145 (43.8)	78 (31.3)	13 (23.2)
Length of Service			
1-5 years	21 (6.3)	18 (7.2)	3 (5.4)
6-10 years	149 (45.0)	86 (34.5)	11 (19.6)
≥ 11 years	161 (48.6)	145 (58.2)	42 (75.0)
Socio-economic condition			
Low	147 (44.4)	60 (24.1)	20 (35.7)
Medium	156 (47.1)	152 (61.0)	9 (16.1)
High	28 (8.5)	37 (14.9)	27 (48.2)

Table 2. Evaluation of the scales used by position

Scale name	Scale Sub-dimensions	Subcontractors'	Permanent	Managers	Total	Kruskal Wallis analysis		Secondary analysis by Wilcoxon Test	
		Employees (n=331)	Employees (n=249)	(n=56)	(n=632)	X ²	p	Dual	p
		Ave. ± ss (median)	Ave. ± ss (median)	Ave. ± ss (median)	Ave. ± ss (median)				
Ethical Manners Scale	Tolerance	29.87±7.77 (29.00)	32.38±7.50 (35.00)	29.05±7.37 (28.00)	29.05±7.37 (33.00)	19.814	<0.001	1-2	<0.001*
	Honesty	25.66±6.01 (25.00)	26.67±6.88 (25.00)	25.83±7.50 (24.00)	26.07±6.51 (25.00)	2.595	0.273		
	Justice	26.14±6.51 (26.00)	26.34±7.27 (26.00)	30.78±7.60 (31.00)	26.63±7.02 (26.00)	21.637	<0.001	1-3 2-3	<0.001* <0.001*
	Responsibility	32.18±9.69 (32.00)	30.01±11.18 (30.00)	35.76±9.47 (32.00)	31.65±10.40 (32.00)	12.829	0.002	1-2	0.011*
	Total	113.8±19.0 (110.00)	115.4±20.6 (112.00)	121.4±25.8 (109.00)	115.1±20.4 (110.00)	2.457	0.293		
Organisational Culture Scale	Strength	25.89±6.30 (26.00)	26.30±7.35 (28.00)	25.60±6.08 (26.00)	26.03±6.71 (26.00)	2.027	0.363		
	Role	30.48±6.83 (30.00)	31.01±8.10 (30.00)	31.38±7.20 (30.00)	30.77±7.38 (30.00)	1.677	0.432		
	Achievement	30.16±7.32 (30.00)	29.11±8.81 (30.00)	30.60±5.48 (31.00)	29.79±7.81 (30.00)	5.389	0.068		
	Support	30.72±9.72 (30.00)	28.14±12.36 (28.00)	30.41±6.39 (30.00)	29.69±10.67 (30.00)	11.694	0.003	1-2	0.001*
	Total	117.2±18.8 (114.00)	114.5±24.3 (113.00)	118.0±17.5 (115.00)	116.2±21.1 (113.00)	1.673	0.433		
Organisational Justice Scale	Procedural	20.27±4.12 (20.00)	20.41±4.89 (20.00)	22.50±4.00 (21.00)	22.50±4.00 (20.00)	10.359	0.006	1-3 2-3	0.001* 0.010*
	Distributive	10.97±2.70 (10.00)	11.27±3.37 (11.00)	12.87±3.06 (12.00)	11.26±3.05 (11.00)	16.469	<0.001	1-3 2-3	<0.001* 0.001*
	Interpersonal	14.79±3.52 (15.00)	15.54±4.34 (15.00)	16.84±3.20 (17.00)	15.26±3.88 (15.00)	16.007	<0.001	1-3 2-3	<0.001* 0.014*
	Informational	12.17±3.58 (12.00)	12.98±3.79 (13.00)	15.19±3.11 (16.00)	12.75±3.72 (12.00)	34.149	<0.001	1-2 1-3 2-3	0.005* <0.001* <0.001*
	Total	58.22±10.46 (58.00)	60.22±11.44 (59.00)	67.41±9.92 (67.00)	59.81±11.09 (59.00)	32.067	<0.001	1-3 2-3	<0.001* <0.001*

* Values which were still significant after Bonferroni correction.

Table 3. Evaluation of temperament traits according to working positions

Scale name	Scale Sub-dimensions	Subcontractors'	Permanent	Managers	Total	Kruskal Wallis analysis		Secondary analysis by Wilcoxon Test	
		Employees (n=331)	Employees (n=249)	(n=56)	(n=632)	X ²	p	Dual	p
		Ave. ± ss (median)	Ave. ± ss (median)	Ave. ± ss (median)	Ave. ± ss (median)				
Novelty Seeking	Exploratory Excitability (NS1)	5.63±1.59 (5.00)	5.85±1.66 (6.00)	6.23±1.34 (6.00)	5.77±1.61 (6.00)	6.729	0.035	1-3	0.015*
	Reflection (NS2)	4.71±1.39 (5.00)	4.65±1.46 (5.00)	5.71±1.51 (6.00)	4.77±1.45 (5.00)	25.356	<0.001	1-3 2-3	<0.001* <0.001*
	Extravagance (NS3)	5.11±1.40 (5.00)	4.57±1.36 (5.00)	4.80±1.40 (5.00)	4.87±1.41 (5.00)	19.127	<0.001	1-2	<0.001*
	Disorderliness (NS4)	4.72±1.37 (5.00)	4.80±1.43 (5.00)	4.91±0.95 (5.00)	4.77±1.36 (5.00)	1.799	0.407		
	Total	20.18±3.09 (20.00)	19.88±2.92 (20.00)	21.66±2.35 (21.00)	20.19±3.00 (20.00)	16.819	<0.001	1-3 2-3	0.001* <0.001*
Harm Avoidance	Anticipatory Worry and Pessimism (HA1)	5.53±1.80 (5.00)	5.53±1.72 (6.00)	4.89±1.52 (5.00)	5.47±1.75 (5.00)	6.396	0.041	1-3	0.018
	Fear of Uncertainty (HA2)	4.58±1.36 (5.00)	4.25±1.39 (4.00)	3.80±1.44 (4.00)	4.38±1.40 (4.00)	19.294	<0.001	1-2 1-3 2-3	0.004* <0.001* 0.024
	Shyness with Strangers (HA3)	3.83±1.26 (4.00)	3.79±1.24 (4.00)	3.98±1.08 (4.00)	3.82±1.24 (4.00)	1.126	0.569		
	Fatigability (HA4)	4.58±1.28 (5.00)	4.57±1.38 (5.00)	4.32±1.25 (4.00)	4.55±1.32 (4.00)	2.632	0.268		
	Total	18.53±3.14 (19.00)	18.14±3.14 (18.00)	17.00±3.10 (17.00)	18.25±3.16 (18.00)	13.165	0.001	1-3 2-3	0.001* 0.014*
Reward Dependence	Sentimentality (RD1)	5.96±1.82 (6.00)	5.63±1.88 (6.00)	5.21±1.82 (5.00)	5.77±1.86 (6.00)	9.776	0.008	1-2 1-3	0.028 0.007*
	Attachment (RD3)	3.73±1.30 (4.00)	3.58±1.50 (4.00)	3.48±1.43 (4.00)	3.65±1.39 (4.00)	3.357	0.187		
	Dependence (RD4)	2.67±1.30 (3.00)	2.74±1.39 (3.00)	2.46±1.46 (3.00)	2.68±1.35 (3.00)	4.175	0.124		
	Total	12.37±2.17 (12.00)	11.96±2.44 (12.00)	11.16±1.94 (11.00)	12.10±2.28 (12.00)	16.046	<0.001	1-2 1-3 2-3	0.019 <0.001* 0.033
Persistence	Total	4.48±1.51 (5.00)	4.26±1.40 (4.00)	5.07±1.53 (5.00)	4.44±1.48 (5.00)	14.475	<0.001	1-2 1-3 2-3	0.042 0.008* <0.001*

* Values which were still significant after Bonferroni correction.

Table 4. Evaluation of character traits according to working positions

Scale name	Scale Sub-dimensions	Subcontractors	Permanen	Managers	Total	Kruskal Wallis analysis		Secondary analysis by Wilcoxon Test	
		' Employees (n=331)	t Employees (n=249)	(n=56)	(n=632)	X ²	p	Dua l	p
Self-Directedness	Responsibility (S1)	4.09±1.42 (4.00)	4.08±1.45 (4.00)	4.96±1.38 (5.00)	4.16±1.45 (4.00)	17.45 3	<0.001 1	1-3 2-3	<0.001 *
	Purposefulness (S2)	4.40±1.46 (4.00)	4.15±1.46 (4.00)	4.25±1.51 (4.00)	4.29±1.47 (4.00)	4.718	0.095		
	Resourcefulness (S3)	2.18±1.16 (2.00)	2.16±1.26 (2.00)	2.46±0.93 (2.00)	2.20±1.18 (2.00)	4.047	0.132		
	Self-acceptance (S4)	5.48±1.75 (6.00)	5.46±1.76 (5.00)	5.14±1.41 (5.00)	5.44±1.73 (5.00)	2.457	0.293		
	Congruent Second Nature (S5)	6.62±1.75 (7.00)	6.33±1.64 (6.00)	6.50±1.38 (6.00)	6.50±1.68 (6.00)	3.856	0.145		
	Total	22.79±4.17 (22.00)	22.20±3.98 (22.00)	23.32±3.4 4 (23.00)	22.61±4.0 5 (22.00)	4.451	0.108		
Cooperativeness	Social acceptance (C1)	3.90±1.22 (4.00)	4.02±1.27 (4.00)	3.69±1.06 (4.00)	3.93±1.22 (4.00)	3.405	0.182		
	Empathy (C2)	3.49±1.28 (4.00)	3.54±1.13 (4.00)	3.80±1.28 (4.00)	3.54±1.23 (4.00)	3.216	0.200		
	Helpfulness (C3)	4.00±1.37 (4.00)	3.85±1.27 (4.00)	3.67±1.66 (4.00)	3.91±1.36 (4.00)	3.226	0.199		
	Compassion (C4)	5.04±1.61 (5.00)	5.06±1.61 (5.00)	5.17±1.25 (5.00)	5.06±1.58 (5.00)	0.364	0.834		
	Integrated Conscience (C5)	4.93±1.37 (5.00)	4.75±1.17 (5.00)	5.16±1.12 (5.00)	4.88±1.28 (5.00)	7.366	0.025	2-3	0.008
	Total	21.38±3.28 (21.00)	21.23±3.02 (21.00)	21.51±3.1 0 (21.00)	21.34±3.1 6 (21.00)	0.189	0.910		
Self-Transcendence	Creative Self-Forgetfulness (ST1)	6.19±2.09 (6.00)	5.77±2.18 (6.00)	6.37±2.36 (6.00)	6.04±2.16 (6.00)	9.049	0.011	1-2 2-3	0.012 0.020
	Transpersonal identification (ST2)	4.93±1.88 (5.00)	4.54±2.05 (5.00)	4.96±1.71 (5.00)	4.78±1.94 (5.00)	6.884	0.032		
	Spiritual acceptance (ST3)	6.67±2.04 (7.00)	6.42±2.02 (6.00)	5.60±1.71 (6.00)	6.48±2.02 (6.00)	12.55 5	0.002	1-3 2-3	<0.001 0.007
	Total	17.79±4.65 (18.00)	16.74±5.14 (16.00)	16.94±4.4 4 (17.00)	17.30±4.8 5 (17.00)	9.769	0.008	1-2	0.002

* Values which were still significant after Bonferroni correction

Table 5. Results of hierarchic regression analysis concerning the prediction of total scores obtained in Ethical Manners Scale and Organisational Justice Scale

	Variable	Ethical Manners Scale (EMS)			Organisational Justice Scale (OJS)		
		β (Beta)	95% CI for B	p	β (Beta)	95% CI for B	p
Model 1	Constant	-	104.76; 124.41	<0.001	-	50.098; 60.486	<0.001
	Age	-0.057	-0.496; 0.189	0.380	-0.123	-0.363; 0.000	0.050
	Gender (Woman=1 / Men=2)	-0.047	-5.218; 1.394	0.257	-0.113	-4.258; -0.763	0.005
	Working mode (Employees=1 / Managers=2)	0.123	2.568; 15.102	0.006	0.251	6.505; 13.131	<0.001
	Length of service	-0.005	-0.450; 0.415	0.937	0.182	0.132; 0.590	0.002
	F		2.527			11.542	
	p		0.040			<0.001	
Model 2	Constant	-	90.32; 130.74	<0.001	-	57.77; 79.20	<0.001
	Age	-0.056	-0.494; 0.189	0.382	-0.131	-0.374; -0.012	0.037
	Gender (Woman=1 / Men=2)	-0.044	-5.094; 1.504	0.286	-0.108	-4.149; -0.652	0.007
	Working mode (Employees=1 / Managers=2)	0.137	3.489; 16.307	0.003	0.261	6.801; 13.59	<0.001
	Length of service	-0.008	-0.467; 0.407	0.893	0.202	0.169; 0.632	0.001
	Novelty Seeking	0.077	-0.094; 1.140	0.097	-0.071	-0.589; 0.065	0.117
	Harm Avoidance	-0.002	-0.587; 0.557	0.959	-0.014	-0.351; 0.255	0.755
	Reward Dependence	0.040	-0.413; 1.126	0.363	-0.013	-0.472; 0.343	0.757
	Persistence	0.144	3.088; 11.855	0.001	-0.021	-0.751; 0.431	0.595
	Self-directedness	-0.065	-0.744; 0.086	0.120	0.040	-0.111; 0.329	0.330
	Cooperativeness	0.033	-0.360; 0.782	0.468	0.106	-0.373; 1.068	0.017
	Self-transcendence	-0.001	-0.368; 0.360	0.983	-0.019	-0.235; 0.150	0.665
	F		2.876			5.872	
p		0.001			<0.001		

CI: Confidence Interval