Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology 49*: 1-49.

Levin, I. & Stokes, J. P. (1989). Dispositional approach to job satisfaction: Role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology 74*: 752-758.

McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1987). Validation of the five factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 52*: 81-90.

McCulloch, M. C. & Turban, D. B. (2007). Using person-organization fit to select employees for high-turnover jobs. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment 15 (1)*: 63-71.

Muchinsky, P. M. & Monahan, C. J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour 31*: 268-277.

Necowitz, L. B. & Roznowski, M. (1994). Negative affectivity and job satisfaction: Cognitive processes underlying the relationship and effects on employee behaviours. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour 45 (3)*: 270-294.

Noguchi, K., Gohm, C. L. & Dalsky, D. J. (2006). Cognitive tendencies of focusing on positive and negative information. *Journal of Research in Personality 40*: 891-910.

Ostroff, C. & Schulte, M. (2007). Multiple perspectives of fit in organizations across levels of analysis. In C. Ostroff & T. A. Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational fit*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum. 3-69.

Otonari, J., Nagano, J., Morita, M., Budhathoki, S., Tashiro, N., Toyomura, K. & Takayanagi, R. (2012). Neuroticism and extraversion personality traits, health behaviours, and subjective well-being: the Fukuoka Study (Japan). *Quality of Life Research 21*: 1847-1855.

Rauthmann, J. F. (2012). You say the party is dull, I say it is lively: A componential approach to how situations are perceived to disentangle perceiver situation, and perceiver x situation variance. *Social Psychological and Personality Science 3 (5)*: 519-528.

Resick, C. J., Baltes, B. B. & Shantz, C. W. (2007). Person-organization fit and work related attitudes and decisions: Examining interactive effects with job fit and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Psychology 92 (5)*: 1446-1455.

Saks, A. M. & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information sources, applicant perceptions of fit, and work outcomes. *Personnel Psychology 50*: 395-426.

EFFECT OF FEEDBACK ON FEELING-OF-KNOWING

METEHAN IRAK AND CANSIN ÖZGÖR

The Relationship between metamemory accuracy and feedback has been investigated in previous studies with varying results. In general, the relationship between feedback (giving information about participants' memory performance, e.g. correct or incorrect) and metamemory accuracy seems to depend upon variables such as; type of feedback (verification vs elaboration), response dependent feedback (correct responses vs incorrect responses) and task dependent feedback (episodic vs semantic memory) (Nelson & Narens, 1990). The results of previous studies show that improvement in metamemory accuracy is affected by self-generated feedback (Lovelace & Stock, 1984) and item-by-item feedback (Stock et al., 1992). These results suggest that feedback might have a significant effect on metamemory performance, either because subjects learn from their mistakes between recall accuracy and confidence judgments, or because they learn to adjust either their low confidence levels on easy items or overconfidence on difficult items. Schwartz and Metcalfe (1994) suggested that feedback might increase metacognitive accuracy when it helps people learn task structure. On the other hand, Mason and Thompson (1987, in Thompson, 1998), and Nelson and Narens (1990) did not find any relationship between feedback and general metamemory and feeling-of-knowing (FOK) accuracy. FOK judgments are believed to rely on partial access to the semantic, perceptual, or affective attributes of a target (Koriat, 1993), familiarity of the cue (Metcalfe, Schwartz & Joaquim, 1993), or a combination of the two processes (Koriat & Levy-Sadot, 2001). According to Koriat's (1993) accessibility model of FOK, FOK judgments are based on feedback resulting from one's attempt to retrieve a target from memory. Confidence in performance is related to preconceived beliefs and competence. Thus, metacognitive feelings are sometimes related to feedback from self-initiated object-level processes. It is known that FOK judgment is an evaluation comprised of people's predictions about remembering currently unrecallable information in a future task

(Hart, 1965). In a classic FOK task, people make predictions about their future task performance regarding unrecallable items. Following this idea, if metacognitive judgments are related to preconceived beliefs and competence, "contradictory information,' such as incorrect feedback regarding one's recall performance (even though the answer was correct) should not influence metacognitive judgments. However, individual differences, such as having high or low levels of confidence (LC) about recall performance and task type might be related to feedback effects The main aim of the present study is to investigate how incorrect feedback about recall performance influences FOK judgment. More specifically, we hypothesized that people having high LC are not affected by incorrect feedback, thus their FOK judgments will not change.

Experiment 1

Method

Participants: Fifty-four university students (41 female, 13 male) voluntarily participated in the study. Age range of the subjects was 18 to 24 years (M=20.57, SD=1.13). All participants reported they are free of any neurological or psychiatric problems.

Materials: Two word-pair lists were used in the study. One hundred and seventy-six words were selected from a word-frequency database in Turkish (Göz, 2003). All words were high frequency nouns, five or six letters long. Eighty-eight word-pairs were designed by randomly matching the words. Next, these word-pairs were randomly assigned to one of the two word-pair lists (referred to as List A and List B). List A was used in the first phase, and List B was used in the second phase of the experiment. Each list consisted of 44 word-pairs, but eight word-pairs (two at the beginning and two at the end of each list) were not included in the statistical analyses in order to minimize primacy and recency effect.

Design and Procedure: The design was a 2 x 2 between subjects factorial design, where participants' former level of confidence (LC: high vs low), and feedback type (incorrect vs correct) were the between-subjects variables. The FOK experiments consisted of two phases. The aim of the first phase was to determine the subjects' LC. In the first (learning) phase, each word-pair (List A) was initially presented, and there was no time limit in the learning phase. At the end of the learning phase, participants were informed about the upcoming cued-recall test and the FOK judgments. Then the first word of each word-pair was presented, and the participants were asked to remember the word that was paired with that

word. At the same time, participants indicated their LC for each answer. Participants were asked to use a 6-point Likert-type rating scale for their LC (1: definitely not sure, 6: definitely sure). Then, for the words they failed to remember, they were asked to give a FOK judgment. They were given explanations about what FOK judgments referred to, and were asked to make their FOK judgment on the basis of the following question: "Even though I don't remember the answer now, do I know the answer to the extent that I could pick the correct answer from among several choices?" Participants were asked to use a 6-point Likert-type rating scale for their FOK judgment (1: definitely will not be able to find the correct answer, 6: definitely will be able find the correct answer). After completion of the cued-recall, LC, and FOK judgments, participants were given a recognition test, in which each cue word was presented along with five alternatives. Then the FOK accuracy value of each participant was calculated by using the Goodman–Kruskal's Gamma correlation. FOK accuracy refers to how well people are able to predict their future memory performance and the best measure of FOK accuracy is Goodman–Kruskal's Gamma correlation (Nelson, 1984). In the second phase, participants were divided into two groups, high (n=25) and low (n=29), according to their mean LC (2.61) in the first phase. Then each of these groups was randomly divided into two groups. Therefore, there were four experimental conditions in the second phase: high LC and correct feedback (n=15), high LC and incorrect feedback (n=10), low LC and correct feedback (n=13), and low LC and incorrect feedback (n=16). Application of the procedure was the same as for the first phase, except for the incorrect feedback condition. In the incorrect feedback condition, participants were asked to give a FOK judgment for all the words they failed to remember, as well as 50% of the words they did remember correctly. For instance, if the participant recalled 20 words out of 40, during the FOK judgments s/he was presented 30 words in the recognition phase (20 words that s/he actually failed to remember, and 50% of the 20 previously remembered words). The 50% of the words which participants correctly remembered were randomly selected from the list by using a computer program. So, the gamma correlations were calculated accordingly for these 30 words. All testing occurred across two days for each participant in a specific testing room, and application procedures were identical for all participants. The experiment was programmed using Visual Studio 2010 Ultimateher. The program was run on a Windows XP computer with a 21-inch monitor. Each word-pair was typed in black Arial 24-point uppercase letters on a white background.

Results

A 2 x 2 MANOVA was carried out. In the analysis, group status (LC group: high and low) and type of feedback (incorrect and correct) were independent variables, as recall, recognition, FOK judgment and FOK accuracy (Gamma r) for the second phase were dependent variables. Results indicated that type of feedback main effect was significant on recognition F (1.51)=29.67, $p< .01$, η^2=.49 and FOK judgment, F (1.51)=7.13, $p< .05$, η^2=.19. Participants who were in the correct feedback condition had higher recognition (M=25.54, SD=4.94) and FOK judgment scores (M=4.98, SD=.87) compared to the participants in incorrect feedback condition (M=22.0, SD=6.03 and M=3.05, SD=1.01, respectively). In addition, a MANCOVA was carried out to control possible effects of actual memory performance (recall performance). In the analysis: group status (LC group: high and low), and type of feedback (incorrect and correct) were independent variables; recognition, FOK judgment, and FOK accuracy (Gamma r) were dependent variables; and recall performance for the second phase was a covariate variable. Results indicated that covariance effect was not significant.

Experiment 2

According to the results of Experiment 1, feedback type had a significant effect on FOK judgment. This effect might vary according to the type of material used to measure performance. To address this possibility, we replicated Experiment 1 using general information questions instead of word-pairs.

Method

Participants: Forty-four university students (32 female and 12 male) participated in the second experiment, none of whom had participated in the first experiment. The mean age was 21.3 (SD=1.25). All participants reported that they are free of any neurological or psychiatric problems.

Materials: Eighty general information questions were selected from a general knowledge question database. The normative difficulty of the questions ranged between 0.10 and 0.92 (Tekcan, Topcuoglu & Kaya, 2007). The 80 questions were randomly divided into two lists (lists A and B) and each list consisted of 40 questions. List A was used in the first phase of the experiment and List B was used in the second phase. The same computer program and settings were used as in the first experiment.

Design and Procedure: The design was a 2 x 2 between subjects factorial design, where participants' LC (high vs low), and feedback type (incorrect vs correct) were the between-subjects variables. All applications and procedure was the same as in the first experiment. For the second phase of the experiment, participants were divided into two groups, high (n=19) and the low (n=25), according to their mean LC (3.03) in the first phase. Then, each group was randomly divided into two groups, and were named according to the LC in the first phase (high and low LC group), and type of feedback (correct and incorrect feedback) in the second phase. Therefore, there were four experimental conditions in the second phase: high LC and correct feedback (n=11); high LC and incorrect feedback (n=8); low LC and correct feedback (n=11); and low LC and incorrect feedback (n=14).

Results

A 2 x 2 MANOVA was carried out. In the analysis, group status (high and low LC) and type of feedback (incorrect and correct) were independent variables, as recall, recognition, FOK judgment and FOK accuracy in the second phase were dependent variables. Results indicated that group status was significant on recall performance only, F (1.44)=7.87, $p< .01$, η^2=.16. High LC group's recall performance (M=11.89, SD=2.64) was significantly higher than low LC group's recall performance (M=9.68, SD=2.69). On the other hand, further main and interaction effects were not significant.

General Discussion

The present study showed that when word-pairs were used, incorrect feedback had a significant effect on FOK judgment, but only for participants with low LC. The results indicate that given an episodic memory task, FOK judgments of participants with low LCs were influenced by incorrect feedback. These participants decreased their FOK judgments, even though they had previously remembered these items. On the other hand, FOK judgments of participants with high LC were not affected by incorrect feedback. Despite that, given a semantic memory task, incorrect feedback did not have a significant effect on FOK judgments. There are consistencies within people's metamemory across different judgment domains (Nelson & Narens, 1990). Also, according to previous results (Hosch, 1994; Payne, Bettman & Johnson, 1988) even though situational factors play an important role in people's general

cognitive functions, confidence in memory and accuracy of memory is stable in individual cognitive styles. These two points can help explain why FOK judgments were influenced by incorrect feedback only among subjects with low LC under an episodic memory task in our study. On the other hand, our study did not support previous research discussed above (Nelson & Narens, 1990) which indicated no relationship between feedback and general metamemory accuracy. Another explanation for the effects of one's subjective belief on FOK performance may be the relationship between confidence and accuracy. According to Bandura (1977), one of the major determinants of people's metacognitive judgments is their perceived self-efficacy. In fact, Koriat (2007) argued that people's preconceived notions regarding their skills in specific fields predicted their evaluation of how well they did on an individual task. In addition, Perfect (2002) suggested that even though people's confidence in their responses is usually predictive of the accuracy of these responses with respect to general-knowledge questions, this is not applicable in the case of eyewitness memory. According to Perfect (2004), this is because people's confidence is based in part on their preconceptions regarding their capabilities. This idea parallels our results showing people's confidence in their memory performance varied according to the type of stimuli. In fact, in the second experiment, incorrect feedback had no significant effect on FOK judgment measured using a semantic memory task. Dunning et al. (2003) suggest that people's perception of performance is one of the basic elements of their preconceived notions about their skills. They state there is no correlation between these notions and objective performance, yet they can lead people to make decisions concerning performance that have little to do with actual accomplishment. In addition, Koriat (2007: 302) argued, "people's confidence in their performance seems to be based in part on their preconceived beliefs about their own competence in the domain of knowledge tested." Consequently, these explanations and our results imply that FOK judgments of people having high preconceptions (or preconceived beliefs) about their own competence (or perceived self-efficacy) are not affected by incorrect feedback. However, this effect is also influenced by memory task. Thus when an episodic memory task was used, FOK judgments of people with low preconceptions about their competence were affected by incorrect feedback. As a speculation, incorrect feedback has less impact on memory confidence or beliefs related to semantic information and knowledge than memory confidence and beliefs related to new (or episodic) learning. It should be mentioned that individual differences (having high or low LC) and type of memory task are important variables to explain the effects of

feedback on FOK judgment. We do not know which other psychological characteristics, such as personality types or metacognitive beliefs, might be linked to this pattern, or whether they correlate with FOK judgments. On the other hand, recent studies (Irak, 2012; Magnussen et al., 2006) showed that beliefs about memory and metacognitive performance significantly correlated with cognitive confidence and levels of self-esteem. It would also be interesting to investigate relationships between feedback, actual memory performance, FOK judgments, other metacognitive and personality characteristics in future studies.

References

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review 84*: 191-215.

Dunning, D., Johnson, K., Ehrlinger, J. & Kruger, J. (2003). Why people fail to recognize their own incompetence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science 12*: 83-87.

Göz, İ. (2003). *Yazılı Türkçe'nin kelime sıklığı sözlüğü* [Word frequency dictionary of written Turkish]. Ankara: Türk Dil K urumu.

Hart, J. T. (1965). Memory and the feeling-of-knowing experience. *Journal of Educational Psychology 56*: 208-216.

Hosch, H. (1994). Individual differences in personality and eyewitness identification. In D. Ross, D. Read, & M. Toglia (Eds.), *Adult eyewitness testimony*. Cambridge: CUP. 329-346.

Irak, M. (2012). Effect of metacognition and self-Esteem on beliefs about memory. *Turkish Journal of Psychology 27 (69)*: 35-46.

Koriat, A. (1993). How do we know that we know? The accessibility model of the feeling of knowing. *Psychological Review 100*: 609-639.

Koriat, A. (2007). Metacognition and consciousness. In P. D. Zelazo, M. Moscovitch & E. Thompson (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Consciousness*. Cambridge: CUP. 289-325.

Koriat, A. & Levy-Sadot, R. (2001). The combined contributions of the cue-familiarity and accessibility heuristics to feelings of knowing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition 27*: 34-53.

Lovelace, E. A. & Stock, W. A. (1984). Metamemory: Monitoring future recallability during study. *Journal of Experimental psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition 10*: 756-766.

Magnussen, S., Andersson, J., Cornoldi, C., De Beni, R., Endestad, T., Goodman, G. S., Helstrup, T., Koriat, A., Larsson, M., Melinder, A.,

Nilsson, L. G., Rönnberg, J. & Zimmer, H. (2006). What people believe about memory. *Memory 14*: 595-613.

Metcalfe, J., Schwartz, B. L. & Joaquim, S. G. (1993). The cue-familiarity heuristic in metacognition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition 19*: 851-861.

Nelson, T. O. (1984). A comparison of current measures of the accuracy of feeling-of-knowing predictions. *Psychological Bulletin 95*: 109-133.

Nelson, T. O. & Narens, L. (1990). Metamemory: A theoretical framework and new findings. In G. H. Bower (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation*. New York, NY: Academic Press. 125-173.

Payne, J. W., Bettman, J. R. & Johnson, E. J. (1988). Adaptive strategy selection in decision making. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition 14*: 534-552.

Perfect, T. J. (2002). When does eyewitness confidence predict performance? In T. J. Perfect & B. L. Schwartz (Eds.), *Applied metacognition*. Cambridge: CUP. 95-120.

—. (2004). The role of self-rated ability in the accuracy of confidence judgments in eyewitness memory and general knowledge. *Applied Cognitive Psychology 18*: 157-168.

Schwartz, B. L. & Metcalfe, J. (1994). Methodological problems and pitfalls in the study of human metacognition. In J. Metcalfe & A. P. Shimamura (Eds.), *Metacognition: Knowing about knowing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 93-114.

Stock, W. A., Kulhavy, R. W., Pridemore, D. R. & Krug, D. (1992). Responding to feedback after multiple-choice answers: The influence of response confidence. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology A: Human Experimental Psychology 45*: 649-667.

Tekcan, A. İ., Topcuoglu, V. & Kaya, B. (2007). Memory and metamemory for semantic information in obsessive–compulsive disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy 45*: 2164-2172.

Thompson, B. W. (1998). Metamemory accuracy: Effects of feedback and the stability of individual differences. *American Journal of Psychology 111*: 33-42.

A Critical Approach to Privatization Policies in the Global Economy and the Role of Cooperatives in the Privatization Process

Abdullah Ökcesiz

Introduction

In this essay, our purpose is to discuss how globalization has impoverished people and harmed world peace while gaining speed within the privatization process as well as proposing ideas about how cooperatives can contribute to the solution process by acting in financial communion. In this context, we also aim to make an animadversion and give information about privatization and globalization, and to indicate the importance and necessity of cooperatives.

Privatized State Economic Enterprises (SEEs) had been administratively ignored and thus their profitability and efficiency had decreased, and they had lost money (Gül, 2004). This situation was regarded as an opportunity or an excuse for their privatization, and SEE fields have become commercial fields for global capitalists. Today, not only SEEs but also underground and overland spaces have been left to native and later foreign entrepreneurial fields of interest. In fact, these SEEs were supposed to be pioneering organizations in entrepreneurship, focusing on the good of the public interest when they were first established. Having become a state within a state, and by using the parliamentary system, the private sector and foreign capital have come into possession of everything without regard for public interest. These establishments, founded by the state in the name of the public, are now being sold unfairly and unscrupulously (Idem).

Supposedly, public borrowing would decrease, the public sector deficit would be eliminated, the state's interference with the economy would be minimized and, with market transition, the public sector's burden would have been lightened and social and economic welfare would be established

qualitative and quantitative methods for marketing research (including advertising), tourism, hotel management, brand management, consumer behaviour, econometrics and statistics. She has authored *Comportamentul consumatorului—studii de caz, aplicaţii, cercetări* (Consumer Behaviour: Case Studies, Applications, Researches) (2011) and *Prospectarea pieţei prin metoda statistică* (Market Prospecting by Statistical Method) (2013), and co-authored *Metode statistice şi econometrice aplicate în economie. Culegere de probleme* (Statistical and Econometric Methods Applied in Economy: Exercises) (2011).

Ufuk GENCEL is currently an Assistant Professor at the Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey. He holds a BA, an MA and a PhD in Public Finance from "Dokuz Eylul" University, Izmir, Turkey. His main research interests are legislation on tax, Turkish tax system and public finance. He has authored *Türkiye'de Yatırım Kararları Üzerinde Kurumlar Vergisinin Etkisi: Bir Alan Araştırması* (Impact of Corporate Tax on Investment Decisions: A Field Research) (2007).

Gaye GÖKALP-YILMAZ is currently a Research Assistant at the Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla, Turkey. She holds a BA in Political Science and Public Administration from the Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey and an MA in Sociology from the Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla. She is a PhD candidate in Sociology at the same University. Her main research interests are everyday life sociology, german turks, migration, and political sociology.

Turgut GÜMÜŞOĞLU is currently an Associate Professor at the University of Istanbul, Turkey. He holds a BA in Sociology from the same University, and a BA in Sociology, an MA in Cultural Sociology and a PhD in Applied Linguistics from the University of Vienna, Austria. His main research interests are sociolinguistics, translations studies, sociology. He has authored *Turkish Migrant in Austria: A social survey of Turkish migrant between structure and integration* (Peter Lang, 2009) and *Language Contact and Turkish-German Code-Switching* (Peter Lang, 2010).

Kübra HIDIROĞLU is currently a Research Assistant at the University of Kirklareli, Turkey. She holds a BA in Sociology and an MA in Sociology from the Uludag University, Bursa, Turkey, and a PhD in Sociology from the University of Istanbul, Turkey. Her main research interests are diaspora, identity and culture.

Metehan IRAK is currently an Associate Professor at the Bahçeşehir University, Istanbul, Turkey. He holds a BA in Psychology from the University of Ankara, Turkey, and an MSc and a PhD in Experimental Psychology from the Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey. His main research interests are metacognition, memory, and executive functions. He has co-authored *Multidisipliner Yaklaşımla Beyin ve Biliş* (Brain and Cognition: Multidisciplinary Approach) (2000) and *Beyin ve Nöropsikoloji: Temel ve Klinik bilimler* (Brain and Neuropsychology: Basic and Clinical Sciences) (2003), and edited *Psikopatolojilerde Bilgi İşleme Süreçleri: Kuramdan Uygulamaya* (Information Processing in Psychopathologies: From Theory to Practice) (2009).

Ljubica KORDIĆ is currently an Assistant Professor at the "J. J. Strossmayer" University, Osijek, Croatia. She holds a BA in English and German from the same University, and an MA in the Methodology of Foreign Language Teaching and a PhD in Linguistics from the University of Zagreb, Croatia. Her main research interests are foreign language teaching (English and German), legal linguistics and sociolinguistics, and multilingualism and minority languages. She has published extensively in the field of linguistics.

Vefa KURBAN is currently an Associate Professor at the "Dokuz Eylul" University, Izmir, Turkey. She holds a BA in History, and an MA and a PhD in the History of Turkish Republic from the Ege University, Izmir, Turkey. Her main research interests are general Turkish history and Turkish world history. She authored *Neriman Nerimanov ve Türkiye Politikası* (Neriman Nerimanov and Turkish Policy) (2012) and *Nobeller, Nobel Ödülü ve Bakü Petrolleri* (The Nobel Family, Nobel Prizes and Baku Petroleum) (2013).

Usama NASSAR is currently an Assistant Professor at Suez Canal University, Ismailia, Egypt. He holds a BA in Architecture Engineering and an MA in Urban Design from the University of Cairo, Egypt, and a PhD in Urban Design from the Suez Canal University, Ismailia. His main research interests are urban design, landscape architecture and green urbanism. He has authored *Landscape as a Tool to Enhance Behavioural Response and Activities* (2013).

Abdullah ÖKCESİZ is currently an Assistant Professor at Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Turkey. He holds a BA in Business Administration from the Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey, an MA in