University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange

Doctoral Dissertations

Graduate School

8-2010

An Investigation of Big Five and Narrow Personality Traits In Relation to Career Satisfaction of Managers

Wei Xiong
wxiong1@utk.edu

Recommended Citation

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Wei Xiong entitled "An Investigation of Big Five and Narrow Personality Traits In Relation to Career Satisfaction of Managers." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

John W. Lounsbury, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Richard Saudargas, Jacob Levy, John Peters

Accepted for the Council:
<u>Dixie L. Thompson</u>

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting here with a dissertation written by Wei Xiong entitled "An Investigation of Big Five and Narrow Personality Traits In Relation to Career Satisfaction of Managers." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

<div style="text-align: right;">

_____John W. Lounsbury_____
Major Professor

</div>

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

_____Richard Saudargas_____

_____Jacob Levy_____

_____John Peters_____

<div style="text-align: center;">

Accepted for the Council:

</div>

Carolyn R. Hodges_____
Vice Provost and
Dean of the Graduate School

<div style="text-align: center;">

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

</div>

An Investigation of Big Five and Narrow Personality Traits

In Relation to Career Satisfaction of Managers

A Dissertation

Presented for

Doctor of Philosophy Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Wei Xiong

August 2010

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my father,

Yunxuan Xiong, Mother, Ju Zhang;

And my loving fiancée, Hsin-neng Wang.

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

Abstract

Career satisfaction has become an important research topic in both psychological and business research. The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationships between general managers' career satisfaction, the Big Five personality traits (agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, extraversion, and openness), as well as narrow personality traits. An archival data source was used consisting of a sample of 6,042 general managers and 48,726 non-managers from various industries. I investigated the relationship between personality variables and general manager's career satisfaction. Results indicated that several personality traits were significantly related to managers' career satisfaction. For example, emotional resilience, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, optimism, and work drive were significantly related to general managers' career satisfaction. Among all the personality traits, emotional resilience and optimism had the highest correlations with general manager's career satisfaction. The difference between managers and non-managers were compared. Implications for future research and practice were discussed.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter I

Introduction

One of the most important research goals in the field of psychology is to explain behavior. Explanations about behavior have generally been defined in terms of two ideas. The first idea is that environmental or situational factors have significant effects on behavior; the second is that personality traits influence behavior. These two approaches have been identified as the nurture and the nature argument. In addition, environments and personality have been viewed as the outer and inner influences to behavior. Environmental explanations fail to address the consistency of behavior across different situations.

Since the early 1900's, the individual's personality has garnered attention from psychologists, and it has been an important topic in the field of psychology. The definition of personality varies from author to author.   In 1932, in his book, "The Development of Personality", Carl Gustav Jung concluded:

"Personality is the supreme realization of the innate idiosyncrasy of a living being. It is an act of high courage flung in the face of life, the absolute affirmation of all that constitutes the individual, the most successful adaptation to the universal condition of existence coupled with the greatest possible freedom for self-determination." (p.99)

Jung's definition involved both the consciousness and the unconscious. He contended that "the achievement of personality means nothing less than the optimum development of the whole individual human being….A whole lifetime, in all its biological, social, and spiritual aspects, is needed" (Jung, 1932, p. 161). In other words, personality is about the individual's life, both subjective and objective.

Floyd and Gordon suggested that personality was a "coherent datum of perception: an objective, devaluated essence" (Allport, 1930, p. 127). In addition, personality was remarkably informed by the social value of the period (Allport, 1930).

In recent years, Carver and Scheier (2000) developed a contemporary definition of personality. They argued "personality is a dynamic organization, inside the person, of psychophysical systems that create a person's characteristic patterns of behavior, thoughts, and feelings." (Carver & Scheier 2000, p.5). Zimbardo and Gerrig (1996) identified personality as a complex set of traits that affect individual's behavior across time and situations.

Research on personality first started in the early 1900's with personality models proposed by Freud, Jung, Adler, and Horney. Freud contributed a great deal to both behavioral psychology and early personality research. He emphasized that the inner psychic forces were unique and significant to an individual's behavior. Following Freud, Alfred Adler, Karen Horney's research, Carl Jung further addressed individual differences represented personality traits. The early

researchers' ideas were described by Hogan and Roberts (2001) as an approach to identify each individual's neurotic tendencies and their struggle to overcome these neuroses. Their approaches contributed to abnormal functioning, but one shortcoming was that these approaches applied exclusively to abnormal functioning.

In the 1930's, personality studies began to emphasize abnormal behavior. Gordon Allport (1937) and Stagner (1937) suggested that personality is not limited to psychopathology; an individual's behavior is also the result of individual difference variables. Although their ideas were not accepted during that time, these were important steps to describe the effect of individual difference variables on behaviors.

In the mid 1900's, Watson first espoused a behavioral view, as outlined by Schultz and Schultz (1994). Rather than investigating subjective internal and unobservable mental events, Watson focused on observable behavior. In 1913, Watson identified his vision of Psychology:

"Psychology as the behaviorist views it is a purely objective experimental branch of natural science. Its theoretical goal is the prediction and control of behavior. Introspection forms no essential part of its methods, nor is the scientific value of its data dependent upon the readiness with which they lend themselves to interpretation in terms of consciousness. The behaviorist, in his efforts to get a unitary scheme of animal response, recognizes no dividing line between man and brute. The behavior

of man, with all of its refinement and complexity, forms only a part of the behaviorist's total scheme of investigation." (p. 159)

Consequently, investigations about normal personality by empirical methods started to become popular in psychology. In the late 1960's, a main interest in psychology was to identify individual difference variables. Raymond Cattell is one of the pioneers in this area. He viewed common traits as important determinants of individual behavior and observed that; common traits vary in different degrees for each individual person (Cattell, 1966). Cattell suggested that unique traits also contribute to behavioral variability. In 1970, Cattell and his colleagues constructed an important measure of personality in terms of 16 traits called the 16 PF (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970). The 16 PF is a measure of personality depicted as 15 traits and one reasoning scale.

The next landmark in personality research was established by Hans Eysenck who thought that the best way to describe personality is in terms of a small number of traits. Traits were constructs representing inter-relations among different behaviors (Eysenck, 1970). Eysenck (1981) developed three bipolar dichotomy dimensions that include these three factors repeated across different studies. The three dimensions are extraversion-introversion, neuroticism-stability, and psychoticism-superego.

Although there were many different studies on the topic of personality, Hogan and Roberts (2001) concluded that there were three powerful forces

hampering personality progress during 1960's and 1970's. First, there was a lack of consensus about conceptual underpinnings. Second, there was disagreement on the purpose of personality assessment. Third, there was disagreement about what assessments should measure. These fundamental differences led to a decline in the growth of personality research. However, another debate arose that affected a large body of personality research: the situation versus personal debate. This debate centers on the nature-nurture dichotomy. The controversy here was about whether personal traits or the environmental situation exerted more influence on behavior.

During the 1960's, the environmental contributions to behavior were emphasized, especially in social psychology. The emphasis of environment became an increasing impediment to personality study (Rotter, 1966). Rotter (1966) was one of the first to disagree with the proposition that traits are the main determinants of behavior. He believed that the individual differences were the result of the environment rather than personality traits. Rotter suggested that, the situation is the most powerful determinant of behavior, though the influence of environmental situation in behaviors is not always typical, Walter Mischel, who was one of Rotter's students, expanded Rotter's ideas, and went further to challenge the traditional notion of personality traits (Mischel & Shoda, 1998). Mischel contended that cognitive and affective factors were important influences on behavior (Mischel & Shoda, 1998). Mischel observed that cognitive and affective states accounted for more variance in behavior than personality traits. Instead of the idea that traits and situation affected behavior independently, Mischel suggested that behavior is the

result of an interaction between personal factors and social situations (Mischel & Shoda, 1998; Mischel & Shoda, 1995; Shoda & Mischel, 1993). In addition, based on an individual's past history, Mischel viewed personal factors as representing memories of previous experiences.

Nevertheless, Hogan and Roberts (2001) concluded that the field of industrial/organizational psychology rediscovered the importance of personality to real world settings. From hiring to promotions, personality has been found to significantly relate to selection issues. It has been suggested that trait measures have less bias than traditional measures of intellectual functioning. The rise in personality research has been supported by an apparent resolution of the person vs. situation debate. Carson (1989) concluded that the debate may be over and the situation was not the determinant of behavior. He believed that the nature side is becoming more accepted than the nurture side, which is a resolution to the nature/nurture debate.

Several important personality models have been developed which have enabled the renewal of personality research. First, Holland (1985) designed vocational theory, identified as the RIASEC model, which includes six basic dimensions of vocational interests: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional. These dimensions were represented on the points of a hexagon. Holland also applied these six vocational interests to a theory of careers. Based on congruence, differentiation, and consistency, Holland believed that personality and environment fit is important for career choices. Congruence refers to the match between interest and work environment; Holland (1985) argued,

"Vocational satisfaction, stability, and achievement depend on the congruence between one's personality and the environment in which one works" (pp. 10-11). Differentiation refers to the difference between the highest and lowest interest; and consistency means the similarity between interests and the work environment. Holland (1985) theorized that a good fit between vocational interests and the work environment leads to job and career satisfaction, while a lack of fit between interests and environment could lead to dissatisfaction in jobs and careers. As Holland (1996) concluded "…Congruence of person and job environment leads to job satisfaction, stability of career path, and achievement." (p.11)

Another key development was the emergence and validation of the five factor model or Big Five model. The utility of the five factor model has been recognized as a revolution in personality research (McRae & Costa, 1987; Costa & McRae, 1988; McRae, 1989; Digman, 1985; Brand & Egan, 1989; John, 1990; Borkenau & Ostendorf, 1990). In the late 1980's, there was an expansion of research on the Big Five (e.g., McCrae & Costa, 1987; Borkenau & Ostendorf, 1990; Brand & Egan, 1989; Costa & McCrae, 1988; Digman, 1985; McCrae, 1989; John, 1989). In fact, the Big Five became as a unifying model of normal personality (McRae & Costa, 1987; Costa & McRae, 1988; McRae, 1989; Digman, 1985; Brand & Egan, 1989; John, 1990; Borkenau & Ostendorf, 1990). Barrick and Mount's (1991) meta-analytical analyses of the Big Five affirmed the utility of the Big Five as it relates to employee selections in various contexts. The following discussion describes the research on the five factor model.

The Big Five

Personality has long been an important topic in the field of psychology. In the late 1960's, investigations about individual difference variables gained a lot of popularity in psychology. The five major dimensions of personality, known the five factor model, have been recognized as one of most important developments in personality research (Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). The five factor model is a widely accepted personality model comprised of five important personality traits, including extraversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and open to experience. The five traits can be used to describe the most salient aspects of personality (Goldberg, 1990).

Since 1980's, publications on the Big Five have been voluminous. The five factor model (Big Five) has been used in numerous empirical studies and has made unique contributions to studies of career success, job performance, vocational behavior research, career progression, job satisfaction, career satisfaction, life satisfaction, and other various dimensions (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998; Seibert & Kraimer, 2001; Tokar, et al. 1998; Lounsbury, Sunstrom, Loveland & Gibson, 2003b). The Big Five has also been used to investigate the validity of personality measures for personnel selection (Barrick & Mount, 1991). For example, Barrick and Mount (1991) conducted meta- analyses of the relationship between the Big Five and performance criteria. They concluded that conscientiousness has a significant positive relationship with job performance across all job types (r=.20 to r =.23). Barrick and Mount (1991) also demonstrated that

conscientiousness is unique among personality traits, including the Big Five, in being a valid predictor of performance across all occupations and job related criteria.

Mount, Barrick and Stewart (1998) found a significant relationship among selected factors of the Big Five and job performance: conscientiousness (r = .26), emotional stability (r =. 18), and agreeableness (r = .14). Among supervisory ratings, personnel data, and training ratings, Salgado's (1997) meta-analytic study revealed that emotional stability was a valid predictor for job performance. Evidently, the Big Five has been utilized in different areas, such as industrial/organizational settings, clinical and developmental psychology (Paunonen & Jackson, 2000). Each of the Big Five personality constructs are described below.

Extraversion represents the tendency to be outgoing, assertive, active, and excitement seeking. Individuals who score high on extraversion are predisposed to the positive emotions, and can be talkative, active, warm, social, energetic and optimistic (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Watson & Clark, 1997). In contrast, individuals who score low on extraversion are characterized as reserved, introverted, and sober. Since extraverts are tending to be positive and active to events, they are likely to handle unsatisfactory situations. Extraversion has also been found positively related to extrinsic career success, job performance, job, career, and life satisfaction (Furnam & Zacherl, 1986; Salgado, 1997; Seibert & Kraimer, 2001; Williamson, Pemberton & Lounsbury, 2005).

Neuroticism represents the tendency to experience negative affect, including anxiousness, moodiness, irritability and anger (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The opposite of neuroticism has been identified as emotional stability, or emotional resilience that has also been used in many studies. Individuals who have a higher score in neuroticism tend to have more emotional distress; on the other hand, lower score describe individuals who are more calm, composed, relaxed and even-tempered (Judge & Bono, 2000). Neuroticism has been found to be related to low self-esteem, low self-confidence and low self-efficacy (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002). For example, Lounsbury et al. (2007) found that neuroticism was negatively related to job satisfaction and career satisfaction for information technology (IT) professionals. In addition, emotional resilience was found most highly correlated with IT satisfaction (Lounsbury et al., 2007).

Conscientiousness represents the tendency to be cautious, deliberate, self-disciplined, neat, orderly, rule following, structured and organized (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Conscientious individuals tend to work hard to achieve goals (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Among the Big Five traits, conscientiousness has found most positive relationship with academic performance (Goff & Ackerman, 1992) and job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997). Recent research has also found that conscientiousness is significantly related to career satisfaction. Logue, Lounsbury, and Leong (2007) found that conscientiousness was positively related to major satisfaction based on a sample of undergraduate students. Similarly, McIIroy

and Bunting (2002) found that conscientiousness was significantly and positively in relation to academic performance.

Agreeableness represents the tendency to be cooperative, trusting, gentle, and kind (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997). Agreeableness involves teamwork, and interaction with others. Individuals who have higher scores on agreeableness are tending to be more modest, altruistic, kind, pleasant, and generous (Costa & McCrae, 1992) and they try to avoid conflict (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997). Also, agreeable people are concerned with others' interests. On the other hand, individuals who have lower scores on agreeableness tend to be cynical, manipulative, skeptical, critical-minded, and tough-minded which can be good for certain jobs such as science, quality control security work, etc. (Seibert & Kraimer, 2001). Some researchers believed that agreeableness is related to transformational leadership (e.g. De Hoogh, et al. 2005; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002). Research results on Agreeableness are complex. Seibert and Kraimer (2001) believed that individuals who have higher of agreeableness were softhearted, and not competitive, and might have lower levels of job performance and career satisfaction. Based on a sample of 496 employees, their results indicated that agreeableness was negatively related to career satisfaction, but not with job performance. Similarly, Boudreau, Boswell, and Judge (2001) found that agreeableness was significantly and negatively related to career satisfaction. In contrast, Williamson, Pemberton and Lounsbury (2005) found that agreeableness (teamwork) was significantly and positively related to career satisfaction.

Openness to experience represents individuals' tendencies to be creative, curious, imaginative, inquisitive, resourceful and inquiring (John & Srivistava, 1999). Individuals who have higher scores in openness tend to intellectually curious, appreciative of art and sensitive to beauty. (McCrae & Costa, 1997); whereas individuals lower on openness tend to be more conventional, traditional, conservative, and to have narrower interests. Open people may be more creative and divergent thinkers who flexible to change and new experiences (McCrae & Costa, 1997). Although not much empirical evidence to support linking between openness with extrinsic career success, or career satisfaction (Seibert & Kraimer, 2001), some studies revealed that openness was related to salary (Seibert & Kraimer, 2001), academic performance (Paunonen & Ashton, 2001b), and career satisfaction (Lounsbury, et al., 2005). For example, by surveying a sample of 498 employees in diverse occupations and organizations, Seibert and Kraimer (2001) suggested that individuals who were more open received lower salaries. Now the discussion shall be moved to the development of the five factor model.

McDougall (1932) first posited five general factors, as the five factor model. Then in the 1960's, there were two studies further developed the Big Five. The first one was the review about American Air Force applied research finished by Tupes and Cistal (1961). U.S. Air Force studies were long-term investigations of the utility of personality measures for employee selection research. Tupes and Cistal (1961) analyzed the findings from a number of studies and found the five replicable factors. Also, Norman (1963)'s further research about Cattell's natural traits reductions.

McCrae and Costa (1997) similarly rearranged Norman's (1963) personality factors (I to V). Factor I represents extraversion; II represents agreeableness; III represents conscientiousness; IV represents emotional stability; and V represented culture. Norman (1963) suggested that culture related to openness.

Digman (1990) also listed each factor of the Big Five. This list includes specific reference to support each factor. For example, Eysenck (1970) first suggested that extraversion was similarly with other researcher's factors, such as Guilford's Social Activity (1975); Peabody and Goldberg's Power (1989); Tellegen's Positive Emotionality (1985); and Norman's Surgency (1963). Similarly, Tupes and Cistal first suggested that agreeableness was related to conformity (Fiske, 1949); likeability (Hogan, 1986); love (Peabody & Goldberg, 1989); and friendly compliance (Digman, 1990). Considering the Big Five's comprehensive structure, Digman (1990) extend the work of Norman, and described the hierarchy representation of the Big Five as four levels. Level 1 includes responses; Level 2 includes habits, dispositions; Level 3 includes characteristics, scales and facets; these levels are sublevels of level 4. Level 4 traits are top level including extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience. Most personality aspects are believed can be subsumed within the Big Five (Goldberg, 1993; John, 1990; Wiggins & Trapnell, 1997). In addition, Saucier and Goldberg (1998) further supported the Big Five dimensions. They evaluated a number of person-descriptive clusters that were non-Big Five dimensions of

personality. Their results showed that the comprehensiveness of the Big Five which could subsume nearly all-traditional personality variables.

Overall, the Big Five successfully summarizes personality and validates it against real world outcomes. It is a robust and broad measure for basic personality traits. Costa and McCrae (1992) noted the key findings regarding the Big Five. First, it has shown consistency across different situations; in addition, the Big Five could hold up across different groups of people; last, but not least, there is genetic basis in the Big Five, and they are recovered in lexical studies.

However, other researchers think that the Big Five is not a comprehensive theory. By reanalyzing Saucier and Goldberg's data, Paunonen and Jackson (2000) found that there were important variances that cannot be accounted for within the Big Five. By reanalyzing same data with Saucier and Goldberg (1998), Pauonen and Jackson (2000) concluded that 20% variance resulted in nine traits that were beyond Big Five, including religiosity, honesty, deceptiveness, conservativeness, conceit, humorousness, sensuality, and masculinity-femininity. In addition, McAdams (1992) critiqued the Big Five as having two weaknesses. First, the Big Five didn't address the causes of personality. Second, it didn't account for situational effects of personality. Block (1995) and Loeving (1994) also suggested that the Big Five does not adequately address personality development. A number of researchers have debated whether broad personality predictors (e.g. the Big Five) display better predictive results for general criteria than specific traits (e.g. Schmidt & Kaplan, 1971; Osigweh, 1989; Costa & McCrae, 1992).

The Bandwidth-fidelity Dilemma

Although the Big Five has been identified as a robust personality

measurement, many human resources practitioners and researchers contend that

narrow measures of personality traits could be more useful in personnel selection

than broad measures (Paunonen, Rothstein & Jackson, 1999). For example, Moon,

Hollenbeck, Humpey, and Maue (2003) found that individually narrow traits have

predictive validity; whereas the predictive validity sank when these narrow traits

combined into a broad factor. Given the complexity of human behaviors, a major

criticism of the Big Five is that it has too much bandwidth (Briggs, 1989; Hogan,

1986; Paunonen, Rothstein, & Jackson, 1999). A number of researchers argued the

Big Five is too broad to carry useful information, and cannot adequately delineate

the cause of a behavior across a spectrum of behavior (e.g., McAdams, 1992;

Loevinger, 1994). For example, Loevinger (1994) demonstrated that the Big Five

was too simplistic to address personality development. Some researchers have

demonstrated that great attention should be focused on narrow personality traits in

organizational behaviors (e.g. Ackerman, 1990; Hough, 1992; Kanfer, Ackerman,

Murtha & Goff, 1996). The bandwidth-fidelity dilemma is one of the old personality

debates (Cronbach & Gleser, 1957). Ones and Viswesvaran (1996) has characterized

the debate as follows:

"In the personality domain, researchers and practitioners often claim to be

faced with the choice of careful measurement of single narrowly defined variable

and more cursory exploration of many separate variables. This has come to be referred to as the bandwidth-fidelity dilemma." (p. 610)

Ones and Viswesvaran (1996) described the bandwidth-fidelity dilemma in personality measurement for personnel selection. They suggested the two competing schools of thoughts about how the broader constructs were related to the narrower constructs. The first school of thought postulated that the causes of more narrow traits were broad traits. The second school of thought postulated that broader constructs represented combinations of narrow components. They also indicated that narrow traits only had higher predictive validity than broad personality traits when the variance to narrow traits was related to job performance.

In addition, Ones and Viswesvaran found that broader personality traits had higher predictive validity than narrower traits in personnel selection; and broader traits also had better explanatory power than narrower traits. Furthermore, Ones and Viswesvaran believed that the Big Five could also benefit organizational behavior theories and helped explain or predict organizational behavior constructs, and theories, such as job satisfaction, career satisfaction, motivation, and organizational commitment.

Paunonen, Rothstein and Jackson (1999) advocated the use of narrow trait measures. They found that narrow traits (PRF scales) were able to increment the criterion prediction of the broad traits (NEO-FFI scales) by 15.7 percent; whereas broad traits (NEO-FFI scales) only incremented the prediction by 4.2 percent. They

believed that using narrow traits would give better predictions for job performance than broad predictions. Broad traits aggregate facets that may have obscure different relationships to performance. They also recommended regressing performance on the narrow trait measures to maximize prediction. Stewart (1999) also suggested that narrow traits add incremental validity at different times in employment. He chose to study a broad personality measure: conscientiousness and 2 more narrow traits: order and achievement. He found that conscientiousness has consistent relationship with performance in both transition and maintenance stages (p=. 03); Order strongly correlated with performance in transition stage, (p=.03) whereas achievement strongly correlated with maintenance stage (p=.04). Order and achievement provided incremental validity beyond the broad measures.   In addition, Moon, Hollenbeck, Humpey and Maue (2003) found that narrow traits have better predictive validity than broad level traits. They demonstrated that the broad factor of Neuroticism didn't have relationship with level of commitment, whereas anxiety (r= .91) and depression (r=.86), the two narrow traits had significant relationship with level of commitment. They also concluded that the future research should address the measure of broad trait (e.g. neuroticism) more narrowly. Specifically, Vasilopoulos, Cucina, Goldberg and Usala (2002) indicated that narrow measures of conscientiousness and emotional stability were better predictor of training performance (p=.14, .09, .08, respectively for the law, operations and combined law/operations course grades) . The evidence about narrow traits added incremental validity to the Big Five indicates that narrow traits play an important role in the bandwidth fidelity dilemma.

Besides the Big Five, work ethic is another important broad personality trait, which may be a component of Conscientiousness. Work ethic has been defined as:

"a set of values based on the moral virtues of hard work and diligence. It is also a belief in moral benefit of work and its ability to enhance character. An example would be the Protestant work ethic or Chinese work ethic. A work ethic may include being reliable, having initiative or maintaining social skills."(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Work_ethic)

In addition, Niles (1999) described work ethic as strong desire to work hard, avoid leisure, and spend time in productive activities.

Work ethic has been found to be related to organizational commitment (Piankoff, 1999); career commitment (Goulet & Singh, 2002); and organizational citizenship (Ryan, 2002). Pogson, Cober, Doverspike and Rogers (2003) suggested that it is important to consider the multidimensional nature of Work ethic, for example, anti-leisure, and hard work. While anti-leisure was positively related to need for cognition, hard work was negatively related to need for cognition. Similarly, Miller, et al. (2002) categorized work ethic in terms of multiple dimensions and subscales.

On the other hand, among narrow traits, there is a particular narrow trait that has demonstrated unique validity relative to the Big Five and other narrow personality traits: the construct of work drive (Lounsbury & Gibson, 2002). Work drive has been defined as a disposition to work for long hours (including overtime)

and an irregular schedule; investing high levels of time and energy into job and career, and being motivated to extend oneself, if necessary, to finish projects, meet deadlines, be productive, and achieve job success (Lounsbury & Gibson, 2002). Work drive may be seen as a component of the broad trait of conscientiousness. Work drive and conscientiousness are viewed as important values to predict job performance and academic performance. (Miller, Woe, & Hudspeth, 2002).

Lounsbury, et al. (2003) found that work drive accounted for significant variance in college students' academic success. In their research, work drive, as a narrow construct, predicted better a larger percentage of variance in academic success than the Big Five traits. They framed their work drive in terms of an academic context. For example, three of their work drive items were: "I would keep going to school even if I didn't have to", "I always try to do more than I have to in my classes", and "I study more than most students I know".

Paunonen and Ashton (2001) also found that work drive was positively related to academic performance. Work drive has been found to be related not only to academic performance but also to important constructs in the work domain, including organizational commitment (Piankoff, 1999); career commitment (Goulet & Singh, 2002); organizational citizenship (Ryan, 2002); and work centrality (Hirschfelf & Field, 2000).

Both broad traits and narrow traits appear to be differentially predictive of different criteria. Cronbach and Gleser (1957) suggested that using narrow traits

ought to be used to predict specific criteria; whereas broad traits should be used to predict broad criteria. However, some researchers have advocated the use of narrow traits for both better prediction and explanation than broad traits (e.g., Tokar, Fischer, & Subich, 1998; Paunonen, Rothstein & Jackson, 1999; Stewart, 1999; Moon, Hollenbeck, Humpey & Maue, 2003). Narrow traits have been used to predict career, vocational work related outcomes (Tokar, Fischer, & Subich, 1998). Narrow personality traits are measured by a number of personality inventories and scales, including the 16 PF (Zak, Meir, & Kraemer, 1979), the California Psychological Inventory (Segal, 1992), the Jackson PRF (Jackson, Pauonen, & Rothstein, 1987), and the Comrey Personality Scales (Montag & Schwimmer, 1990). To help clarify the bandwidth-fidelity dilemma, we now move on to the relationship between personality traits (broad and narrow traits) and satisfaction.

Personality and Satisfaction

During the 1970's, interest in satisfaction peaked, and there were more than 5000 research articles written on this topic. The results of many studies have indicated that personality traits are related to satisfaction. More recently, one line of this research has focused on the relationship between personality and career satisfaction in a variety of career contexts. Satisfaction has been studied in relation to personality traits in a variety of contexts. Several studies have revealed that both the Big Five and narrow traits are significantly related to satisfaction. For example, based on sample of 164 undergraduate business major students, Logue et al. (2007) examined how major satisfaction was related to the Big Five traits, specific narrow

personality traits, and vocational interests represented by RIASEC dimensions. She found that there were positive correlations between satisfaction with one's major and the Big Five traits of conscientiousness, emotional stability, and extraversion. Logue also observed a positive relationship between the three traits of the Big Five and satisfaction. Moreover, Logue found that there was a positive relationship between major satisfaction and three specific traits, including optimism, assertiveness, and work drive. The later three traits have also consistently been found significantly related to job and career satisfaction. Logue proposed that adolescents who have higher score on optimism and work drive tended to have higher GPAs, which could lead to higher levels of satisfaction. In her study, students in business major tended to be more dominant and assertive. Students who had higher level of assertiveness were more satisfied with their major than students who had lower levels of assertiveness. Logue found that optimism and assertiveness as well the three vocational interests of realistic, conventional, and artistic accounted for nearly half of the variance in major satisfaction. She found that the combination of the Big Five and narrow traits accounted for higher levels of variance in satisfaction than either the Big Five or narrow traits alone themselves.

The relationship between personality traits and satisfaction has been examined in a variety of contexts. For example, college student life satisfaction has been found to be positively related to extraversion, self-esteem, optimism, (e.g., Hogan & Roberts, 1996) and some traits of 16 PF, such as Warmth, Surgency, and Social Boldness (Zak, Meir, & Kraemer, 1979). Lounsbury, Saudargas, Gibson, and

Leong (2005) used a sample of 532 undergraduates and found that the Big Five traits

of extraversion, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness were

significantly related to college students' life satisfaction. In addition, they found

that narrow traits were also significantly related to life satisfaction, but did not

contribute significantly to the variance of prediction of satisfaction as much as the

Big Five.

Holland's RIASEC framework (1985) and VPI (Vocational Preference

Inventory) have been used to examine the relationship between personality and

major satisfaction in college students. Based on a sample of 147 students majoring

in math and 176 students majoring in sociology, Morrow (1971) found that there

was no significant difference between congruent and incongruent students.

Congruence was defined for both majors separately. Math majors were classified as

an investigative dimension, and sociology majors were classified as a social

dimension. Similarly, based on a study of 129 female students from various majors,

Spokane and Derby (1979) found no significant relationship between satisfaction

with major and RIASEC congruence scores for different majors and personality.

However, in their study of 1,697 college students, Nafziger et al. (1975) did find that

college students who had higher levels of congruence on RIASEC had higher levels

of satisfaction with their majors.

DeNeve and Cooper (1998) also found that conscientiousness, extraversion

and neuroticism were significantly related to satisfaction across many different

studies. In addition, Judge, Heller, and Mount (2002) found that conscientiousness (r

= .26), extraversion (r = .25) and neuroticism (Emotional Stability, r = .29) had the highest correlations with job satisfaction among the Big Five.

Based on the Holland model, there is consistent relationship between personality and environment fit theory across different situations. By assessing students' personality traits and vocational interests, advisers and counselors could help students decide their majors. In that way, students are more likely to find best-fit majors and have higher level of major satisfaction. Besides college students, Logue suggested that these results could also apply to other fields of study, and leading to job satisfaction, career satisfaction, and life satisfaction. Actually, there has been an upsurge in interest on investigating the relationships between personality traits and career variables (e.g., Carson, 1989; Reed, Bruch, & Haase, 2004). Career satisfaction, which is an important variable for individual career development, will be discussed further below.

Personality and Career Satisfaction

Hall (1976) identifies career as the entirety of "work-related experiences and activities over the span of a person's life" (Hall, 1976, p.4). Career satisfaction has been defined as the individual's satisfaction of his or her entire career development and advancement (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, &Wormley, 1990; Lounsbury et al., 2004). Career satisfaction also refers to "factors inherent in the job or occupation itself and is dependent on the incumbent's subjective evaluation relative to his or her own goals and expectations" (Seibert & Kraimer, 2001, p. 2). Career satisfaction

summarizes people's feeling of work in a span of lifetime and represents how people feel about their lifetime of work, and it is related to global life satisfaction (Lounsbury, Park, Sundstrom, Williamson, & Pemberton, 2005). It should be noted that that career satisfaction is different with job satisfaction (Judge et al., 1995; Seibert & Kraimer, 2001; Lounsbury et al., 2005). Job satisfaction has been defined as a specific job positive emotional state (Locke, 1976). In contrast, career satisfaction encompasses all jobs across individual's whole career (Williamson, Pemberton & Lounsbury, 2005).

Career satisfaction is related to various factors, and personality traits are one of the factors. For example, Super (1953) observed that

"Work satisfaction and life satisfaction depend upon the extent to which the individual finds adequate outlets for his abilities, interests, personality traits, and values; they depend upon his establishment in a type of work, a work situation, and a way of life in which he can play the kind of role which his growth and exploratory experiences have led him to consider congenial and appropriate". (pp. 189-190).

Several studies have examined the relationship between personality and job performance (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991); personality and job satisfaction (e.g., Brief, 1998; Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986), but there have been fewer studies on the related construct of career satisfaction (Seibert & Kraimer, 2001).

It is necessary to expand that research to the related, but conceptually distinct, construct of career satisfaction. Career satisfaction is an important variable for individuals. According to Career Strategist (2004), during a lifetime, a typical American worker works approximately 100,000 hours. Career satisfaction is an important outcome of career progression (Seibert, Crant, & Kramer, 1999), and mentoring (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lilma, 2004). In addition, career satisfaction has been viewed as a key ingredient in life satisfaction, (Burke, 2001; Lounsbury, Park, Sundstrom, Williamson, & Pemberton, 2004) and career success (Seibert & Kraimer, 2001).

Career satisfaction has been viewed as an important part of intrinsic career success (Seibert & Kraimer, 2001; Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1995; Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barric, 1999). Career success has been defined in terms of both extrinsic and intrinsic career outcomes (Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1995). Extrinsic outcomes represent objective success, such as salary and promotions; whereas intrinsic outcome reflects individuals' feelings, such as job satisfaction and career satisfaction. As an important component in career success, career satisfaction has been studied in various career contexts, such as counselor education professionals (Bozionelos, 1996); female physicians (Walfish, Polifka, & Stenmark, 1985, 1985); female professionals and managers (Richardsen, Mikkelsen, & Burke, 1997); physicians and psychiatrists (Sturm, 2001); social workers (Hanson & McCullagh, 1997); female psychologists in medical schools (Nathan, Rouce, & Lubin, 1979); and different organizational and industry groups (Judge, Cable,

Boudreau, & Bretz, 1995). For example, Wiggins and Bowman (2000) investigated the factors leading to career success and satisfaction for female and male healthcare managers.

In addition, career satisfaction has been found to be related to many other factors, such as salary, promotion (Seibert, Crant, & Kraimer, 1999), mentoring (Allen, Eby, Proteet, Lentz, & Lilma, 2004), and hours worked (Wallace, 2001). For instance, Chapman (1982) found that career satisfaction is positively related to schoolteachers' skills, values, and professional accomplishments. Seibert, Crant, and Kraimer (1999) also have found that career satisfaction is positively related to salary and promotion.

Although career satisfaction is less often studied than other job affect variables like job satisfaction, some studies have begun to investigate the roots of career satisfaction. Predictors of career satisfaction and job satisfaction have been studied and identified, such as personality traits (Garfinkel et al. 2005), family structures (Keng-Howe & Liao, 1999), income (Seibert & Kraimer, 2001), supervisor support and career anchor impact (Jiang & Klein, 1999). For example, Garfinkel et al. (2005) investigated predictors of professional and personal satisfaction with a career in psychiatry. They found that personal experience and personality traits contributed to psychiatrist' career satisfaction. After surveying 802 psychiatrists, Garfinkel et al. (2005) found that Neuroticism was a consistently negative predictor of career satisfaction. Psychiatrists who perceived low emotional burden from patients tended to have extreme dissatisfaction with work.

Recently, there have been attempts to study the effects of personality on career satisfaction. Empirical studies have shown that a number of personality traits are significantly related to career satisfaction. In previous research on personality and career satisfaction, it has been found that several of the Big Five traits—especially agreeableness, conscientiousness, and extraversion--were significantly related to career satisfaction. For example, extraversion has consistently been found to be positively related to job and life satisfaction (Furnam & Zacherl, 1986; Watson & Slack, 1993), and career satisfaction (Boudreau, Boswell, & Judge 2001; Seibert & Kraimer, 2001). On the other hand, neuroticism has been found to be negatively related to career satisfaction (Boudreau, Boswell, & Judge 2001; Seibert & Kraimer, 2001).

Other studies have found different results for the relationships between personality traits and career satisfaction. In a sample of 496 employees from various industries, Seibert and Kraimer (2001) found that agreeableness was negatively related career satisfaction. In contrast, Boudreau, Boswell, and Judge (2001) found that Agreeableness was positively related to career satisfaction in a sample of U.S. executives.

Besides the Big Five personality dimension, some researchers have studied other personality traits related to satisfaction. For example, Lounsbury, et al. (2005) found that there were significant relationships between assertiveness and job satisfaction；customer service and satisfaction；work drive and satisfaction; and optimism and job satisfaction.

Staw et al. (1986) demonstrated that people who had higher levels of positive affectivity had higher levels of job satisfaction and career satisfaction for a long period of time. In a study of 496 employees from a diverse set of occupations and organizations, Seibert and Kraimer (2001) found that there was a negative relationship between an individual's level of neuroticism and career satisfaction. Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, and Barrick (1999) investigated the relationship between the Big Five and career satisfaction. During the longitudinal study, they found that Openness and Conscientiousness were positively and significantly related to career satisfaction, whereas Neuroticism had negative and significant relationship to career satisfaction. Agreeableness and extraversion had no significant relationship with career satisfaction. These findings suggest that specific personality traits accounted for individuals' intrinsic success validities over a life span time.

Similarly, using two samples of American and European executives, Boudreau, Boswell, and Judge (2001) found that extraversion and agreeableness were positively related to career satisfaction, but conscientiousness and neuroticism were negatively related to career satisfaction. However, there were differences emerged between the U.S. and European samples. Neuroticism had lower levels of relationship with extrinsic success for U.S. executives, but not the Europeans; whereas extraversion had higher level of relationships of extrinsic career success for European executives, but not the U.S. executives. Consonant with Boudreau et al.'s findings, in a sample of 496 employees (318 males and 178 females) from different organizations and occupations, Seibert and Kramer (2001) found that extraversion

was positively related to career satisfaction, but agreeableness and neuroticism was negatively related to career satisfaction.

Lounsbury, Loveland, Sundstrom, Gibson, Drost, and Hamrick (2003) discovered that 13 different personality traits were significantly correlated with career satisfaction in their sample of 5,932 individuals undergoing career transitions. Lounsbury et al. determined that a core set of three traits-- emotional resilience, optimism, and work drive-- accounted for most of the explainable variance in their measure of career satisfaction. They found that conscientiousness, extroversion, and openness were significantly related to career satisfaction in certain occupational groups. Besides the three factors of the Big Five traits, there were other narrow traits significantly related to career satisfaction, such as assertiveness, customer service orientation, and human managerial relations orientation. Lounsbury et al. also suggested that personality traits had important effects on career adaptation, and career selection.

In addition, Lounsbury and his colleagues have conducted a series of investigations of the relationships between personality traits (the Big Five and narrow traits) and career satisfaction for different occupational groups. Across a range of different occupations and organizations, they found extensive similarity in personality –career satisfaction relationships. For informational science professionals, Lounsbury et al. (2003) examined a sample of 1352 participants from all over the world, including participants from United States, Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, and other countries. They found that

conscientiousness, openness, and emotional stability, the three traits of the Big Five

model had significantly related to career satisfaction, as well as optimism,

assertiveness, and tough-mindedness. They also found that career satisfaction and

life satisfaction were positively related. But there are differential relationships of

personality with life satisfaction and career satisfaction. Lounsbury et al. indicated

that, in this context, personality traits studies align with person-environment fit

theory. For example, people who have higher level of openness are more fittingly

employed in occupations requiring continued learning and innovation.

Lounsbury, Moffitt, Gibson, Drost, and Stevens (2007) examined personality

traits (the Big Five and narrow traits) in relation to job satisfaction and career

satisfaction for 1059 information technology (IT) professionals. They found that

eight traits were significantly related to career satisfaction: assertiveness, emotional

resilience, extraversion, openness, teamwork, customer service orientation,

optimism, and work drive. Especially, contrary to job description and career

planning advice, extraversion and teamwork were related to job and career

satisfaction for IT professionals. Lounsbury et al. suggested that extroverts might be

better suited for IT works than introverts. Their findings demonstrated the important

effects of personality traits on career satisfaction and intrinsic career success.

In a study involving over 1300 information professionals, Williamson,

Pemberton, and Lounsbury (2005) examined the relationship between personality

traits and career and job satisfaction. Participants were from various information

industries, including academic reference librarians, archivists, catalogers, distance

education librarians, public librarians, records managers, school media specialists, special librarians, systems librarians, and other information professionals. Besides the Big Five, they also investigated other narrow personality traits, such as teamwork, visionary work style, and work drive. They found significant correlations between personality traits and both career and job satisfaction. Optimism, emotional stability, teamwork, assertiveness, and work drive accounted for the largest portion of variance in career satisfaction.

In summary, both broad personality traits and narrow traits have a significant relationship with career satisfaction. Considering the issue of the bandwidth-fidelity dilemma, it is important to examine how both broad and narrow traits contribute to the validity of various career criterions. One optimal research strategy might be to encompass both broad and narrow aspects of personality traits as predictors of different criteria such as satisfaction. Researchers may want to examine the combined contributions of the broad and narrow traits in criterion-related validation. Some personality traits display different relationships with career satisfaction in a variety of contexts. Future research in this area should continue to clarify the relationship between personality and satisfaction, both job satisfaction and career satisfaction.

Chapter II

Examination of the Big Five and narrow traits in relation to general managers' career satisfaction

Objectives

Although there are previous studies of personality attributes and career satisfaction (e.g. Judge, Heller & Mount, 2002; Furnham, Petrides, Tsaosis, Pappas, & Garrod, 2005), the present study extended previous results by examining the Big Five and additional narrow traits in relation to career satisfaction. Based on the meta-analysis of Judge, Heller and Mount (2002) found that Emotional Stability, Conscientiousness, and extraversion were the strongest predictors of job and career satisfaction. Furnham, Petrides, Tsaosis, Pappas, and Garrod (2005) also found similar research results. The first goal of my current study was to examine the how the Big Five traits are related to general managers' career satisfaction. In addition, the present study also examined the relationship between narrow personality traits and managers' career satisfaction. Regarding the relationship between career satisfaction and personality traits, the current study examined whether general managers differed from other occupations in mean level of the personality traits under consideration.

Research Questions

The career satisfaction of successful managers has been an interesting topic for researchers (e.g. Korman, 1980; Gattiker & Larwood, 1988). Although research has been conducted on a variety of topics related to socio-economic factors and the career satisfaction of managers, such as title and income (Korman, 1980), promotions (Rosenbaum, 1985), the length of time spent in his/her positions and demographic variables (Gattiker & Larwood, 1988), no previous research has tried to link personality characteristics and the career satisfaction of general managers. In current study, I not only examined the relationship between the Big Five traits and career satisfaction, but also investigated narrow personality traits in relation to career satisfaction.

It is important to study predictors for managers' career mobility, success, and career satisfaction (Gattiker & Larwood, 1988). Personality traits should be investigated as important predictors for general managers' career success. Boudreau, Boswell, and Judge (2001) found that extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness were positively related to U.S. executives' career satisfaction. In a comparison sample of European executives, Boudreau et al. found that extraversion was correlated significantly with career satisfaction. Other studies have reported distinctions between managers and other non-managers (e.g. Mathis & Jackson 2002). For example, Lounsbury et al. (2008) found that there were significant differences on personality traits between human resource managers and all other human resource professionals. Based on a review of the literature of the personality

traits and satisfaction, the following hypotheses and research questions were addressed:

Research Question 1: Which personality traits are significantly related to career satisfaction for general managers?

The following directional hypotheses were advanced.

H1: Emotional resilience will be significantly and positively related to career satisfaction of general managers.

Managers usually handle high levels of job pressure, because they are leaders of multiple, ongoing projects that are important to the viability and success of the organization. It is expected that more stable, resilient managers would be able to handle ongoing job stress, and have higher levels of job satisfaction and career satisfaction. For example, Boudreau, Boswell, and Judge (2001) found that Neuroticism was significantly negative related to executives' career satisfaction in both U.S. and European samples. Similarly, Seibert and Kramer (2001) found that Neuroticism was negatively related to career satisfaction in a sample of 496 people from a variety of occupations. Moreover, Lounsbury et al. (2003) found that Emotional Resilience produced significant correlations with career satisfaction in 14 occupational groups. Therefore, it is expected that Emotional Resilience would be positively related to career satisfaction.

H2: Extraversion will be significantly and positively related to career satisfaction of general managers.

Interpersonal and communication skills are included in the extraversion related activities, such as communicating in the group, taking the lead of interaction within group meeting and discussion (McCrae & Costa, 2003). Communication is a key factor for managers to create successful social networks, including friendships and acquaintanceships (Pappas, Flaherty, & Wooldridge, 2004). Interpersonal and communication skills are very important for "general managerial competence" (Schein, 1978). Hood communications skills help managers convey important information and motivate employees. (Potthoff, 2004).

Managers' interpersonal and communication skills are related to their job performance and career satisfaction (Potthoff, 2004). Previous research results have shown that extroverted managers tend to have stronger interpersonal communication skills and higher levels of career satisfaction than introverted managers (Pappas, Flaherty, & Wooldridge, 2004). Therefore, it was expected that extraversion would be positively and significantly related to managers' career satisfaction.

H3: Openness will be significantly and positively related to career satisfaction of general managers.

Managers with higher levels of Openness may be more likely to find new opportunities to use new methods and innovative procedure to reach organizational goals. De Hoogh et al. (2005) have found that Openness plays an important role for

charismatic leaders. As a leader in a group or organization, managers who are more open tend to have higher levels of performance and higher levels of career satisfaction.

H4: Conscientiousness will be significantly and positively related to career satisfaction of general managers.

Conscientiousness has been found to be positively related to salary, promotion, and extrinsic career success (Judge et al., 1999; Seibert & Kraimer, 2001). Managers who are more conscientious have been found to perform at higher levels on their jobs (Barrick & Mount, 1991), which could lead to higher levels of career satisfaction。Many recent research results have found that Conscientiousness is significantly, positively related to career satisfaction. For example, Boudreau, Boswell, and Judge (2001) found that Conscientiousness was positively related to career satisfaction in both U.S. and European executives. Using longitudinal data, Judge et al. (1999) reported that Conscientiousness was positively related to job career satisfaction in manager occupations. Also, Lounsbury and his colleagues found that Conscientiousness is positively related to with career satisfaction and job satisfaction in human resource managers positions (e.g. Lounsbury et al., 2008).

H5: Agreeableness will be significantly and positively related to career satisfaction of managers.

Managers usually work as part of teams at work and are frequently involved in cooperative activities which would be facilitated by higher levels of

Agreeableness. Based on a sample drawn from New Zealand and the United States, Stevens et al. (2002) found that individuals who had first-line managerial jobs exhibited higher level of agreeableness and openness to experience. Judge et al. (1998) found that individuals who have higher level of agreeableness were more attracted to team organizations. In addition, Judge and Bono (2000) found that there was a significant positive relationship between Agreeableness and transformational leadership. Based on the above findings, it was expected that agreeableness would be positively and significantly related to career satisfaction for managers in this study.

H6: Optimism will be positively related to career satisfaction of general managers.

Optimism refers a propensity to view and approach situations, people, prospects and the future with a positive outlook. Individuals who have higher levels of optimism display greater persistence in dealing with difficult situations as well as handling stress and setbacks (Seligman, 1990). Optimism is an important job attribute for managers. Managers usually handle a wide variety of challenging situations at work and regularly face high levels of stress; they have different attribution sets or frameworks regarding success and failure. Aspinwall (1988) found that "optimists pay more attention to negative information, remember more of it, and show evidence of greater elaborative processing of it, and rather than devoting attention to all of the information presented, optimists pay particularly close attention to the most useful information available." (p. 225). These results

have been supported by other studies (e.g., Geers, Handley & McLarney, 2003). Based on these findings, Papenhausen (2006) specifically found thatoptimism positively influences managers' problem recognition, problem solving actions, and career satisfaction.

H7: Work Drive will be positively related to career satisfaction of general managers.

Work Drive has been defined as a disposition to work for long hours (including overtime) and an irregular schedule; investing high levels of time and energy into job and career, and being motivated to extend oneself, if necessary, to finish projects, meet deadlines, be productive, and achieve job success. Achievement motivation is related to Work Drive (Lounsbury, Gibson, & Hamrick, 2004). Wetherbe et al. (1999) found that achievement motivation is a motivator for Information System managers. Work Drive has been found to be positively related to college GPA and job performance (e.g. Lounsbury et al. 2003). In addition, Lounsbury et al. (2008) found Work Drive was positively related to career satisfaction for HR managers. Accordingly, it is expected that Work Drive would be positively related to managers' career satisfaction in this study.

Research Question 2: Based on previous research results (Judge, Heller & Mount, 2002), emotional stability, conscientiousness, and extraversion were the Big Five traits most highly related to career satisfaction. The present study examined

whether, these three traits each have higher correlations with career satisfaction than the other Big Five traits of openness and agreeableness.

The articles reviewed in current study established a link between career satisfaction and personality traits. Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, and Garrod, (2005) conducted a study to examine the relationship between the Big Five personality traits and career satisfaction. However, the current study will also serve as an extension of their results by examining additional personality variables in relation to general managers' career satisfaction. To analyze how the Big Five and narrow personality traits are related to general managers' career satisfaction, the following research question was addressed:

Research Question 3: How much variance in Managers' career satisfaction is accounted for by the Big Five personality traits versus narrow personality traits? The current study will analyze the amount of variance of each personality trait accounted for general managers

Managers are typically responsible for planning and directing the work of a group of individuals, monitoring their work, and taking corrective action when necessary. In this study, there were over 50,000 individuals from different occupations. A major premise of Holland's (1976, 1996) vocational theory is that individuals gravitate toward, are satisfied with, and remain in occupations where there is a good fit between their personality and the work environment. Another major research goal of the present study was the following

Research Question 4: Do managers as an occupational group differ from non-managerial occupations on the Big Five and narrow personality traits?

In addition, in the case of two traits—Assertiveness and Visionary Style--directional hypotheses could be advanced based on previous research and the meaning of the construct represented by the trait.

Hoque and Noon (2001) found that managers were involved more strategic planning than other non-managers. Accordingly, the following hypothesis was tested:

H8: Managers would have higher visionary scores than non-managers.

Assertiveness is very important for managers (Shaw & Rutledge, 1976). Indeed, a key attribute of general manager is virtually synonymous with the meaning of Assertiveness: "a willingness to lead, take charge, and offer opinions and direction." (O*NET, 2008) As Shaw and Rutledge noted, assertiveness training has been utilized to enhance managerial effectiveness. Effective managers are usually assertive. Cattell et al. (1970) found higher Assertiveness scores for manager than non-managers. Accordingly, the following hypothesis was tested:

H9: Managers will display higher Assertiveness scores than non-managers.

Managers are under high levels of pressure, because they usually lead multiple, projects. A United Kingdom study reported that 70% of managers feel work-related stress, which might have negative effect on managers' effectiveness at work (www.grestwestlife.com, 2008). For non-managers, although Emotional

Resilience was found to be the variable most highly correlated with career

satisfaction, managers' stress might under higher level pressure than other

occupations (Lounsbury, et al., 2008). Accordingly, the following hypothesis was

tested:

H10: Managers would have a higher level of Emotional Resilience than non-

managers.

Method

Overview

This study used archival data that were extracted from eCareerFit.com, a

professional assessment website offering online career assessment to a variety of

organizations for leadership development and career development. The data source used

in this study contained information on individuals from a wide range of industries and

occupations, including managers from different organizations. All data samples were

collected through internet from individuals receiving online questionnaires. The

questionnaires were developed to examine selected personality characteristics, along with

career satisfaction. The scales used in this study have been validated in previous studies

(Lounsbury et al., 2003; Lounsbury & Gibson, 2008).

Sample

The subjects in this study are from the database collected by Resource Associates,

Inc. The total of 6,402 managers and 48,726 non-managers in this study represented a

wide range of industries in the United States, including banking and financial services

(10%), information technology (5%), communications (4%), retail (4%), health care (2%), science and technology (2%), entertainment (2%), automotive (1%), transportation (1%), utilities (1%) and printing (1%). Of the samples, 68.1% were male and 31.9% were female. There were 21% participants under 30 years old; 23% participants were between 30-39 years old; 33% participants were between 40 to 49 years old; 23% participants were 50 years old and over. In addition, the sample of 8,937 Informational Technology professionals was used in this study to compare the difference with Managers.

Procedures

The assessments were managed by eCareerFit.com. The research instruments were available to participants in print form, web form, or e-mail attachment. The assessment data consisted of personality, career satisfaction, job satisfaction and demographic data. Permission to utilize this data set in this study was requested and obtained from eCareerFit.com. However, since the assessments are property of the company, some detail information of the assessments is confidential, and not available to be published.

Instrumentation

Personality measures

The personality measures used in this study was the Personal Style Inventory (PSI), a work-based inventory that has been used in various studies (Lounsbury & Gibson, 2002; Lounsbury, Loveland, et al., 2003; Lounsbury, Sundstrom, Loveland, & Gibson, 2003), and had acceptable reliability and validity (Lounsbury, et al., 2003). The

PSI inventory includes 136 general personality items, and it has been validated in studies of predictors of career decidedness of many occupations and college students. (Lounsbury, Tatum, Chambers, Owens, & Gibson, 1999)

All personality traits were assessed with PSI on a five-point Likert type response scale: 1= Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = In-between, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. Below is a brief description of each of the personality constructs examined in the study, along with the total item numbers, coefficient alpha for the present dataset and examples of construct validity coefficients from previous study (Lounsbury et al., 1999)

Extraversion -- represents the tendency to be outgoing, assertive, active, and excitement seeking (7 items).

Neuroticism (Emotional Stability) -- represents the tendency to experience negative affects, such as anxiousness, moodiness, and anger (6 items).

Conscientiousness -- represents the tendency to be cautious, deliberate, self-disciplined, neat, and well-organized (8 items).

Agreeableness (Teamwork) -- represents the tendency to be cooperative, trusting, gentle, and kind (6 items).

Openness to experience -- represents individuals' tendencies to be creative, introspective, imaginative, resourceful and insightful (9 items).

Assertiveness -- represents the degree to which a person attempts to control situations or the thoughts and actions of others. It is a person's disposition to express ideas confidently, but not in an aggressive manner (8 items).

Customer Service Orientation -- implies a desire to provide satisfactory service to customers, both internal and external; always putting customers first; it means going above and beyond the normal job description or policy (7 items).

Image Management -- represents a person's disposition to observe and control self-presentation (6 items).

Intrinsic Motivation -- refers to motivation to engage in an activity for its own work factors, such as challenge and meaningfulness. On the other hand, extrinsic motivations are rewards, pay, and other benefits (6 items).

Optimism -- defines as a tendency to look on the more favorable side or expect the most favorable outcome of events or conditions. It represents a tendency to minimize problems even in the difficult situations (8 items).

Work Drive -- represents high levels of time and energy for jobs. It is a disposition to work long hours and an irregular schedule to achieve job success (8 items).

Visionary -- implies a personal style that focuses on creating an organizational vision, by developing strategy for long-term goals (8 items).

Career Satisfaction

Career satisfaction was defined as the satisfaction of a career as a whole. In this study, using the framework of Judge, Cable, Boudreau, and Bretz (1995), Career satisfaction was measured by a five-item scale. This measure has been used and validated in previous career satisfaction studies (e.g. Lounsbury, Moffitt, Gibson, Drost, & Stevenson, 2007). The items dealt with a variety of career aspects, including career progress and trajectory, career advancement, future career prospects (Lounsbury et al.,

2004). Respondents were presented with two phrases and asked to indicate which side

was most indicative of respondents feeling about their careers. Coefficient alpha for this

scale is .81. Sample items are displayed in Figure 1. Data were collected by

eCareerFit.com, which has developed and performed the assessments to a variety of

organizations.

Figure 1: Sample items for Career Satisfaction

I am very dissatisfied with the way my career has progressed so far.	1 2 3 4 5 ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	I am very satisfied with the way my career has progressed so far.

I am very satisfied with my job and benefits	1 2 3 4 5 ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	I am very dissatisfied with my pay and benefits.

Chapter III

Results

Overview

Descriptive statistics and correlation analyses were performed to assess the relationship of the Big Five and the narrow traits to career satisfaction for general managers. A series of independent samples *t tests* were performed to examine whether there was a significant difference between managers and all other occupations on the Big Five and narrow traits. Regression analyses were performed to examine the incremental validity of narrow traits in predicting career satisfaction above and beyond the Big Five traits for General Managers.

The first research question addressed the relationship between personality traits and General Managers' career satisfaction. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for this purpose. Table 1 displays the correlations between personality variables and career satisfaction for general managers. Table 5 displays the intercorrelations among all personality variables. All Hypotheses related to research question 1 were confirmed (H1 to H7). As can be seen from Table 1, career satisfaction was significantly and positively related to: emotional resilience ($r = .33$, $p < .01$),optimism ($r = .34$, $p < .01$), assertiveness ($r = .08$, $p < .05$), work drive ($r = .17$, $p < .01$), extraversion ($r = .24$, $p < .01$), team work ($r = .21$, $p < .01$), openness ($r = .15$, $p < .01$), conscientiousness ($r = .17$, $p < .01$).   However, image management was significantly, negatively related to career satisfaction ($r = -.12$, $p < .01$). The

results also showed that intrinsic motivation ($r=.03$, $p>.01$), customer service orientation ($r=.02$, $p>.01$), and visionary style ($r=.05$, $p>.01$) were not significantly related to managers' career satisfaction.

The correlations between career satisfaction with emotional resilience and optimism were significant higher than all other correlations. Among the Big Five, emotional resilience had the strongest relationship with Managers' career satisfaction ($r = .33$, $p < .01$), whereas optimism had the strongest relationship with career satisfaction among the narrow personality traits ($r = .34$, $p < .01$). To determine if Emotional Resilience was a stronger predictor of Managers' career satisfaction than optimism, a Fisher's t test (Guilford & Fruchter, 1973) was used to $t$est for the difference in magnitude between two correlation coefficients, producing a value of t (55236) $= 1.97$ $p < .01$). Based on the significant t result, it was concluded that Emotional Stability did appear to be a better predictor of Managers' career satisfaction than optimism.

Career satisfaction was positively and significantly related to all the Big Five traits, (correlations ranging from $r =. 17$, $p <.01$ for Conscientiousness, to $r =.33$, $p <.01$ for Emotional Stability). Among all narrow personality traits, career satisfaction was significantly related to all narrow personality traits except Intrinsic Motivation ($r=.03$, $p>.05$) and Customer Service Orientation ($r=.02$, $p>.05$), (with significant correlations ranging from r $=. 08$, $p <.05$ for Assertiveness, to r$= .34$, $p <.01$ for optimism). The median Big Five correlation with career satisfaction was r $=.24$, $p <.01$, while the median narrow traits correlation with career satisfaction was

r =.08, p <.01, Based on the regression results, both the Big Five and narrow

personality traits, as separate sets, were significantly related to career satisfaction.

Since the Big Five had a significantly higher (t (55236) = 3.75, p < .01) median

correlation (r = .24) than narrow personality traits (r =.08), the Big Five personality

traits showed stronger relationships with managers' career satisfaction than did the

narrow traits.

The second research question 2 asked among the Big Five, which model is

better to predict general managers' career satisfaction. The first model consisted

extraversion, emotional stability, and conscientiousness. The second model

included openness and agreeableness. Results were displayed in Table 8 and Table 9

respectively. As shown in Table 8, extraversion, emotional stability,

conscientiousness demonstrated a significant multiple correlation of r =.324, p <.01

with career satisfaction. As shown in Table 9, openness and team work

(agreeableness) produced a multiple correlation of r = .191, p <.01 with career

satisfaction. Thus it appears that the better model of the two for predicting predict

general managers' career satisfaction included extraversion, emotional stability and

conscientiousness.

A series of hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to address the

research question about how the Big Five predicting manager's career satisfaction.

First, the Big Five measures were entered as predictors; the results were displayed in

Table 6. The model containing emotional stability, extraversion, agreeableness

created an R square = .113 (p <.01). Adding conscientiousness increased the R

square to .115 (*p* <.01). As predictors of career satisfaction, emotional stability,

extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness created an R square of .115 (*p*

<.01). The R square value remains the same (R square = .115, *p* < .01) after adding

openness, therefore, openness was not a significant unique predictor of General

Managers' career satisfaction.

The third research question was focused on the amount of variance in career

satisfaction accounted for by the Big Five personality traits, and the narrow traits

separately. To investigate this research question, a stepwise multiple regression was

performed. Because there was not enough evidence from prior research to identify

the precedence of personality traits, stepwise multiple regression analyses were used.

Table 9 displays the results of stepwise multiple regression.   The first entered

personality traits were traits that had highest correlation with career satisfaction,

emotional resilience and optimism. Emotional resilience accounted for 9.4% of

career satisfaction's variance; followed by optimism, which accounted for additional

2% of variance. Customer service orientation and assertiveness contributed

additional .8% and .2% of the unique variance in career satisfaction (*p* <.01). These

four factors jointly produced a multiple correlation .352 (p < .01), accounting for

12.4% of the variance in general managers' career satisfaction (p < .01). Both broad

and narrow personality variables produce a multiple correlation square value of R

square = .145, (*p* <.01).

Next, the narrow personality traits were entered into a multiple regression

predicting career satisfaction. The narrow traits model included optimism, customer

service, assertiveness, intrinsic motivation, work drive, and visionary style. As displayed in Table 11, this model produced an R square value of.123, $p <.01$.

To further examine the research question of incremental validity of personality traits in relation to career satisfaction of general managers, two sets of hierarchical regression analyses were performed. First, the Big Five were entered as a set, followed by all other narrow traits entered stepwise. Second, the two sets of personality variables were entered reversely. The narrow personality variables were entered first, followed by the Big Five personality traits entered as a set, with results displayed in Table 10 and 12, respectively. As can be seen from Table 10, among general managers, the Big Five traits accounted for 11.5% of the variance in career satisfaction ($p <.01$), followed by all other narrow personality traits as a set accounting for an additional 12.3% of the variance ($p <.01$) in career satisfaction. When entered in reverse order (See Table 12), all narrow personality traits jointly accounted for 12.2% of the variance of managers' career satisfaction ($p <.01$), followed by the Big Five traits which collectively added 14.5% of the variance ($p <.01$) explained in career satisfaction (See Table 13).

The fourth research question examined personality trait differences between general managers and individuals in other occupations. To compare if there were significant differences between managers and all other occupations, a series of *t tests* were performed to compare the mean scores of general managers against the corresponding mean scores for all other non-manager occupations. Table 2 displays the sample numbers, means, standard deviations, for the eleven personality traits,

along with career satisfaction separately for managers and all other occupations. Table 4 displays the *t tests* results for all samples.

Compared to all other occupations, general managers had significant higher mean scores on all but one of the personality traits, including openness, conscientiousness, emotional resilience, agreeableness, extraversion, assertiveness, image management, optimism, work drive, customer service orientation, and visionary style. The mean score of intrinsic motivation of general managers (3.47) was significantly lower (t (55236) = 3.75, $p < .01$) than the mean score (3.54) for all other occupations. General managers also had a higher level of career satisfaction (3.50) than all other occupations (3.35) (*t (8490) =12.82), p <.01)*

Hypothesis 8 concerned whether there were higher visionary style scores for general managers than all other occupation. As displayed in Table 2, hypothesis 8 was confirmed with the finding that the mean visionary style scores for general managers is 2.97 and all other occupations is 2.88 (*t(55236)=*-9.32, $p <.01$).

Hypothesis 9 asked whether there was a higher level of assertiveness for general managers than all other occupations. Results were displayed in Table 2. The mean assertiveness score for general manager was 3.79; whereas the mean assertiveness score for all other occupation was 3.45 (*t (55236) =*-36.58, $p <.01$). Therefore, general managers had higher level of assertiveness than all other occupation.

Hypothesis 10 proposed that general managers would have higher emotional stability mean scores than all other occupations. As displayed in Table 2, this hypothesis was confirmed with the finding that the mean emotional stability scores for general managers is 3.54, while the mean scores for all other occupations is 3.40 (t (55236) = -19.39, p <.01).

Chapter IV

Discussion

The main goal of the present study was to examine the relationship between personality traits and career satisfaction of general managers. This study also investigated differences in the mean levels of personality variables between managers and non-managers. Additionally, the incremental validity value of narrow traits in addition to the Big Five traits, both broad (Big Five) and narrow personality traits was investigated.

The current research findings add to the current knowledge of personality traits and career satisfaction. A discussion of specific findings is presented below.

Contribution to Current Knowledge

The first research question was which personality traits are significantly related to career satisfaction for general managers. Seven hypotheses were advanced under this research question. The first hypothesis was that emotional resilience was significantly and positively related to career satisfaction of general managers. Considering the difference between managers and non-managers, hypothesis 10 asked if managers had higher levels of emotional resilience than non-managers. Consistent with research in other areas, I found that emotional resilience had the strongest (and positive) correlation with career satisfaction of general managers. Moreover, managers displayed a significantly higher mean level of emotional resilience than non-managers. One explanation for this finding is that

people who score higher on emotional stability can better handle job stress, particularly, the higher levels of stress associated with managerial positions, than those who have lower levels of emotional stability (Lounsbury et al. 2008). For general managers, the role demands place a premium on emotional stability because of the stressful nature of most managerial jobs. Along these lines, Blancero, Boroski, and Dyer (1996) found that emotional resilience was a key competence for managers. Emotional stability has also been shown to be related to mangers' work performance, ability to organize work relationships, and handle stress (Blancero, Boroski & Dyer, 1996). Barrick and Mount (1991) reported that most managers report feelings of job-related stress. Job-related stress could lead to negative work outcomes. People who experience higher levels of job stress may not be able to perform their work effectively. General managers who have higher levels of emotional resilience may be better able to control their own job stress and perform more effectively.

The current findings regarding the first hypothesis are also consistent with previous studies showing that managers with a higher level of emotional stability have higher levels of career success and career satisfaction (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999). Also, Lounsbury, Loveland, et al (2003) found that for human resource managers, compared to a set of broad and narrow personality traits, emotional stability had the highest correlation with career satisfaction and was also substantively predictive of career satisfaction across different occupations. Similarly, Melamed (1996a, 1996b) found that emotional stability was related to higher occupational status.

In the present study, managers had higher levels of extraversion than non-managers and— supporting Hypothesis 2— extraversion was positively related to the career satisfaction of managers. Such results point toward what Buss (1996) terms the adaptive value of extraversion, and what can also be interpreted as good person-job fit for managers from the perspective of Holland's (1985) vocational fit theory. In either case, extraversion would be assumed to be an important attribute for managers. In support of the latter, many of the core competencies of managers can be seen as involving extraversion, including, regular interaction with subordinates and coworkers, leading discussions and meetings, establishing and maintaining good working relationships with upper management as well as members of one's immediate work group, giving performance feedback to direct reports, and communicating organizational goals and new developments to subordinates (O*NET, 2009; De Raad, 2000). In addition, studies of the personality traits of managers in relation to job outcomes have shown that Extraversion is positively related to overall job performance (Robie, Brown, & Bly, 2005), task performance (Balthazard, Potter, & Warren, 2002),   earnings (Boudreau, Boswell, & Judge (2001), and job satisfaction (Lounsbury, et al., 2003). That Managers would have higher levels of extraversion than non-managers is also consistent with Holland's (1976, 1996) vocational theory and Schneider's Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) model (Schneider, 1987; Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995) in that individuals with higher levels of extraversion may gravitate toward and be attracted to the managerial profession because it utilizes their extraversion and also because individuals with higher levels of

extraversion are more likely to be selected for managerial positions managers,

Similarly, from the perspective of Holland's theory, managers with higher levels of

extraversion would be more likely to be successful in and satisfied by such work

because of the importance of this trait for managerial tasks and functions. Thus, it

appears that extraversion is one core component of person-job fit for managers and

should be a factor considered in the recruitment, selection, training, development,

promotion, and retention of managers.

Another trait which differentiated managers and non-managers and was

positively related to managerial career satisfaction was openness. Consistent with

the third hypothesis of the present study, openness was significantly and positively

related to the career satisfaction of general managers. One explanation here is that

managers must keep abreast of organizational changes as well as innovations in

their industry, marketplace fluctuations, and new practices in their profession

(Koscho, 2003). Also, many of the core competencies of managers can be seen as

involving openness, such as learning new knowledge and strategies as well as

sharing them with coworkers and subordinates; and adapting technological

innovations for task management (O*NET, 2009). Individuals with higher levels

of openness tend to have greater adaptability to change. For the above reasons,

openness also appears to be critical for successful managerial performance and,

ultimately, for career satisfaction.

The fourth hypothesis stated that conscientiousness was significantly and

positively related to career satisfaction of general managers. In the present study,

conscientiousness had the second highest correlation with managers' career

satisfaction, which is consonant with other studies reporting that the

conscientiousness of company employees is related to career satisfaction and job

satisfaction (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999).

Previous studies also suggested that conscientiousness is positively related to

retention (Barrick & Mount, 1991), job performance, (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, &

Barrick, 1999), and salary and earnings (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Also, managers

scored higher on conscientiousness than individuals in other occupations in the

current study. From the perspective of Holland's theory, a higher level of

conscientiousness is desirable for managers because managers have to follow rules,

be reliable and dependable, maintain organization and other similar functions

reflecting conscientiousness (O*NET, 2009). Thus, it is not surprising to find that

conscientiousness in the present study was highly related to general managers' career

satisfaction.

In the present study, agreeableness was significantly and positively related to

career satisfaction of managers, supporting Hypothesis 5. One possible explanation

for this result is that agreeableness activities reflect key competencies for general

managers. Agreeable individuals tend to be cooperative, participative, and have

equable relationships with fellow employees in a work group (Graziano & Eisenberg,

1997). People who are more agreeable tend to be warm, cooperative, and able to

work pleasantly and interdependently with team members (Graziano & Eisenberg,

1997).Also, Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, and Garrod (2005) found that

individuals with higher level of agreeableness were more likely to have positive

relationship with coworkers, Similarly, managers with higher levels of agreeableness

may have better relationships with coworkers. Having friendly, equable relationship with coworkers has been shown to be related people's career satisfaction (Brief, 1998).

Confirming the sixth hypothesis, optimism was positively related to the career satisfaction of general managers. Among the narrow personality traits under study here, optimism had the highest correlation with career satisfaction of managers in the present study. This finding was consistent with previous results, such as those of Furnham and Zacherl (1986). Seligman (1990) found that optimism was positively related to job performance and career satisfaction. Moreover, optimism has been shown to be a valid predictor of job performance and career satisfaction (Lounsbury, Loveland, & Gibson, 2002).

Optimistic individuals are more likely to motivate themselves and make the most of their talent (Seligman, 1990). Scheier (1987) reported that optimists tend to expect favorable outcomes even when they are confronted with obstacles. They also suggested that optimists tend to internalize positive events and they usually see failure as transient. On the other hand, pessimists tend to attribute failure as being long-term in nature. Employees who tend to have negative dispositions are more likely to have negative job- related thoughts which could lead to lower levels of career satisfaction (Judge et al. 1999). Along these lines, Scheier et al. (2001) found that individuals who are more optimistic respond to stressors less negatively than more pessimistic individuals. Aspinwall et al., (2001) found that more optimistic individuals tend to use active methods to cope with stress on the job, and have higher level of career satisfaction. Also, Clawson and Newburg (2005) found that optimistic managers had

higher levels of enthusiasm and greater commitment to their jobs. Tombaugh (2004) indicated that "Optimistic leaders are more likely to see problems as challenges, exert greater effort for longer periods to reach their goals, and seek out and appreciate the positive aspects of difficult situations" (2004, p. 15). Arakawa and Greenberg (2006) found that the teams led by Optimistic managers are more engaged and productive. In addition, managers' optimism was found to be related to positive leadership, project engagement, job performance, and career satisfaction (Arakawa & Greenberg, 2006). With respect to the present study, the above findings concerning optimism support the proposition that being optimistic helps managers deal with all manner of setbacks, roadblocks, aggravations, and other stressors inherent to their jobs; accordingly, one can see how the optimism of managers would be related to their career satisfaction.

The seventh hypothesis, that work drive would be positively related to career satisfaction of general managers, was confirmed. This finding is consistent with previous research results. For example, work drive has been found to be a robust predictor of job performance, job satisfaction, and career satisfaction (Lounsbury, et al. 2003; Wetherbe et al. 1999). Moreover, based on a DNL Global Company report (www.sourcingmag.com, 2008), work drive was significantly and positively related to managers' performance and career satisfaction. Managers who have higher levels of work drive tend to be more likely to make realistic decisions at work and are more satisfied with their careers. (Wetherbe et al. 1999) Therefore, it is not surprising to find that work drive was positively related to career satisfaction of general managers,

Research question 2 asked if conscientiousness, extraversion and emotional stability have stronger relationships with managers' career satisfaction than openness

and extraversion. After comparing the two regression models extraversion, emotional stability, and conscientiousness vs. openness and agreeableness), the former model (with three predictors) was more highly related to general managers' career satisfaction than the model comprised of openness and Agreeableness as predictors. Such a pattern of results is similar to those reported by Judge, Heller and Mount (2002), who found that among the Big Five traits, emotional stability, conscientiousness, and extraversion were the ones most highly related to job satisfaction. In addition, Salyer (2007) suggested that employees who are more extraverted, conscientious, and emotionally stable tend to have higher levels of job performance and, thus, higher levels of career satisfaction. Future research could investigate whether this pattern of results generalizes to, or is different for, a variety of occupations. All these results were consistent with the current finding that conscientiousness, extraversion and emotional stability have stronger relationships with managers' career satisfaction than openness and extraversion.

To clarify further assess how career satisfaction was related to personality traits, Research Question 3 asked how much variance in managers' career satisfaction is accounted for by the Big Five personality versus narrow personality traits. Results of the stepwise multiple regressions indicated that both broad and narrow personality traits are valid predictors for career satisfaction. A moderately largely amount of the variance in general managers' career satisfaction was accounted for by a relatively small number of personality traits. For example, in the present study, image management, assertiveness, visionary style, intrinsic motivation, customer service orientation and optimism accounted for 12 percent of the variance of general

managers' career satisfaction. These narrow personality traits added a relatively large

amount of variance in the prediction of career satisfaction above and beyond the Big

Five personality traits. It is important that future research investigate whether narrow

personality traits can add unique variance to career satisfaction in other occupational

fields.

Research question 4 asked if managers differ from non-managerial

occupations on the Big Five and narrow personality traits. In the present study

there were significant differences in mean scores on most personality traits

between managers and non-managers. Specifically, managers had higher scores on

most personality traits than non-managers, including extraversion, emotional

stability, openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness, optimism, customer service,

assertiveness, intrinsic motivation, work drive, and visionary style. More

specifically, the current study found that general managers had higher assertiveness

scores than all other non-managers. Assertiveness is nearly universally considered

to be an essential component of leadership (Lee, et al. 1995). For example, general

managers must be assertive to function effectively in the larger organization

compete for resources, seize the initiative in unstructured situations, take charge of

ongoing events, motivate and persuade subordinates, handle conflict between

employees, marshal work team resources for goal attainment, take a firm stand on

key issues, enforce decisions, and myriad other functions. A higher level of

assertiveness has been shown to be a key component of organizational success of

managers (Lee, et al. 1995) and the job performance of managers (e.g. Tichy,

1983). Along these lines, Tichy (1983) demonstrated the importance of

assertiveness for managers who take a change agent role in organizations. Also, Lounsbury et al. (2008) found that assertiveness is an important functional personality attribute of human resource managers.

Hypothesis 9 concerned whether managers had higher visionary scores than non-managers. In current study, visionary style scores for managers were higher than for non-managers. This finding is consistent with previous studies such as, Ulrich (1997), who found that managers are more strategically focused and visionary than non-managers. In the current study, however, visionary style was not significantly related to manager's career satisfaction. This result was consistent with Lounsbury et al. (2008)'s comparative analysis of occupations. They found that visionary style was not significantly related to career satisfaction of human resource managers. They also suggested that visionary style perhaps did not contribute to managers' career development and fulfillment.

Chapter V:

Conclusions and Implications for Future Research

The present study investigated specific narrow personality construct, and broad personality traits in relation to managers' career satisfaction. It clearly demonstrated that career satisfaction of general managers is linked to multiple personality traits. Overall, in the present study, all ten hypothesized relationships were consistent and supported with previous research findings across occupations, which enhanced the construct validity.

The present findings have manifold implications for general managers. First, the personality traits that have higher correlations with managers' career satisfaction, such as emotional stability, optimism, and extraversion, could be useful for screening applicants for managerial positions. Also, if the manager is working as a coach or mentor, it would be beneficial for the coach to have higher levels of extraversion and optimism.

In addition, the present findings for personality traits can be used to formulate desirable standards for personnel selection. Such information could be used to create multi-faceted personality assessments and improve pre-employment selection progress. The assessment results could be useful to lower subsequent turnover rates.

Compared to other economic and social change factors, personality traits are not only valid predictors of job performance and career satisfaction, but also are relatively stable through the adult years (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Lounsbury, Gibson, & Hamrick, 2004; Lounsbury et al. 2008; Salgado, 1997;). Thus, from a

practical perspective, the present findings could be helpful in career planning, mentoring, personal counseling, and succession planning and career development, over the course of person's career and further into retirement.

Subsequent research could further investigate broad and narrow personality traits in relation to career satisfaction, job satisfaction, and other job-related criteria, such as job performance, , organizational citizenship behavior, turnover, and person –organizational (P-O) fit.   Future research could employ longitudinal designs to investigate the casual relationship between personality traits and career satisfaction as well as the dynamics of job change, career plateauing, career change, and retirement decisions, among others. Although in current study, there were a total of 12 different personality traits, including five broad traits and seven narrow traits, other personality variables and managerial style could be considered in future research, such as locus of control, dominance, task structuring orientation, and empathy. Moreover，future research could extend the present research findings to other factors related to career satisfaction, such as salary, mentoring, and supervision. Future research could also examine a variety of occupations and industrial sectors.

Limitations

Several limitations of the present study should be noted. Since the study used archival data, the control of data collection process was limited. The participants in this study were self-selected and self-reported, the information about participants was limited. For example, ethic information and demographic information was not available in this study. It would be useful to learn more information about participation rates by demographic attribute. Moreover, self-report data might involve an inherent social desirability bias (Assor & Connell, 1992).Some participants may have been responding in a socially desirable manner, which could have biased the results.

Although participants were obtained from different regions and industrial sectors in the United States, more internationally diverse samples would increase the external validity of the present study. Samples with cultural difference and wide geographic regions could increase the generalizability of results of the current study.

Summary

In summary, this study provided new evidence to support the proposition that both broad and narrow personality traits are related to the career satisfaction of general managers. It extended the existing knowledge of personality traits and their relation to career satisfaction. Additionally, since personality traits are significantly related to job performance and job satisfaction, (e.g. Witt & Burke, 2002; Lounsbury, et al. 2008), the present findings might be helpful to consider for career planning and employee selection for different occupations. .

In the present study, inclusion of narrow personality traits substantially enhanced criterion-related validity of the Big Five. Specifically, emotional stability and optimism displayed the strongest correlation with the career satisfaction of general managers. Future research could extend the current findings to other occupations, or examine different factors related to job performance, career satisfaction.

References

Ackerman, P. L. (1990). A correlation analysis of skill specificity: Learning, abilities, and Individual differences, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition,* 16, 883-901.

Allen, T D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 89(1), 127-136.

Allport, F. (1930). The religion of a scientist. *Harpers,* 160. 352-366.

Andrews, F. M. (1974). Social indicators of perceived life quality. *Social Indicators Research*, *1*, 279-299.

Arakawa, D. & Greenberg, M. (2006). Optimistic Managers & Their Influence on Productivity & Employee Engagement, *Technology Organization. Gallup Management Journal, 2(1),* http:://gmj.gallup.com

Aspinwall, L. G. (1998). Rethinking the role of positive affect in self-regulation. *Motivation and Emotion*, 22: 1-32

Aspinwall, L. G., Richter, L., & Hoffman III, R. R. (2001). Understanding how optimism works: An examination of optimists' adaptive moderation of belief and behavior. In E. C. Chang (Ed.) optimism *and pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice*. 217-238. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Assor, A. & Connell, J.P. (1992). The validity of students' self-reports as measures of

    performance affecting self-appraisals. In D.H. Schunk and J.L. Meece (Eds.),

    Student perceptions in the classroom. 25-47. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence

    Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and

    job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26.

Balthazard, P. Potter, R. & Warren, J. (2002). "The Effects of Extraversion and

    Expertise on Virtual Team Interaction and Performance," vol. 8, pp.269, 35th

    Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS'02)-

    Volume 8, 2002.

    http://www.computer.org/portal/web/csdl/doi/10.1109/HICSS.2002.994426

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership (Theory, research, and managerial*

    implications). New York: Free Press.

Blancero, D., J. Boroski, and L. Dyer. 1996. Key competences for a transformed

    human resource organization: Results of a field study. *Human Resource*

    Management Journal 35, no. 3: 383–403.

Block, J. (1995). A contrarian view of the five-factor approach to personality

    description. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 187-215.

Borkenau, P. & Ostendorf, F. (1990). Comparing exploratory and confirmatory factor

analysis: A study on the 5-factor model of personality. *Personality and*

Individual Differences, 11, 515-524.

Boudreau, J.W., Boswell, W.R. & Judge, T.A. (2001). Effects of personality on

executive career success in the Unites States and Europe. *Journal of*

Vocational Behavior, *58*(1), 53-81.

Bozionelos, N. (1996). Organizational promotion and career satisfaction.

Psychological Reports, 79(2), 371-375.

Brand, C.R. & Egan, V. (1989). The 'big five' dimensions of personality? Evidence

from ipsative, adjectival self-attributions. *Personality and Individual*

Differences, 10, 1165-1171.

Brief, Arthur P. (1998). *Attitudes in and around Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

Briggs, S. R. (1989). The optimum level of measurement of personality constructs.

In: Buss, D. M. and Cantor, N. (Eds.) *Personality psychology: recent trends*

and emerging directions, Springer, New York.

Burke, R.J. (2001). Organizational values, work experiences and satisfactions

among managerial and professional women. *Journal of Management*

Development, 20(4), 346-354.

Buss, D. M. (1996). Social adaptation and five major factors of personality. In J. S. (Eds.). *The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives*.   192-207.   New York: Guilford.

Career Strategists (2004). What we do. http://www.careerstrategists.net/what.html Retrieved November 30, 2009.

Carson, R.C. (1989). Personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 40*, 227-248.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2000). *Perspectives on Personality*. *4th edn*. Boston; London: Allyn and Bacon.

Cattell, R.B., Eber, H.W. & Tatsuoka, M.M. (1970). *Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality Ability Testing.

Chapman, D. (1982). Career satisfaction of teachers. *Educational Research Quarterly, 7*(3), 40-50.

Clawson, J.G. & Newburg. D.S. (2005). The motivator's dilemma. In *The future of human resource management*, ed. M. Losey, S. Meisinger, and D. Ulrich, 15–22. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI) and the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costa, P.T. Jr. & McCrae, R.R. (1988). From catalog to classification: Murray's needs and the five factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 258-265.

Costa, P.T. & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Services.

Cronbach, L. J. & Gleser, G. C. (1957). *Psychological Tests and Personnel Decisions,* University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.

De Raad, B. (2000). *The big five personality factors (The psycholexical approach to personality).* Seattle: Hogrefe & Huber.

DeNeve, K.M., and H. Cooper. 1998. *The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being.* Psychological Bulletin 95: 542–75.

De Hoogh, A. H., Den Hartog, D. N. & Koopman, P. L. (2005). Linking the Big Five-Factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership; perceived dynamic work environment as a moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 839-865.

Digman, J.M. (1985). *The big five factors of personality: Some efforts after meaning.* (Paper presented at the meeting of the Society of Multivariate Experimental Psychology, Berkeley, CA).

Digman, J.M. (1988). *Classical theories of trait organization and the big five factors of personality*. Presented at Annual Meeting of American Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.

Digman, J.M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41*, 417-440.

Eysenck, H.J. (1970). *The structure of human personality*. London: Methuen.

Eysenck, H.J. (1981). *A model for personality.* New York: Springer – Verlag.

Fiske, D.W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 44, 329-344.

Furnam, A., & Zacherl, M. (1986). Personality and job satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 7,* 453-359.

Furnham, A., Petrides, K.V., Tsaousis, I., Pappas, K., & Garrod, D. (2005). A cross cultural investigation into the relationships between personality traits and work values. *Journal of Psychology 139,* 5-32.

Garfinkel, P. E., Bagby, R. M., Schuller, D. R. Dickens, S. E., & Schulte, F.S. (2005) Predictors of professional and personal satisfaction with a career in psychiatry. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry--Original Research, 50(6),* 333-341.

Gattiker, U. E. & Larwood (1988). Predictors for managers' career mobility, success, and satisfaction. *Human Relations,* 41(8), 569-591

Geers, Handley & McLarney (2003). Discerning the role of optimism in persuasion: The valence-enhancement hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 554-465

Goff, M. & Ackerman, P.L. (1992). Personality-intelligence relations: Assessment of typical intellectual engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(4), 537-552.

Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 1216-1229.

Goldberg, L.R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist, 48*, 26-34.

Goulet, L.R. & Singh, P. (2002). Career commitment: A reexamination and an extension. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*, 73-91.

Graziano, W. G., & Eisenberg, N. h. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* 795-824. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Greenhaus, J.H., Parasuraman, S., Wormley, W. (1990), ""Organizational experiences and career success of black and white managers"", *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 64-86.

Guilford, J. P. & Fruchter, B. (1973) *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education.* New York: McGraw-Hill

Guilford, J.P. (1975). Factors and factors of personality. *Psychological Bulletin, 82*, 802-814.

Hall, D. T. (1976). *Careers in organizations*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear publishing.

Hampson, S. E., John, O. P. & Goldberg, L. R. (1986). Category breadth and hierarchical structure in personality: Studies of asymmetries in judgments of trait implications, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18, 135-164.

Hanson, J.G. & McCullagh, J.G. (1997). Satisfaction with the social work profession: A ten-year analysis of undergraduate students' perceptions. *Psychological Reports*, *80*, 835-838.

Harmon, L. W., Hansen, J. C., Borgen, F. H., & Hammer A. L. (1994). *Strong Interest Inventory: Applications and technical guide*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hirschfeld, R.R. & Field, H.S. (2000). Work centrality and work alienation: Distinct aspects of a general commitment to work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), 789-800.

Hogan, R.T. (1986). *Hogan Personality Inventory*. Minneapolis, MN: National

Computer Systems.

Hogan, F. & Roberts, B.W. (1996). Issues and non-issues in the fidelity-bandwidth trade-off. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*(6), 627 - 637.

Hogan, R.T. & Roberts, B.W. (2001). Introduction: Personality and industrial and organizational psychology. In R.T. Hogan and B.W. Roberts (Eds.), *Personality psychology in the workplace* 3-16. Baltimore: United Book Press.

Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Holland, J. L (1996). Exploring careers with a typology: What we have learned and some new directions. *American Psychologist*, *51*(4), 397-406.

Hoque, K., and N. Noon. 2001. 'Counting angels': a comparison of personnel and HR specialists. *Human Resource Management Journal 11*, no. 3: 5–22.

Hough, L. (1992) The big five personality variables--construct confusion: Description versus prediction, *Human Performance, 5*, 139-155.

Hoffman, T. (1999). The meanings of competency. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 23*, 275-286.

Jackson, D. N., Paunonen, S. V. & Rothstein, M. G. (1987). Personnel executives: Personality, vocational interests, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Employment Counseling,* 24(3), 82-96

Jiang, J. J. & Klein, G. (2000). Supervisor support and career anchor impact on the
     career satisfaction of the entry-level information systems professional.
     Journal of Management Information Systems/ winter 1999-2000, 16 (3), 219-
     240.

John, O.P. (1989). Towards a taxonomy of personality descriptors. In D. Buss & N.
     Cantor's (Eds.) *Personality psychology: Recent trends and emerging directions*.
     New York: Springer-Verlag.

John, O.P. (1990). The "big-five" taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural
     language and in questionnaires. In L. Pervin (ed.), *Handbook of personality
     theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York: Guilford Press.

John, O. P., & Srivistava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History,
     measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In E. Pervin & O. John (Eds.),
     Handbook of personality (pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.

Judge, T.A., & Bono, J.E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and
     transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 751-765.

Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D. (1995). An empirical
     investigation of the predictors of executive career success. *Personnel
     Psychology, 48*(3), 485-519.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002) Personality and

    Leadership: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review, *Journal of Applied*

    Psychology, Vol. 87, No. 4, 765-780.

Judge, T.A., Heller, D., & Mount, M.K. (2002) Five-factor model of personality and

    job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(3),* 530-

    541.

Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick, M. R. (1999). The Big Five

    personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life

    span. *Personnel Psychology,* 52: 3, 621-652.

Judge, T.A., Locke, E.A., Durham, C.C., & Kluger, A.N. (1998). Dispositional

    effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of*

    Applied Psychology, 83(1), 17-34.

Judge, T.A., Erez, A., Bono, J.E., & Thoresen, C.J. (2002). Are measures of self-

    esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy

    indicators of a common core construct? *Journal of Personality and Social*

    Psychology, 83(3), 693-710.

Jung, C.G. (1960) *The development of personality*. Princeton, New Jersey: Bollingen

    Series XX. Princeton University Press,

Kanfer, R., Ackerman, P. L., Murtha, T. & Goff, M. (1996). Personality and

    intelligence in industrial and organizational psychology. In: Saklofske, D. H.

and Zeidner, M. (Eds.) *International handbook of personality and intelligence*, Plenum Publishing, New York, in press.

Keng-Howe & Liao Ziqi (1999). Family structures on income and career satisfaction of Managers in Singapore. *Journal of Management Development*, *18 (5),* 464-476.

Koman, A. K. (1980). *Career success/personal failure.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Koscho, G. R. (2003). President's message. *Information Executive*, *7*(2), 1.

Lee, D. M. S., Trauth, E. M., & Farwell, D.   (1995). Critical skills and knowledge requirements of IS professionals: A joint academic industry investigation. *MIS Quarterly*, *19*(3), 313-340.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology.* 1297-1350. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Loevinger, J. (1994). In search of grand theory. *Psychological Inquiry, 5*, 142–144.

Logue, C. T., Lounsbury, J. W., Gupta, A., & Leong, F. T. (2007). Vocational interest themes and personality traits in relation to college major satisfaction of business students. *Journal of Career Development, 33,* 269-295.

Lounsbury, J.W., Tatum, H. E., Chambers, W., Owens, K., & Gibson, L.W. (1999).

    An investigation of career decidedness in relation to the "Big Five" personality

    constructs and life satisfaction. *College Student Journal, 33(4),* 646-652.

Lounsbury, J. W., Sundstrom, E., Loveland, J.M. & Gibson, L.W. (2003).

    Intelligence, 'Big Five' personality traits, and work drive as predictors of

    course grade. *Personality and Individual Differences* 35: 1231–1239.

Lounsbury, J. W., Sundstrom, E, Loveland, J. L., & Gibson, L. W. (2003a). Broad

    versus narrow personality traits in predicting academic performance of

    adolescents. *Learning and Individual Differences, 14,* 65-75.

Lounsbury, J. W., Sundstrom, E., Loveland, J. M., & Gibson, L. W. (2003b).

    Intelligence, "Big Five" personality traits, and work drive as predictors of

    course grade. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35,* 1231-1239.

Lounsbury, J. W., Loveland, J. M, Sundstrom, E. D., Gibson, L. W., Drost, A. W., &

    Hamrick, F. L. (2003). An investigation of personality traits in relation to

    career satisfaction. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *11*(3), 287-307.

Lounsbury, J. W., Gibson, L. W., & Hamrick, F. L. (2004). The development of a

    personological measure of work drive. *Journal of Business and Psychology,*

    18(4), 347-371.

Lounsbury, J. W., Park, S. H., Sundstrom, E., Williamson, J., & Pemberton, A. (2004) Personality, career satisfaction, and life satisfaction: Test of a directional model. *Journal of Career Assessment, 12,* 395-406.

Lounsbury, J. W., Gibson, L. W., Steel, R. P., Sundstrom, E. D. & Loveland, J. L. (2004). An Investigation of intelligence and personality in relation to career satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*(1), 181-189.

Lounsbury, J. W., Saudargas, R. A., Gibson, L.W., & Leong, F. T, (2005). An investigation of broad and narrow personality traits in relation to general and domain-specific life satisfaction of college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(6), 707-729.

Lounsbury, J. W., Moffitt, L., Gibson, L.W., Drost, A.W., & Stevens, M. (2007). An investigation to job and career satisfaction of information technology professionals. *Journal of Information Technology*, 00, 1-10.

Lounsbury, J. W., Steel, R. P., Gibson, L. W. & Drost, A. W. (2008). Personality traits and career satisfaction of human resource professionals. *Human Resource Development International*, *11(4)*, 351-366.

Mathis, R.L., and J.H. Jackson. (2002). *Human resource management: Essential perspectives.* Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.

McAdams, D.P. (1992). The five-factor model *in* personality: A critical appraisal. *Journal of Personality, 60*(2), 329-361.

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.

McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human

   universal. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 509-516.

McDougall, W. (1932). Of the words character and personality. *Character*

   Personality, 1, 3-16.

McIlroy, D., & Bunting, B. (2002). Personality, behavior, and academic

   achievement: Principles for educators to inculcate and students to model.

   Contemporary Educational Psychology, 27(2), 326-337.

Mischel,W, & Shoda,Y. (1995).A cognitive-affective system theory of personality:

   reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in

   personality structure. *Psychological review, 102(2)*, 246-268.

Mischel,W, & Shoda,Y. (1998). Reconciling processing dynamics and personality

   dispositions. *Annual review of psychology, 49*, 229-258,

Miller, M.J., Woehr, D.J., & Hudspeth, N. (2002). The meaning and measurement

   of work ethic: Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional

   inventory [Monograph]. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 60*, 451-489.

Montag, I., Schwimmer, M., (1990). Vocational interests and personality traits.

Man & Work, 2(2), 77-95.

Moon, H., Hollenbeck, J.R., Humphrey, S.E., & Maue, B. (2003). The tripartite

model of neuroticism and the suppression of depression and anxiety within an

escalation of commitment dilemma. *Journal of Personality, 71*(3), 347-368.

Morrow, J. M. (1971). A test of Holland's theory of vocational choice. *Journal of

Counseling Psychology, 18,* 422-425.

Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R. & Stewart, G. L., (1998). Five-Factor Model of

personality and Performance in Jobs Involving Interpersonal Interactions

Human Performance, 1532-7043, 11(2), 145 – 165

Nafziger, D. H., Holland, J. L., & Gottfredson, G. D. (1975). Student-college

congruency as a predictor of satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,

22*(2), 132-139.

Nathan, M. H., Rouce, S., & Lubin, B. (1979). Career satisfaction and satisfaction of

women psychologists in medical schools. *Professional Psychology*, *10*, 104-

109.

Niles, F.S. (1999). Toward a cross-cultural understanding of work-related beliefs.

Human Relations, 52(7), 855-867.

Norman, W.T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes:

Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of

Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 574-583.

Ones, D.S. & Viswesvaran, C. (1996). Bandwidth-fidelity dilemma in personality

measurement for personnel selection. *Journal of Organizational*

Behavior,17(6), 609-626.

O*NET (2009). O*NET online. Occupational Information Network. General

managers. Retrieved September 16, 2009 from

http://online.onetcenter.org/link/summary/11-1021.00.

Osigweh, C. A. B. (1989). Concept fallibility in organizational science, *Academy of*

Management Review, 14, 579-594.

Papenhausen, C. (2006). Half empty or half full: the effects of top managers'

dispositional optimism on strategic decision-making and firm performance,

Journal of Behavior Apply Manage, 7, 103–115.

Pappas, J. M., Flaherty, K. E. & Wooldridge, B. (2004). Tapping into Hospital

Champions: Strategic Middle Managers. *Health Care Management Review,*

29, 8-16.

Paunonen, S.V., Rothstein, M.G., & Jackson, D.N. (1999). Narrow reasoning about

the use of broad personality measures for personnel selection. *Journal of*

Organizational Behavior, 20, 389-405.

Paunonen, S.V. & Jackson, D.N. (2000). What is beyond the big five? Plenty!

Journal of Personality, 68(5), 821-835.

Paunonen, S.W. & Ashton, M.C. (2001a). Big five factors and facets and the

    prediction of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(3),

    524-539.

Paunonen, S.V. & Ashton, M.C. (2001b). Big five predictors of academic

    achievement. *Journal of Research in Personality, 35*, 78-90.

Peabody, D. & Goldberg, L.R. (1989). Some determinants of factor structures from

    personality-trait descriptors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*,

    552-567.

Piankoff, J. (1999) The Effects of Centralization, Formalization and Innovation Norms

    on Organizational Commitment, *Dissertation Abstract International* 60(4-B):

    1898 (University Microfilms International).

Pogson, C.E., Cober, A.B., Doverspike, D., & Rogers, J.R. (2003). Differences in self-

    reported work ethic across three career stages. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,*

    62(1), 189-201.

Reed, M. B., Bruch, M. A., & Haase, R. F. (2004). Five-factor model of personality

    and career exploration. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 12, 223-238

Richardsen, A.M., Mikkelsen, A., Burke, R.J. (1997). Work experiences and career

    and job satisfaction among professional and managerial women in Norway.

    Scandinavian Journal of Management, *13*(2), 209-218.

Robie, C., Brown, D. & Bly, P. (2005). The Big Five in the USA and Japan. *Journal of Management Development, 24* (8): 720-737.

Rogers, D.T., *The Work Ethic in Industrial America, 1850-1920*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1978. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Work_ethic)

Rosenbaum, J. E. (1985). Persistence and change in pay inequalities: Implications for job evaluation and comparable worth. In Larwood, L. Gutek, B.A. and Stromberg, A. (Eds.), *Women and work (1)*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1985, 115-140.

Rothstein, M.G., Paunonen, S.V., Rush, J.C. & King, G.A. (1994). Personality and cognitive ability predictors of performance in graduate business school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*(4), 516-530.

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies of internal versus external control of reinforcements. *Psychological Monographs*, 80.

Ryan, J.J. (2002). Work values and organizational citizenship behaviors: Values that work for employees and organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*(1), 123-132.

Sadler-Smith, E. Badger, B. & Leat, M. (2000). Physician heal thyself tension versus Satisfaction in personnel practitioners. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 10, 8-15.

Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European Community. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 82: 1, 607-620.

Saucier, G. & Goldberg, L.R. (1998). What is beyond the big five? *Journal of Personality, 66*(4), 495-524.

Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (2001). Optimism, pessimism, and psychological well-being. In E. C. Chang (Eds.). *Optimism & pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs.* Boston: Addison Wesley.

Schultz, D., & Schultz, S.E. (1994). *Theories of personality* (5th ed.) Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Schmidt, F. L. & Kaplan, L. B. (1971). Composite vs. multiple criteria: A review and resolution of the controversy, *Personnel Psychology, 24,* 419-434.

Schneider, B. （1987）. The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology* 40: 437–453.

Schneider, B. Goldstein, H.W. & Smith, D.B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology* 48: 747–779.

Segal, U. A. (1992). Values, personality and career choice. *Journal of Applied Social Sciences*, *16*(2), 143-159.

Seibert, S.E., Crant, J.M., & Kraimer, M.L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(3), 416-427.

Seibert, S. E. & Kramer, M. L. (2001). The five-factor model of personality and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *58*(1), 1-21.Seligman, M. E. P. (1991). *Learned optimism*. New York: Pocket Books.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1990). *Learned optimism*. New York: Pocket Books.

Schneider, R.J., Hourh, L.M. & Dunnette, M.D. (1996). Broadsided by broad traits: How to sink science in five dimensions or less. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*(6), 639-655.

Shaw, M. E., & Rutledge, P. (1976). Assertiveness training for managers. *Training and Development Journal,* 8-14.

Shoda, Y., & Mischel, W. (1993). Cognitive social approach to dispositional inferences: What if the perceiver is a cognitive-social theorist? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 574-585.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. *Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Sneed, T. G., Carlson, J. S., & Little, T. D. (1994). The relationship of teacher and parent ratings of academically related personality traits to academic performance in elementary age students. *Learning and Individual Differences, 6(1),* 37-64.

Spokane, A. R., & Derby, D. P. (1979). Congruence, personality pattern, and satisfaction in college women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 15, 36-42.

Stagner, R. (1937). *Psychology of personality*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 31, 56-77.

Stevens, C. D., Guthrie, J. P., Ash, R. A., & Coate, C. J. (2002). Does personality predict preferred managerial style? Evidence from New Zealand and the United States. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 40(3)*, 322-344

Stewart, G.L. (1999). Trait bandwidth and stages of job performance: Assessing differential effects for conscientiousness and its subtraits. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(6), 959-968.

Sturm, R. (2001). Are psychiatrists more dissatisfied with their careers than other physicians? *Psychiatric Services, 52*(5), 581.

Super, D.E. (1953) A theory of vocational development, *American Psychologist,* 8, 185-190.

Tellegen, A. (1985). Structures of mood and personality and their relevance to assessing anxiety with an emphasis on self-report. In Tuma A. H. and Maser J. D. (Eds.) *Anxiety and the anxiety disorders*, 681–706.

Tett, R. P., Jackson, D., N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as

predictors of job performance: a meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 703-742.

Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology,* 44, 703-742.

Tharenou, P. (1997). Explanations of managerial career advancement. *Australian Psychologist, 32*(1), 19-28.

Tichey, N.M. (1983). *Managing strategic change: Technical, political, and cultural dynamics.* New York: Wiley.

Tokar, D.M., Fischer, A.R., Subich, L.M. (1998). Personality and vocational behavior: A selective review of the literature, 1993-1997. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 53*, 115-153.

Tombaugh, J.R. (2005) "Positive leadership yields performance and profitability: Effective organizations develop their strengths," *Development and Learning in Organizations,* 19:3, 15-17

Tupes, E.C. & Christal, R.E. (1961). Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings. *Journal of Personality, 60*, 225-251.

Ulrich, D. 1997. *Human resource champions: The next agenda for adding value and delivering results*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Vasilopoulos, N. L., Cucina, J. M., Goldnberg, R., & Usala, P. D. (2002). *Personality and Training Proficiency: Issues of Bandwidth-Fidelity, Validity, and Curvilinearity*. Paper presented at the 17th meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Toronto, Canada.

Walfish, S., Polifka, J.A., & Stenmark, D.E. (1985). Career satisfaction in clinical psychology: A survey of recent graduates. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 16*(4), 576-580.

Wallace, J.E. (2001). The benefits of mentoring for female lawyers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 58: 3, 366-391.

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1997). Extraversion and its positive emotional core. In R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology.* 767-793. San Diego: Academic Press.

Watson, D., & Slack, A. K. (1993). General factors of affective temperament and their relation to job satisfaction over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 54,* 181-202.

Watson, J. B. (1913). Psychology as the behaviorist views it. *Psychological Review*, *20*, 158-177.

Wetherbe, J.C., Wetherbe, B. and Frolick, M. (1999). Mass customization and reward systems: Different strokes for different folks, *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, *39,* 29-37.

Wiggins, C. & Bowman, S. Y. (2000). Career success and life satisfaction for female and male healthcare managers. *Hospital topics: Research and perspectives on healthcare, 78 (3)* , 5-10.

Wiggins, J.S. & Trapnell, P.D. (1997). Personality structure: The return of the big five. In R. Hogan, J.A. Johnson, & S.R. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology*, 737-765, San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Williamson, J.M., Pemberton, A.E., & Lounsbury, J.W. (2005). An investigation of career and job satisfaction in relation to personality traits of information professionals. *Library Quarterly,* 75(2), 122-141.

Zak, I, Meir, E., & Kraemer, R. (1979). The common space of personality traits and vocational interests. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 43*(4), 424-428.

Zimbardo, P. G. & Gerrig, R.J. (1996*). Psychology and life* (14th ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Appendix

Table 1 Manager Correlations with Career Satisfaction

Correlations

		Career Satisfaction
Conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation	.166
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6042
Emotional Stability	Pearson Correlation	.330
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6042
Extraversion	Pearson Correlation	.241
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6042
Openness	Pearson Correlation	.149
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6042
Team Work	Pearson Correlation	.211
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6042
Assertiveness	Pearson Correlation	.078
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012
	N	6042
Customer Service	Pearson Correlation	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.523
	N	6042

Table 1 continued

Correlations

		Career Satisfaction
Image Management	Pearson Correlation	-.124
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6042
Intrinsic Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.032
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.308
	N	6042
Optimism	Pearson Correlation	.336
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6042
Work Drive	Pearson Correlation	.171
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6042
Visionary Style	Pearson Correlation	.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.083
	N	6042
Career Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	6042

Table 2 Results of Descriptive Statistics and *t* test for Manager and Non-Manager

	Occupations	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Openness	Non-manager	48726	3.7311	.69641	-5.878	8392	.000
	managers	6042	3.8654	.64581	-6.221	1407.004	.000
Conscientiousness	Non-managers	48726	3.3431	.69942	-.168	8392	.867
	managers	6042	3.3469	.66643	-.174	1386.608	.862
Emotional Stability	Non-managers	48726	3.4022	.72732	-6.076	8392	.000
	managers	6042	3.5469	.65907	-6.543	1425.359	.000
Team Work	Non-managers	48726	3.4660	.77439	-10.183	8392	.000
	managers	6042	3.7250	.72392	-10.712	1400.826	.000
Extraversion	Non-managers	48726	3.7196	.78214	-7.426	8392	.000
	managers	6042	3.9105	.73646	-7.770	1395.382	.000
Assertiveness	Non-managers	48726	3.4546	.86607	-11.899	8392	.000
	managers	6042	3.7914	.77274	-12.962	1438.213	.000
Image Management	Non-managers	48726	2.5576	.80630	-3.714	8392	.000
	managers	6042	2.6560	.75125	-3.917	1403.361	.000
Intrinsic Motivation	Non-managers	48726	3.5471	.80208	2.836	8392	.005
	managers	6042	3.4720	.78292	2.888	1369.441	.004

Table 2 continued

	Occupations	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Optimism	Non-managers	48726	3.7794	.79397	-5.920	8392	.000
	managers	6042	3.9324	.67904	-6.656	1475.665	.000
Work Drive	Non-managers	48726	3.2886	.79243	-9.624	8392	.000
	managers	6042	3.5403	.77293	-9.806	1369.957	.000
Customer Service Orientation	Non-managers	48726	4.2567	.55103	-1.549	8392	.121
	managers	6042	4.2854	.60982	-1.435	1293.418	.151
Visionary Style	Non-managers	48726	2.8795	.77112	-3.716	8392	.000
	managers	6042	2.9740	.74714	-3.806	1374.623	.000
Career Satisfaction	Non-managers	48726	3.3516	.94740	-4.900	8490	.000
	managers	6042	3.5036	.87004	-5.225	1409.504	.000

Table 3 Total Sample (Career Satisfaction not considered)
Managers higher than non-managers on everything except Customer Service and Intrinsic Motivation (they are lower).

Group Statistics

	Occupations	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Openness	Non-manager	48726	3.7980	.67574	.00306
	managers	6042	3.9355	.63508	.00787
Conscientiousness	Non-managers	48726	3.3302	.70772	.00321
	managers	6042	3.3853	.68758	.00852
Emotional Stability	Non-managers	48726	3.4393	.71195	.00323
	managers	6042	3.6197	.65305	.00809
Team Work	Non-managers	48726	3.5161	.77187	.00350
	managers	6042	3.7703	.72819	.00902
Extraversion	Non-managers	48726	3.7719	.77715	.00352
	managers	6042	3.9708	.70362	.00872
Assertiveness	Non-managers	48726	3.5385	.82910	.00376
	managers	6042	3.9304	.66786	.00828
Image Management	Non-managers	48726	2.5968	.81160	.00368
	managers	6042	2.6616	.77879	.00965
Intrinsic Motivation	Non-managers	48726	3.5013	.80875	.00366
	managers	6042	3.4614	.78722	.00976

Table 3 continued

Group Statistics

	General Managers	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Optimism	Non-Manager	48726	3.8114	.77306	.00350
	Manager	6042	3.9947	.67336	.00834
Work Drive	Non-manager	48726	3.3205	.78930	.00358
	Manager	6042	3.6335	.72560	.00899
Customer Service Orientation	Non-manager	48726	4.3202	.46964	.00213
	Manager	6042	4.4175	.44788	.00555
Visionary Style	Non-manager	48726	2.9291	.77274	.00350
	Manager	6042	3.0240	.76121	.00943
Career Satisfaction	Non-manager	48726	3.3516	.94740	.01098
	Manager	6042	3.5036	.87004	.02695

Table 4 *t*-test for Equality of Means

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
						95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Lower	Upper
Openness	39.041	.000	-15.531	55236	.000	-.15487	-.12016
			-16.285	8604.062	.000	-.15407	-.12096
Conscientiousness	14.073	.000	-5.918	55236	.000	-.07332	-.03684
			-6.050	8462.588	.000	-.07292	-.03723
Emotional Stability	77.867	.000	-19.385	55236	.000	-.19862	-.16214
			-20.706	8714.294	.000	-.19746	-.16330
Team Work	27.846	.000	-25.123	55236	.000	-.27403	-.23436
			-26.266	8587.277	.000	-.27317	-.23523
Extraversion	133.817	.000	-19.611	55236	.000	-.21883	-.17906
			-21.157	8775.958	.000	-.21738	-.18051
Assertiveness	558.731	.000	-36.585	55236	.000	-.41283	-.37085
			-43.114	9415.964	.000	-.40966	-.37403

Table 4 continued

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
						95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Lower	Upper
Image Management	36.512	.000	-6.081	55236	.000	-.08570	-.04392
			-6.276	8514.251	.000	-.08506	-.04457
Intrinsic Motivation	4.722	.030	3.748	55236	.000	.01902	.06072
			3.826	8454.913	.000	.01944	.06029
Optimism	219.745	.00	-18.228	55236	.000	-.20296	-.16355
			-20.251	8969.652	.000	-.20100	-.16552
Work Drive	96.703	.00	-30.330	55236	.000	-.33319	-.29274
			-32.342	8704.033	.000	-.33193	-.29399
Customer Service Orientation	84.304	.00	-15.784	55236	.000	-.10936	-.08520
			-16.367	8540.527	.000	-.10893	-.08563
Visionary Style	2.946	.086	-9.325	55236	.000	-.11485	-.07496
			-9.432	8406.648	.000	-.11463	-.07518
Career Satisfaction	12.825	.000	-4.900	8490	.000	-.21288	-.09122
			-5.225	1409.504	.000	-.20914	-.09496

101

Table 5

Results of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Big Five Personality Variables Predicting career satisfaction

Step	Variable	Multiple R	R-Square	R Square Change	Sig. F Change
1	Emotional Stability	.307(a)	.094	.094	.00
2	Emotional Stability, Extraversion	.321(b)	.103	.009	.00
3	Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Agreeableness	.336(c)	.113	.010	.00
4	Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness	.339(d)	.115	.002	.00
5	Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness	.339(e)	.115	.000	.35

a. Predictors: Emotional Stability

b. Predictors: Emotional Stability, Extraversion

Table 6: Results of a multiple regression predicting career satisfaction with the Big Five

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.339[a]	.115	.114	.98516	.115	145.754	5	5607	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Team Work, Conscientiousness, Openness, Emotional Stability, Extraversion

b. Dependent Variable: Career Satisfaction

Table 7 Results of a Multiple Regression Predicting Career Satisfaction with Extraversion, Emotional Stability, and Conscientiousness as Predictors.

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.324[a]	.105	.104	.99071	.105	218.687	3	5609	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, entered as a set

b. Dependent Variable: Career Satisfaction

Table 8 Results of a Multiple Regression Predicting Career Satisfaction with Openness and Agreeableness as Predictors.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.191[a]	.036	.036	1.02773	.036	105.923	2	5610	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Team Work, Openness entered as a set

b. Dependent Variable: Career Satisfaction

Table 9 Results of a Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Career Satisfaction with the Big Five personality traits

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.180[a]	.032	.032	1.02972	.032	188.309	1	5611	.000
2	.191[b]	.036	.036	1.02773	.004	22.804	1	5610	.000
3	.332[c]	.110	.110	.98760	.074	466.139	1	5609	.000
4	.336[d]	.113	.112	.98634	.002	15.312	1	5608	.000
5	.339[e]	.115	.114	.98516	.002	14.429	1	5607	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Team Work

b. Predictors: (Constant), Team Work, Openness

c. Predictors: (Constant), Team Work, Openness, Emotional Stability

d. Predictors: (Constant), Team Work, Openness, Emotional Stability, Conscientiousness

e. Predictors: (Constant), Team Work, Openness, Emotional Stability, Conscientiousness, Extraversion

Table 10 Results of Multiple Regressions Predicting Career Satisfaction with the Narrow Personality Traits

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.350[a]	.123	.121	.98114	.123	97.982	8	5604	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Image Management, Assertiveness, Visionary Style, Work Drive, Intrinsic Motivation, Customer Service Orientation, Optimism

b. Dependent Variable: Career Satisfaction

Table 11 Hierarchical Regression Predicting Career Satisfaction entering Narrow Personality Traits

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.307[a]	.094	.094	.99624	.094	584.658	1	5611	.000
2	.321[b]	.103	.103	.99139	.009	56.061	1	5610	.000
3	.327[c]	.107	.107	.98944	.004	23.096	1	5609	.000
4	.338[d]	.114	.113	.98562	.007	44.529	1	5608	.000
5	.344[e]	.118	.117	.98343	.004	26.058	1	5607	.000
6	.350[f]	.122	.121	.98125	.004	25.988	1	5606	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Optimism

b. Predictors: (Constant), Optimism, Customer Service Orientation

c. Predictors: (Constant), Optimism, Customer Service Orientation, Assertiveness

d. Predictors: (Constant), Optimism, Customer Service Orientation, Assertiveness,
Intrinsic Motivation

e. Predictors: (Constant), Optimism, Customer Service Orientation, Assertiveness, Intrinsic Motivation,
Work Drive

f. Predictors: (Constant), Optimism, Customer Service Orientation, Assertiveness, Intrinsic Motivation, Work
Drive, Visionary Style

Table 12 Hierarchical Regression predicting Career Satisfaction entering Broad and Narrow Personality Traits

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.380[a]	.145	.143	.96917	.145	72.895	13	5599	.000

a. Predictors: all broad and narrow personality traits

Table 13 Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression for the Big Five Personality variables predicting Career Satisfaction

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.307[a]	.094	.094	.99640	.094	582.674	1	5611	.000
2	.321[b]	.103	.103	.99161	.009	55.352	1	5610	.000
3	.336[c]	.113	.112	.98618	.010	62.985	1	5609	.000
4	.339[d]	.115	.114	.98515	.002	12.654	1	5608	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Stability

b. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Stability, Extraversion

c. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Team Work

d. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Team Work,

Conscientiousness

VITA

Wei Xiong was born in Sichuan, China. She attended public schools in Chengdu, Sichuan; and graduated from Chengdu University of Technology, China with a Bachelor of Arts in Law. After received her Bachelor degree, Ms. Xiong left China to pursue a Ph.D. degree in Educational Psychology at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, U.S.A. After one year study, Ms. Xiong decided to transfer to Applied Industrial Psychology major in Experimental Program in the Department of Psychology at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

At the University of Tennessee, Ms. Xiong served as Teaching Assistant and Research Assistant. She pursued research in the area of personality. While in her Ph.D. program, Ms. Xiong conducted several industrial-organizational consulting projects; these included work at a large manufacturing corporation and a local manufacturing plant which also has global operations. After receiving her Ph.D., Ms. Xiong plans to teach full time in Psychology and pursue industrial-organizational psychology consulting projects.