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Abstract

A research was conducted to find out (1) what do the students perceive about some of the factors of their personality and (2) what do the students think others perceiving about some of their factors of the personality. Findings were interesting. In most of the cases, the difference between (1) & (2) was very less, which is very normal. But in very few cases, the difference between (1) & (2) was found to be very high, and we identified these high differences as cases of "Abnormality in Perception". Based on this kind of research, if we are able to find out the cases of "Abnormality in Perception" i.e., the difference in 1 & 2 being very high & imaginary, we are in a position to take some corrective actions and help such persons with the help of Counseling and Psychotherapy or even psychiatrist help.
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Introduction

This research was conducted on MBA students, who are in the age-group of 20 to 25 years. In this age group, the person is highly conscious about his personality and about his image. He is under high level of stress because of the rigorous course. Sometimes, because of failure in some subjects or non-attainability of desired goals as per his expectation, his real personality may take backstage, temporarily. For example, if his real personality is Extrovert, he may turn to be Introvert. Similarly, there are many factors working to influence his personality (may be temporarily). Hence, there is difference in his real self and his reflected self. This difference could be for many reasons. For example, the person knows that his or her actual personality is different (which only he knows) and which is not reflected to others, rather a different personality is reflected to others. This difference can be up to a normal permissible limit. If this is the case, then there is scope to reduce this actual difference in personality. Help can be provided by way of training, suggestions so that the person enhances his / her potential and reflects his or her real Personality. But, if this difference is VERY HIGH (abnormality in perception) and imaginary i.e., if the person always feels that others have a different view about his personality than what he has (and if this difference is very high and not real), then help can be provided by way of Counselling & Psychotherapy.
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So, the first step is to find out whether a difference exists between what the person rates himself on his personality and what he perceives regarding how others would be rating him on his personality. And we also need to find out that how much large is this difference.

Keeping this issue in mind, a research project was undertaken. It was found that in case of 2 MBA students (out of total 96 students researched); the difference was found abnormally high (abnormality in perception).

**Literature Survey:**

**What is Personality?**

Personality is more than the distinctive impression a person makes on others. It is the sum total of ways in which an individual reacts to and interacts with others; how well the person achieves objectives.

It refers to the structures inside a person that explains why he or she creates a particular impression on others. Personality refers to a person’s stable and consistent behavior. The determining factors are: Heredity and Environment. Situational conditions may sometimes require change in behavior.

**THE BIG FIVE MODEL OF PERSONALITY:**

1. **Extraversion**
2. **Emotional stability**
3. **Conscientiousness**
4. **Openness to experience**
5. **Agreeableness**

**1. EXTRAVERSION**

The individual is:

More sociable, more active, impulsive, less moody, less introspective, less preoccupied with self. He is socially oriented, outgoing, gregarious. He is dominant, ambitious, adventurous, assertive; experiences positive emotions. Such individual is more likely to take up leadership roles. He has greater number of close friends.

Extraversion:

Characteristics at 3 levels of extraversion are as follows:

- **High:** extraverted, outgoing, active, and high-spirited. Prefers to be around people most of the time.

**2. EMOTIONAL STABILITY VS. NEUROTICISM**

Neuroticism – traits manifesting anxiety, emotional instability, stress proneness. Personal insecurity, depression, lack of positive psychological and emotional adjustment. The person tends to experience: anxiety, hostility, depression, self-consciousness, vulnerability, and impulsiveness.

Neuroticism

Characteristics at 3 levels of Neuroticism are as follows:

- **High:** Sensitive, emotional, prone to experience feelings that are upsetting like negative moods, anxiety, fear, irritability, depression, and physical symptoms. They are affected by negative life events.

- **Average:** Generally calm and able to deal with stress, but sometimes experience feelings of guilt, anger, or sadness.

- **Low:** Secure, hardy, and generally relaxed even under stressful conditions.

**3. CONSCIENTIOUSNESS**

It is related to:

* Achievement orientation – the person is hardworking and persistent.
* Dependability – responsible and careful.
* Orderliness – planful and organised.

It concerns the person's self-control, need for achievement, order, persistence. It is a predictor of success. Conscientious persons live longer.

Characteristics at 3 levels of Conscientiousness are as follows:

- **HIGH:** Conscientious and well organised. Have high standards and always strive to achieve their goals.

- **AVERAGE:** Dependable and moderately well organised. Generally have clear goals, but are able to set work aside.

- **LOW:** Easygoing, not very well organised, and sometimes careless. Prefers not to make plans.

**4. OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE**

Concerns a person's range of interests and fascination with novelty.

* Reflective; Looking for the meaning of experiences.

* Imaginative, autonomous, curious, nonconforming, unconventional.

Such people succeed in most occupations due to their: Flexibility, Creativity, Intellectual orientation, Artistic sensitivity.
Characteristics at 3 levels of 'openness to experience' are as follows:

HIGH: Open to new experiences, has broad interests and is very imaginative.

AVERAGE: Practical but willing to consider new ways of doing things. Seeks a balance between the old and the new.

LOW: Down-to-earth, practical, traditional and set in his or her ways.

5. AGREEABLENESS
One who is -
LIKEABLE: good-natured, cheerful, gentle.
COOPERATIVE: trusting of others and caring.

Such a person is more successful in teamwork, customer service. But in trying to please others, might sacrifice personal success.

Characteristics at 3 levels of agreeableness are as follows:

HIGH: Compassionate, good natured, eager to cooperate and avoid conflict.

AVERAGE: Generally warm, trusting, pleasant, but can sometimes be stubborn and competitive.

LOW: Hardheaded, skeptical, proud, and competitive. Tends to express anger directly.

TYPE 'A' & TYPE 'B' PERSONALITY:
Type-A Personality: Characteristics of the person with Type A personality are as follows:
* Time urgency
* Multiple activities
* Extremely competitive
* Rigidity of thought
* Poor planning

Type - B Personality
Characteristics of the person with Type B personality are as follows:
* Relaxed, no time urgency
* In-depth involvement of activities
* Flexibility of thoughts
* Strategic planner

Chris Argyris's immaturity-maturity continuum

| Immaturity-maturity continuum | Maturity characteristics |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| • Passivity                    | • Activity               |
| • Dependence                   | • Independence           |
| • Few ways of behaving         | • Diverse behavior       |
| • Shallow interests            | • Deep interests          |
| • Short time perspective       | • Long time perspective  |
| • Subordinate position         | • Superordinate position |
| • Lack of self-awareness       | • Self-awareness control |

Argyris says that human personality, rather than going through precise stages, progresses along a continuum from immaturity as an infant to maturity as an adult.

Emotional maturity or Emotional Quotient

Based on research in both the neurological & behavioral sciences, it seems that a person’s EQ may be a much better predictor of success than the traditionally revered IQ (intelligence, as measured by standardized tests).

* People with high EQ have delayed gratification (reason over impulsiveness), understand their own feelings & feelings of others. They know how to regulate their emotions, like anger, anxiety etc, in a way that enhances success on the job and in life.

* This EQ starts to develop at an early stage & continues to develop, both neurologically & through socialization.

* To take advantage of this newly found personality attribute, HR trainers are beginning to provide instructions in such areas as raising consciousness, building empathy (integrating perspectives of others) etc.

The socialization process & personality

* Persons, groups & organizations influence the personality of an individual.

* A recent study found that the socialization tactics of organizations can have a positive, long-run impact on the adjustment of employees (i.e., lower role-conflict & ambiguity, less stress, higher job satisfaction, commitment etc.).

* Employees should come to 'know the ropes' (i.e., they get to know the tricks of the trade).

* Some of the steps for successful organizational socialization are: providing challenging first job, providing relevant training, providing timely & relevant feedback, placing new recruits in work-groups with high morale etc.

Determinants of personality

* Heredity (e.g. Physical stature, facial attractiveness etc.)

* Environment (e.g. Culture: expected norms of behavior from boys & girls, etc.)

* Contribution from family (considerable influence on personality development, especially in early stages. Parents serve as the model to the child. Orphans or children reared in cold/unstimulated home are more likely to be socially & emotionally maladjusted than children raised by parents in warm & loving environment. Siblings also contribute to personality).
• Socialization process (at home, outside and in organizations).

• Situational considerations (e.g., a person having high need for power & achievement is placed in a bureaucratic work situation, will be frustrated & may behave apathetically & / or aggressively).

Major personality traits influencing organizational behavior

• Authoritarianism (tend to be rigid, strongly oriented towards conformity to rules & regulations. Prefer stable & structured work environment, which are governed by clear rules & procedures. Prefer autocratic & directive leadership & exhibit high respect to individuals in position of authority).

• Locus of control (internal & external loc. Employees with external loc are less satisfied with jobs, have higher absenteeism, less involved with jobs. Employees with internal loc have more control over their own behavior).

• Machiavellianism (derived from writings of nicolo Machiavelli). It refers to individual’s propensity to manipulate people. Machiavellians would be prone to participate in organizational politics. They are adept at interpersonal game playing, power tactics, identifying influence system in organization etc. In jobs that require bargaining skills, Machiavellians perform better.

• Agreeableness: From organization’s perspective, highly agreeable people are likely to develop good working relationships with all organizational constituents (co-workers, subordinates, superiors, customers etc.).

Introvert & extrovert (extraversion): It is normally associated with individual’s sociability & interpersonal skills. Extroverts (high degree of extraversion) are: gregarious, sociable, more suitable for positions requiring considerable interaction with others. Managerial positions are dominated by extroverts, suggesting that this managerial trait is a factor in managerial success. Introverts (low degree of extraversion) are: shy, quiet, more suitable for jobs requiring thought & analytical skills, without requiring much of interaction).

• Risk-taking: People differ in their willingness to take chances, e.g., high risk taking person may be more fitting for jobs which require rapid decision making, like stock trader in a brokerage firm. Accountant’s job may require person with low-risk taking personality trait.

• Self-monitoring: It refers to the individual’s ability to adjust his behavior to external factors. High self monitors are capable of presenting striking contradictions between their public & private selves. Low self-monitors cannot deviate their behavior. They tend to display their true disposition & attitude in every situation, hence high behavioral consistency between who they are & what they do. We might also hypothesize that high self monitors are more successful in managerial positions, where individuals are required to play multiple & contradictory roles. High self-monitors are capable of putting on different “faces” for different audiences.

Research Methodology:
Data was collected on 2 different questionnaires: Personality Test Questionnaire (I): How do you see yourself? Personality Test Questionnaire (II): Your Perception about How Others see you.

Data Collection: Questionnaire no. 1 & 2 were personally administered & responses were collected. Items of the questionnaire were drawn from the following source: Ref.: http://www.999-life.com/personality-test-questionnaire.html Each questionnaire consist of 35 items in form of statements relating to the personalities. Responses for each item in the questionnaire were scored as follow:

| RESPONSES   | SCORES |
|-------------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | -2     |
| Disagree       | -1     |
| Neutral        | 0      |
| Agree          | 1      |
| Strongly Agree | 2      |

Sample Size: Respondents were 96 randomly selected MBA students of a Business School who had completed 1 year of study in the B-School.

1. Students were given 15 minutes to answer the first questionnaire. They were required to self rate themselves on the 35 items.
2. After 15 minutes, the 1st questionnaire was collected and the 2nd questionnaire was administered. It consisted of the same 35 items, but now they were required to respond on how they feel others perceive them on these items. They were again given 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Data Analysis / Observations / Interpretations / Findings:

OBJECTIVE: To identify respondents whose absolute differences in responses between corresponding pair of items in the two questionnaires on an average is very high (abnormality in perception) i.e., significantly higher than 2.

Step 1: For each respondent we obtained the absolute differences of responses between each pair of items. Example: If the respondents' response for the 1st question in the 1st questionnaire is 0 and the response to the corresponding 1st question in the 2nd questionnaire is 2 then the absolute difference would be |0 - 2| = 2. These absolute differences would take values between 0 and 4.

Step 2: For each respondent we obtained the average of the absolute differences.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of absolute differences of responses for each respondent (Abbreviation: Resp1: Respondent 1)

| n  | Number of items in each questionnaire | Mean of Absolute Differences (x) | Std. Deviation of Absolute Differences (s) | Std. Error Mean SE s/ \sqrt{n} |
|----|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 35 | RESP1                                | 1.1143                           | 1.3234                                    | .2237                         |
| 35 | RESP2                                | .6000                            | .6039                                     | .1021                         |
| 35 | RESP3                                | 1.1714                           | 1.0706                                    | .1810                         |
| 35 | RESP4                                | .8000                            | .7971                                     | .1347                         |
| 35 | RESP5                                | 2.8286                           | .9544                                     | .1613                         |
| 35 | RESP6                                | .6000                            | .6039                                     | .1021                         |
| 35 | RESP7                                | 1.1714                           | 1.0706                                    | .1810                         |
| 35 | RESP8                                | .8000                            | .7971                                     | .1347                         |
| 35 | RESP9                                | 1.1143                           | 1.3234                                    | .2237                         |
| 35 | RESP10                               | .6000                            | .6039                                     | .1021                         |
| 35 | RESP11                               | 1.1714                           | 1.0706                                    | .1810                         |
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| RESP | 35 | .6000 | .6039 | .1021 |
|------|----|-------|-------|-------|
| RESP | 35 | 1.1714 | 1.0706 | .1810 |
| RESP | 35 | .8000 | .7971 | .1347 |
| RESP | 35 | 1.1143 | 1.3234 | .2237 |
| RESP | 35 | .6000 | .6039 | .1021 |
| RESP | 35 | 1.1714 | 1.0706 | .1810 |
| RESP | 35 | 1.1143 | 1.3234 | .2237 |
| RESP | 35 | .8000 | .7971 | .1347 |
| RESP | 35 | 1.1714 | 1.0706 | .1810 |
| RESP | 35 | 1.1143 | 1.3234 | .2237 |
| RESP | 35 | .6000 | .6039 | .1021 |
| RESP | 35 | 1.1714 | 1.0706 | .1810 |
Interesting Observation

The averages of absolute differences between corresponding pairs of items in two questionnaires are in the range of 0 to 1.17 for all respondents with the exception of respondent 5 (whose average of absolute differences is 2.8286) and respondent 53 (whose average is 2.6857). So, this is found that the average of absolute differences respondent 5 and 53 which is found to be significantly higher than 2.

So, the following hypothesis was tested

Null Hypothesis: The average of absolute differences of corresponding pair of items on the two questionnaires for individual respondent is not higher than 2 (i.e., \( H_0: \mu \leq 2 \))

Alternate Hypothesis: The average of absolute differences of corresponding pair of items on the two questionnaires for individual respondent is significantly higher than 2. (i.e., \( H_1: \mu > 2 \))

Let us set decision criteria that a very low p-value and positive t-statistics will be considered as abnormal case (since a very low p-value suggests significant difference from 2 and positive t-statistics will suggest higher than 2 average absolute difference).

Table 2: One sample t-test for testing mean of absolute difference in responses between corresponding pair of items for each respondent (Abbreviation Resp1: Respondent 1)

The table value of t for 99% confidence interval is given as \( t_0 = 2.727 \)

| Test Value | 2 |
|---|---|
| \( T \) | \( \text{DF} \) | \( \text{P-Value} \) | \( \text{Mean Difference} \) | \( \text{99% Confidence Interval of the Difference} \) | Lower | Upper |
| 1 | (N-1) | | | | \( \frac{1}{2} \sigma \text{SE} \) | \( \frac{1}{2} \sigma \text{SE} \) |
| RESP1 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -0.8857 | -1.4960 | -2.754 |
| RESP2 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP3 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -0.8286 | -1.3223 | -3.348 |
| RESP4 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -0.824 |
| RESP5 | 5.136 | 34 | .000 | -0.8286 | -1.2000 | -1.1215 |
| RESP6 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP7 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -0.8286 | -1.3223 | -3.348 |
| RESP8 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -0.824 |
| RESP9 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -0.8857 | -1.4960 | -2.754 |
| RESP10 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP11 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -0.8286 | -1.3223 | -3.348 |
| RESP12 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -0.824 |
| RESP13 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -0.8857 | -1.4960 | -2.754 |
| RESP14 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP15 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -0.8286 | -1.3223 | -3.348 |
| RESP16 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -0.824 |
| RESP17 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -0.8857 | -1.4960 | -2.754 |
| RESP18 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP19 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -0.8286 | -1.3223 | -3.348 |
| RESP20 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -0.824 |
| RESP21 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -0.8857 | -1.4960 | -2.754 |
| RESP22 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP23 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -0.8286 | -1.3223 | -3.348 |
| RESP24 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -0.824 |
| RESP25 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -0.8857 | -1.4960 | -2.754 |
| RESP26 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP27 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -0.8286 | -1.3223 | -3.348 |
| RESP28 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -0.824 |
| RESP29 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -0.8857 | -1.4960 | -2.754 |
| RESP30 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP31 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -0.8286 | -1.3223 | -3.348 |
| RESP32 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -0.824 |
| RESP33 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -0.8857 | -1.4960 | -2.754 |
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| RESP34 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP35 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -8.286 | -1.3223 | -.3348 |
| RESP36 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -.8324 |
| RESP37 | -9.960 | 34 | .000 | -8.857 | -1.4960 | -.2754 |
| RESP38 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP39 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -8.286 | -1.3223 | -.3348 |
| RESP40 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -.8324 |
| RESP41 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -8.857 | -1.4960 | -.2754 |
| RESP42 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP43 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -8.286 | -1.3223 | -.3348 |
| RESP44 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -.8324 |
| RESP45 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -8.857 | -1.4960 | -.2754 |
| RESP46 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP47 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -8.286 | -1.3223 | -.3348 |
| RESP48 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -.8324 |
| RESP49 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -8.857 | -1.4960 | -.2754 |
| RESP50 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP51 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -8.286 | -1.3223 | -.3348 |
| RESP52 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -.8324 |
| RESP53 | 4.084 | 34 | .000 | .6857 | -.2276 | 1.1438 |
| RESP54 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP55 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -8.286 | -1.3223 | -.3348 |
| RESP56 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -.8324 |
| RESP57 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -8.857 | -1.4960 | -.2754 |
| RESP58 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP59 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -8.286 | -1.3223 | -.3348 |
| RESP60 | -8.907 | 34 | .000 | -1.2000 | -1.5676 | -.8324 |
| RESP61 | -3.960 | 34 | .000 | -8.857 | -1.4960 | -.2754 |
| RESP62 | -13.715 | 34 | .000 | -1.4000 | -1.6785 | -1.1215 |
| RESP63 | -4.579 | 34 | .000 | -8.286 | -1.3223 | -.3348 |

Vol 2 Issue 1 March 2009 Adarsh Journal of Management Research 22
We can observe that in only two cases, respondent 5 and respondent 53, the p-value is low (implies significant difference from 2) and t-value is positive.

Findings & Conclusions:
In case of two respondents (respondent no. 5 & 53), the averages of absolute differences between corresponding pairs of items in two questionnaires are very high (table 1: respondent 5 average 2.8286; and respondent 53 average 2.6857). Also, refer table 2, respondent no. 5 & 53 for further analysis.

In other words, there is abnormality in perception in respondent no. 5 & 53. Hence, we find that there seems to be a very high level of need for counseling and psychotherapy for respondent no. 5 & 53.

Limitations & Suggestions:
1. Sample size is 96 students. Further study is suggested to include more students from more number of colleges in different cities.

Questionnaire:
Annexure 1 & Annexure 2 are the same set of questionnaire of 35 items.

In Personality Test Questionnaire (I) under Annexure 1, the respondent answers the questions in the context of "How do you see yourself?"

In Personality Test Questionnaire (II) under Annexure 2, the respondent answers the questions in the context of "Your Perception about how Others see you?"

1. I enjoy socializing and meeting people
   Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

2. I find it hard to trust people
   Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

3. I take pride in the job I do
   Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

4. I remain calm in tense situations
   Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

5. I like to try new things
   Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

6. I am shy and reserved
   Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

7. I am naturally a kind person
   Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

8. I prefer to start a project, or a job, rather than finish it
   Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

9. I am relaxed and laid back
   Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

10. I prefer to be in control of my life with very little surprises
    Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

11. I am a "party animal"
    Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

12. I tend not to show my emotions to other people
    Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

13. I am very efficient in the job that I do
    Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

14. I often worry about things going wrong
    Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

15. I love to be surprised
    Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

16. I prefer socializing with close friends & the immediate family
    Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree

17. I enjoy helping people
    Strongly Disagree -2° -1° 0° 1° 2° Strongly Agree
18. I tend to be disorganized at work
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
19. I do not easily get upset with others
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
20. I dislike taking risks
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
21. I enjoy meeting new people
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
22. I speak my mind
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
23. People can depend on me to complete a job
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
24. I constantly worry about my love life
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
25. I enjoy arts, music and other artistic experiences
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
26. I tend to be quiet when in a group of people
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
27. I find it easy to generally see the good in people
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
28. I dislike work & prefer to do other things with my time
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
29. I tend to worry about the future
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
30. I enjoy deep thoughts and analyzing situations
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
31. People often invite me out to parties
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
32. I forgive people easily
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
33. I am often in trouble for not finishing a task properly
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
34. I am often tense
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
35. I am creative
   | Strongly Disagree -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Strongly Agree
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