AN INVESTIGATION OF CAREER AND JOB SATISFACTION IN RELATION TO PERSONALITY TRAITS OF INFORMATION PROFESSIONALS
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This study collected data on personality characteristics, job satisfaction, and career satisfaction from more than 1,300 information professionals. Respondents included academic reference librarians, archivists, catalogers, distance education librarians, public librarians, records managers, school media specialists, special librarians, systems librarians, and other information professionals who responded to listserv requests or picked up questionnaires at a national library conference. Significant correlations were obtained between personality variables and both career and job satisfaction. Stepwise regression analyses were performed, revealing that five variables (Optimism, Emotional Stability, Teamwork, Visionary Work Style, and Work Drive) accounted for 20 percent of the variance in job satisfaction. Four variables accounted for 19 percent of the variance in career satisfaction (Optimism, Work Drive, Emotional Resilience, and Assertiveness). Hierarchical regression analyses were performed to test Lounsbury et al.’s general composite measure of Emotional Resilience, Work Drive, and Optimism as predictors of job and career satisfaction. These variables accounted for 18 percent of the variance in job satisfaction and 19 percent of the variance in career satisfaction. Recommendations for employers to help with hiring and managing information professionals were made.

The career and job satisfaction of librarians and other information professionals is an important topic for library administrators, library and information sciences faculty, and individuals working in these careers. Job
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satisfaction, as conceptualized in the current study, refers to satisfaction with one’s present job. Career satisfaction is satisfaction with one’s career as a whole [1, 2]. While many variables contribute to career and job satisfaction [3–6], the present study focuses on personality traits, that is, relatively enduring characteristics of individuals that are relatively consistent over time and across situations [7]. Researchers in disciplines outside the field of library science have demonstrated that personality traits are important contributors to career and job satisfaction [1, 8, 9], and the present study extends this line of research to library science. We offer the personality findings in this study with caution since they are aggregated for many different specialties within the information profession. Future reports by the present authors will focus on differences among the specialties.

Career and Job Satisfaction: An Overview

C. L. Hulin and T. A. Judge, in their discussion of the literature on job attitudes, point out “there are more individual variables that may be regarded as antecedents or consequences of job attitudes than can be reasonably discussed in this chapter” [10]. E. A. Locke, who authored a seminal article, “The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction” [11], found that, at the time of that study, there were 3,350 articles or dissertations on job satisfaction. To help the reader gain an overview of the literature of job satisfaction, we summarize the six models of job satisfaction presented by Hulin and Judge. First, the Cornell Model, which was developed by P. Smith, L. Kendall, and C. Hulin [12], focused on the importance of frames of reference in mediating other factors in the formation of job/work role evaluations. Past experiences may explain why some individuals rate apparently undesirable jobs highly and others express dissatisfaction with apparently desirable jobs. J. W. Thibaut and H. W. Kelley [13] focused on the importance of comparison levels in determining job satisfaction. If job role outcomes are less than expectations (comparison levels), the job will be perceived as dissatisfying. If job role outcomes are higher than expected, the job will be perceived as satisfying. Locke’s Value-Percept Model [11] included a formula expressing job satisfaction as Satisfaction = (want–have) × importance. “Want” was referred to as value content, and “have” was referred to as “perceived amount of value provided by the job.” “Importance” represented the importance of the value to the individual. The Job Characteristics Model [14] focused on the importance of enriching job characteristics in producing job satisfaction. The five important enriching characteristics were task identity (being able to see one’s work from beginning to end), task significance (one’s work is seen as important and significant), skill variety, autonomy, and feedback.
(degree to which the employee receives feedback about his or her performance). So-called Disposition Influences Models of job satisfaction have focused on factors such as the “gripe index” [15] and, more recently, positive affectivity and negative affectivity. Positively affective individuals are often jovial, self-assured, and attentive. Negatively affective individuals tend to experience fear, sadness, guilt, and hostility [16]. Judge, Locke, and C. C. Durham [17] focused on core self-evaluations (an individual’s fundamental beliefs about herself and her functioning in the world), another dispositional influence on job satisfaction. Finally, the last model of job satisfaction discussed by Hulin and Judge [10] is Person-Environment Fit. “Person-environment fit models emphasize complex multivariate interactions between person and environmental characteristics as determinants of job satisfaction” [10, p. 266].

The multitude of theories about job satisfaction and the vast empirical literature base make it impossible for any single study to take all relevant variables into account. Hulin and Judge provide a commonly accepted theoretical specification of job satisfaction: “Job satisfactions are multidimensional psychological responses to one’s job” [10, p. 255]. The complexity of job satisfactions leads us to limit our area of inquiry to the role of information professionals’ personality factors in job satisfaction.

In line with Judge et al.’s [18] description of career satisfaction, we treated it as one of the “intrinsic” (subjectively defined) elements of career success. Judge et al. distinguish between career and job satisfaction, as do we, defining job satisfaction as satisfaction with the present job and career satisfaction as satisfaction with one’s career as a whole. Career satisfaction is a broader construct than job satisfaction because it encompasses all the jobs that an individual has worked. We examined both job satisfaction and career satisfaction in this study; the two are interpretable as overlapping but different constructs because they are correlated .58 in the study, which represents only 34 percent shared variance between the two constructs.

Job Satisfaction among Librarians

In summarizing the literature on job satisfaction in the library field from the 1970s and 1980s, S. G. Nandy [19] concluded, “it may be said that characteristics of both the individual and the job appear to be related to job satisfaction, but they are intercorrelated to such an extent that it is extremely difficult to isolate them for scientific investigation” [19, p. 214]. This point applies to later research on librarians’ job satisfaction as well, with studies focusing on job characteristics, individual characteristics, or both. For example, M. Mirfakhrai [20] collected background demographic characteristics of academic librarians and also used the Job Descriptive
Index to measure their job satisfaction. This instrument focuses on the work itself, supervision, pay, coworkers, and opportunities for promotion. D. S. Bengston and D. Shields [6] focused on job variables such as management style and wealth/collection size while replicating M. P. Marchant's predictive model of faculty evaluations of the library [21]. Job satisfaction among librarians was predicted by participative management style and collection size. Satisfaction among librarians led to higher university faculty ratings of the library. A. J. Bloom and C. W. McCawley [22] surveyed public librarians and administrators and found differences between the two groups on satisfaction with job characteristics (pay, communication and decision making, job structure, and the future). L. Estabrook, C. Bird, and F. L. Gilmore [4] studied the use of technology in relation to job stress with job satisfaction. They also measured extrinsic rewards (job characteristics such as income and opportunity for advancement), intrinsic rewards (individual factors such as amount of discretion over work and social integration), and likes and dislikes. Race, social integration, income, and job stress regressed significantly on job satisfaction for professionals. B. P. Lynch and J. Verdin studied contextual factors of job satisfaction in the 1987 replication of their previous study [3]. Factors included gender, tenure (years worked in the particular library), career commitment, supervisory level, functional department, and occupational group (nonprofessional or professional). In the replication, career orientation, supervisory level, departmental affiliation, and occupational group were significantly associated with job satisfaction. Lynch and Verdin also found that job routineness was significantly correlated with job satisfaction. D. H. Waters [23] studied the relationship between thirteen aspects of work (varied, interesting, closely supervised, regimented, challenging, simple, independent, hack, fragmented, routine, repetitive, creative, and exciting) and job satisfaction.

Using the act-frequency approach, G. Allen [24] developed a taxonomy of acts of librarians who fit their job well. Many of these acts described individual characteristics, such as keeping current in the professional literature or responding positively to change. B. Horenstein [5] focused on job characteristics, investigating the relationship between faculty status and job satisfaction among academic librarians. She found that there was a variety of differences between the satisfaction with aspects of their job of librarians without faculty status or rank, of those who had either faculty status or rank, and of those who had both faculty status and rank. Differences were also obtained between these three groups on their participation in professional activities. G. J. Leckie and J. Brett replicated Horenstein's work, applying it to a Canadian sample [25].
Job Satisfaction and Personality

Job satisfaction has been correlated with a variety of personality traits in psychology. Trait systems studied in relation to job satisfaction include the Big Five Personality Traits [26]; H. J. Eysenck's Personality System [27] (Psychoticism, Extraversion, and Neuroticism; see also D. M. Tokar and L. M. Subich [28], A. Furnham and M. Zacherl [29], and Furnham et al. [30]). Most recently, J. W. Lounsbury et al. [2] studied a diverse sample of 5,932 individuals in fourteen separate occupational groups and found that job satisfaction was significantly related to Assertiveness, Conscientiousness, Customer Service Commitment, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Openness, Optimism, Tough-Mindedness, and Work Drive.4

Career Satisfaction and Personality

Although P. Tharenou [31] noted that few studies of career satisfaction have taken a personological approach, Judge et al. [1], J. W. Boudreau, W. R. Boswell, and Judge [8] and S. E. Seibert and M. L. Kramer [9] investigated the “Big Five” personality traits in relation to career satisfaction. Their findings established the importance of personality variables in accounting for variation in intrinsic career success. Also, Lounsbury et al. [2] found that career satisfaction was significantly related to Assertiveness, Conscientiousness, Customer Service Commitment, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Openness, Optimism, Tough-Mindedness, and Work Drive, with most of the variance in career satisfaction across occupations being accounted for by Emotional Stability, Work Drive, and Optimism.

Personality Studies among Librarians

Personality traits of librarians and other information professionals have been studied since 1948 [32–34], but until now, there has been no comprehensive effort to relate job or career satisfaction to personality characteristics of librarians or other information professionals. The largest study of librarians’ personality characteristics was M. J. Scherdin’s 1992 survey of 1,600 satisfied librarians with master’s degrees in library or information science [35]. Scherdin employed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and found that librarians were most frequently Introverted Sensing Thinking Judging (ISTJ) and Introverted Intuiting Thinking Judging (INTJ) types 4. These traits are defined in the methods section of this article.
(16.5 percent and 11.5 percent, respectively). Both types shared the characteristics of being logical, productive, and reflective, Scherdin pointed out, while they differed on the Sensing/Intuitive scale. “Sensing (S) types are drawn to occupations that let them use their practical skills, where they can deal with facts. Intuitive (N) like situations in which they look at possibilities, think independently, and problem-solve at a systems level” [35, p. 134]. Another study by A. Goulding et al. focused on 239 information and library science students in the United Kingdom [33]. These students were administered the Sixteen Personality Factors instrument (Cattell) and were found to be “less abstract thinking and bright, less affected by feelings, less submissive and humble, but more tender minded and sensitive, more trusting and accepting, more imaginative, more insecure and self-blaming, more socially precise, and more relaxed and tranquil than the normative population” [33, p. 19]. For other studies of personality traits among librarians, see J. Agada’s review [32].

Research Goals

The present study was undertaken not only as a partial replication of the previous studies of personality correlates of career satisfaction but also as an extension of prior results in other occupational fields by examining additional personality variables in relation to career and job satisfaction for information professionals. There are, of course, many personality traits one could study in this context. We followed the guidelines of R. J. Schneider, L. M. Hough, and M. D. Dunnette [36] in selecting for study personality traits that have been found in previous research to be related to career and job satisfaction and that appear to be relevant for the general type of work performed by information professionals. Accordingly, we had the following five research goals:

1. To examine whether the personality traits of Adaptability, Assertiveness, Autonomy, Conscientiousness, Customer Service Commitment, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Openness, Optimism, Teamwork, Tough-Mindedness, Visionary Work Style, and Work Drive are significantly related to job satisfaction for information professionals.

2. To examine whether the personality traits of Adaptability, Assertiveness, Autonomy, Conscientiousness, Customer Service Commitment, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Openness, Optimism, Teamwork, Tough-Mindedness, Visionary Work Style, and Work Drive are significantly related to career satisfaction for information professionals.

3. To examine the amount of variance in job satisfaction that can be accounted for by these personality traits.
CAREER AND JOB SATISFACTION

4. To examine the amount of the variance in career satisfaction that can be accounted for by these personality traits.

5. To attempt to replicate, for information professionals, Lounsbury et al.’s finding of the importance of Emotional Resilience, Optimism, and Work Drive in relation to job satisfaction and career satisfaction [2].

Method

Participants
The participants for this study consisted of a nonrandom sample of 1,352 librarians and information science professionals who responded to print or e-mail solicitations to fill out the personality inventory. The inventory was available in print form, as an e-mail attachment, and as a Web form. Subjects were solicited via e-mail messages to LIBNT-L, TLA-L, EBSS-L, New Breed Librarian, SYSLIB-L, AUTOCAT, CHILD_LIT, ARCHIVES-L, RECMGMT-L, and OFFCAMP during the summer and fall of 2002, and through print surveys left on tables at a national librarians’ conference (annual American Library Association conference, summer 2002). Nonrandom samples do not permit inferences about the populations from which they are derived [37] but are widely used in applied social science research, especially in correlational designs such as the present one. The Institutional Review Board human subjects’ permission was received to conduct this study, and all subjects’ data were kept confidential. Respondents who indicated that they wished to receive individualized feedback were sent via e-mail a Microsoft Word document interpreting their scores on the inventory.

Although geographic locale was not included in the inventory, e-mail extensions indicated that the sample was international in scope, including subjects from Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, the United States, and other countries. Those participants who did not work in a professional library or information science position were deleted from the sample. For example, library science students, library technicians or paraprofessionals, clerks, and business analysts were not included. The following demographic information was collected about respondents: job title (which included an “Other” choice and a blank to enter current profession), years employed in present job, and years employed in an information profession. One of the job title choices, “Medical or Law Librarian,” was expanded to encompass “Special Librarian” during data analysis. Those respondents who chose the “Other” category for the job title question, because of multiple job titles, were arbitrarily assigned to the category for one of their job titles.
TABLE 1
Demographic Characteristics of the Information Profession Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reference librarian</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archivist</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records manager</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public librarian</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School librarian</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special librarian</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems librarian</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloger</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance education librarian</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other information professional</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in current position:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–5</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years as an information professional:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–5</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

when possible. No further demographic data were collected. The demographic data are summarized in table 1.

Inventory
Subject matter experts in information professions were consulted during the development of the personality inventory. These experts were asked to list the traits of successful members of the information professions studied. The authors measured these traits using relevant components of the Personal Style Inventory (PSI) [38], a proprietary work-based normal personality measurement system. The PSI consisted of 101 questions measuring sixteen scales: Adaptability, Assertiveness, Autonomy, Conscientiousness, Customer Service, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Openness, Optimism, Teamwork, Tough-Mindedness, Visionary Work Style, and Work Drive. Table 2 provides a brief construct definition for the personality traits measured by our inventory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Potential Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Refers to a person being flexible and able to make on-the-spot adjustments to different situations. High scorers are able to go with the flow, respond flexibly to changing circumstances, and function comfortably with change. Low scorers tend to be more rigid and inflexible, preferring to work in unchanging settings with predictable outcomes.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flexibility may be important to information professionals due to the ever-changing nature of their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>Refers to a person’s ability to assert him/herself, taking charge of situations, speaking up on matters of importance, defending personal beliefs, and being forceful.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assertiveness may be important for information professionals in leadership or public service roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>A disposition to function autonomously and in a self-directed manner on one’s job; to make work decisions and choose a course of action without reliance on others.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Autonomy may be necessary for information professionals who work alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Refers to a person’s conscientiousness, reliability, trustworthiness, and readiness to internalize company norms and values.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Conscientiousness may be useful to information professionals who need to uphold policies and rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Orientation</td>
<td>Striving to provide highly responsive, personalized, quality service to [internal and external] customers; putting the customer first; and trying to satisfy the customer, even if it means going above and beyond the normal job description or policy.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Customer service orientation may be helpful to information professionals who deal with the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Resilience</td>
<td>Overall level of adjustment and emotional resilience in the face of job stress and pressure. This can be conceptualized as the inverse of neuroticism.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Emotional resilience may help information professionals deal with stress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Tendency to be sociable, outgoing, gregarious, warm-hearted, and talkative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Receptivity/openness to change, innovation, new experience, and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Refers to a person having an optimistic, hopeful outlook concerning prospects, people, and the future even in the face of difficulty and adversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Propensity for working as part of a team and cooperatively on work group efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough-Mindedness</td>
<td>Appraising information and making work decisions based on logic, facts, and data, rather than feelings, values or intuition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Drive</td>
<td>Disposition to work long hours (including overtime) and an irregular schedule; greater investment of one's 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary vs. Operational Work Style</td>
<td>Refers to a work style which emphasizes creating an organizational vision and mission, developing corporate strategy, identifying long-term goals, and planning for future contingencies versus an operational work style which focuses on day-to-day activities and accomplishments, short-term goals, current problems, and implementation of plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Extraversion may help information professionals in public service or leadership roles.
- Openness may aid information professionals who must learn on their jobs.
- Optimism may be helpful to information professionals in dealing with coworkers and the public.
- Teamwork may be helpful to information professionals who must work in teams.
- Tough-mindedness may be helpful to information professionals who must solve technical problems.
- Work drive may be important to ambitious individuals in information professions.
- Information professionals who must do long-range planning may benefit from a visionary work style. Information professionals who must deal with routine operations and be attentive to details may benefit from an operational work style.
All scale items have been used extensively in a wide range of organizations and have been validated for a variety of jobs [2, 38, 39]. Following the work of M. J. Schmit et al. [40], some of the questions were especially contextualized for the information science professions for this study. An example of a question that was contextualized is the following:

| Given the chance, I would be much more interested in activities like developing procedures, specifying work practices, and allocating resources for the library or organization. 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Given the chance, I would be much more interested in activities like creating an inspiring vision for the future of the library or organization. |

In addition to these personality variables, there were two questions measuring Career Satisfaction (one’s satisfaction with one’s career as a whole) and eight questions measuring Job Satisfaction (one’s satisfaction with one’s current job). One of the career satisfaction items was similar to the one used by Lounsbury et al. [2] to establish personality-career satisfaction relationships that were validated across occupations; the Job Satisfaction items were previously used by J. W. Lounsbury and L. L. Hoopes [41]. The Job and Career Satisfaction measures correlated .58 in this study, which means that they shared only 34 percent common variance and can be considered separate variables. The number of questions adds up to 100, rather than 101, because there was also a Life Satisfaction question not analyzed in the present study.

Results

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics and coefficient alphas of the study variables. The coefficient alphas for eight of the measures were greater than .80, with somewhat lower alphas observed for Autonomy (.69) and Career Satisfaction (.69), which is probably the result of the small number of items in each measure (three and two, respectively). More modest coefficient alphas were also observed for Conscientiousness (.64) and Customer Service (.66). The correlations among the study variables are also reported in table 3.

Interestingly, all of the personality measures were significantly related to Career Satisfaction, ranging from a low of \( r = -.05 \) \((P < .05)\) for Tough-Mindedness to a high of \( r = .36 \) \((P < .01)\) for Optimism. Ten of the 13 personality measures correlated significantly with Job Satisfaction, with the

5. Coefficient alphas are a measure of the reliability of a scale [42].
6. The \( r \) figure is the correlation between two variables [42].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient Alpha</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.86012</td>
<td>.72262</td>
<td>.62206</td>
<td>.53111</td>
<td>.73474</td>
<td>.82492</td>
<td>.62695</td>
<td>.85903</td>
<td>.86018</td>
<td>.77782</td>
<td>.80642</td>
<td>.78389</td>
<td>.71709</td>
<td>1.00076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note.</td>
<td>Sample sizes for the above correlations ranged between 1,346 and 1,352.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P<.05$.  
** $P<.01$.  

Note.—Sample sizes for the above correlations ranged between 1,346 and 1,352.
### TABLE 4
Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression for Predicting Job Satisfaction from Personality Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td>.158**</td>
<td>.158**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Emotional Resilience</td>
<td>.419**</td>
<td>.176**</td>
<td>.018**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td>.010**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Visionary-Operational</td>
<td>.437**</td>
<td>.191**</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work Drive</td>
<td>.442**</td>
<td>.196**</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—$N$ = 1,346–52
* $P < .05$.
** $P < .01$.

Tables 4 and 5 display the results of stepwise multiple regression analyses with the personality traits serving as the predictor variables and the Job Satisfaction and Career Satisfaction measures serving, respectively, as the criterion variables. As can be seen in table 4, five variables significantly entered the equation, with Optimism, Emotional Resilience, Teamwork, Visionary Work Style, and Work Drive collectively producing a multiple correlation of $R = .442$ ($P < .01$), accounting for 19 percent of the variance in Job Satisfaction. As can be seen in table 5, four variables significantly entered the equation, with Optimism, Work Drive, Emotional Resilience, and Assertiveness collectively producing a multiple correlation of $R = .435$ ($P < .01$), accounting for 18 percent of the variance in Career Satisfaction.

### TABLE 5
Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression for Predicting Career Satisfaction from Personality Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.127**</td>
<td>.127**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work Drive</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td>.168**</td>
<td>.040**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Emotional Resilience</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td>.018**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—$N$ = 1,346–52
* $P < .05$.
** $P < .01$.

7. “Specifically, the aim of a regression analysis is to derive an equation relating a dependent and an explanatory variable or, more commonly, several explanatory variables. The derived equation may sometimes be used solely for prediction, but more often its primary purpose is as a way of establishing the relative importance of the explanatory variable(s) in determining the response variable, that is, in establishing a useful model to describe the data” [42, p. 161].
TABLE 6
RESULTS OF HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR PREDICTING JOB SATISFACTION FROM PERSONALITY TRAITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emotional Resilience, Work Drive, Optimism</td>
<td>.424**</td>
<td>.180**</td>
<td>.180**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>.436**</td>
<td>.190**</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visionary-Operational</td>
<td>.442**</td>
<td>.196**</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—$N = 1,346–52$.
** $P < .01$.

and Assertiveness producing a multiple correlation of $R = .435$ ($P < .01$), accounting for 19 percent of the variance in Career Satisfaction.

To evaluate the generalizability of Lounsbury et al.’s [2] general composite of Emotional Resilience, Work Drive, and Optimism as predictive of career and job satisfaction, we entered these as a set into multiple regression analyses followed by the other measures, which were allowed to enter the regression equation in stepwise fashion. Tables 6 and 7 display the results of these analyses for Job Satisfaction and Career Satisfaction, respectively.

As can be seen in table 6, in the case of Job Satisfaction, the set of Emotional Resilience, Optimism, and Work Drive produced a multiple correlation of $R = .424$ ($P < .01$), which means that they accounted for 18 percent of the variance in Job Satisfaction. Teamwork and Visionary Work Style added an additional 1.6 percent to the prediction of Job Satisfaction.

In table 7, with Career Satisfaction serving as the dependent variable, the set of Emotional Resilience, Optimism, and Work Drive produced a multiple correlation of $R = .431$ ($P < .01$), which means that they accounted for 19 percent of the variance in Job Satisfaction. Assertiveness added only another 0.03 percent.

Discussion

The present findings indicate that personality traits are significantly related to job and career satisfaction for the information professionals in this study.

TABLE 7
RESULTS OF HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR PREDICTING CAREER SATISFACTION FROM PERSONALITY TRAITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emotional Resilience, Work Drive, Optimism</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td>.186**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td>.189*</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—$N = 1,346–52$.
* $P < .05$.
** $P < .01$.
In the case of Job Satisfaction, ten of the thirteen personality traits studied were correlated significantly; moreover, all of the thirteen traits were significantly correlated with Career Satisfaction. The results of this study are consistent with the findings of Lounsbury et al. [2] for other occupational groups. The hierarchical regression analyses support Lounsbury et al.'s [2] g factor of Emotional Resilience, Work Drive, and Optimism as predictors of Career Satisfaction. They found that across fourteen occupations, 17 percent of the variance in Career Satisfaction was accounted for by these three measures, whereas the other personality measures added only 2 percent. This is similar to the present results of 19 percent of the variance in Career Satisfaction accounted for by these three measures, whereas the other significant personality measure added only .3 percent. Thus, the present results augment the generalizability or “external validity” [43] of Lounsbury et al.’s [2] g, or general factor, for predicting career satisfaction in diverse occupational groups.

Without generalizing beyond our nonrandom sample, we may speculate that these results are readily interpretable in the context of the information profession. Emotionally resilient individuals are likely to be better able to handle the stress and strain of today's information jobs than emotionally reactive individuals. As J. Nawe [44] points out, stress is prevalent in the information profession: “Ironically, major sources of both satisfaction and stress to the library and information workforce are patrons and their colleagues. They also experience stress in response to budget cuts; low status accorded to the profession; coping with the demands of an endless proliferation of software interfaces, varying equipment and configurations, and escalating user demands; lack of specialist knowledge; excessive workload; communicating with strangers; unsatisfactory working conditions; bad management, and monotony of work” [44, p. 36].

We may also speculate that optimistic individuals may well receive more intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction for positive outlooks, particularly in libraries where employees are often encouraged to project a positive image to patrons and the larger community. Individuals with higher levels of work drive are probably better than those with lower levels of work drive at handling the multiple and increasing demands associated with today’s information professions. As observed by H. L. Eiring [45, p. XX], “The new competencies required for success comprise two broad categories: technical and personal. . . . Personal skills include the ability to interact with diverse individuals in a broad range of situations to maximize collaboration and understanding.”

The results of the stepwise multiple regression analyses indicate that a relatively small subset of traits can account for a substantial amount of the variance in both Career Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction in this sample. Collectively, Optimism, Emotional Resilience, Teamwork, Visionary Work
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Style, and Work Drive accounted for 20 percent of the variance in Job Satisfaction. Also, Optimism, Work Drive, Emotional Resilience, and Assertiveness accounted for 19 percent of the variance in Career Satisfaction for this sample. It may be that the role of Teamwork in predicting job satisfaction for the sample reflects a more recent (or greater) emphasis on work teams and the importance of cooperation in current jobs. Perhaps Visionary Work Style may also have contributed positively to Job Satisfaction because those who focus on long-range goals over the details of particular job environments may be more satisfied with these environments. It may be that Assertiveness leads to more Career Satisfaction because assertive individuals have more leadership skills and, thus, may experience greater extrinsic career success (rewarding assignments, promotions, salary, etc.).

There are several organizational- and individual-level issues resulting from this study. First, in view of the burgeoning literature in industrial organization demonstrating the many uses of personality traits in preemployment assessment [46, 47], one can, with caution, draw implications from our study to the recruitment and selection of candidates for information science jobs.

For example, the employing organization might try to recruit and select individuals for information job openings who are more optimistic, resilient, hard working, assertive, team-minded, and visionary in their work style. Also, these characteristics might be emphasized in employee orientation and training programs. Further, supervisors could try to adjust their management style to accommodate personality differences. For example, employees with greater work drive could be assigned more challenging projects. Or, employees with lower levels of emotional resilience could be given more time to complete stressful tasks and, if necessary, be provided with stress-reduction training or employee assistance programs.

Another possible application would be to have supervisors adjust their coaching and mentoring styles to employee personality characteristics. For example, a supervisor could give an employee feedback on the interpersonal consequences of his/her pessimistic style and encourage the employee to be more positive around coworkers and patrons. It should be noted here that although personality traits are fairly consistent over time and across situations, there is opportunity for trait modification, as shown by Seligman’s work on learned optimism. However, that pessimism may be better suited for job situations that involve anticipating problems or checking for errors, such as cataloging. Similarly, individuals could look for projects that are best suited to their personality and, over the course of a career, look for jobs that offer the best person-environment fit. Finally, individuals with an “unfavorable” prognosis for job and career satisfaction in an information job might want to consider a different career path.
Another strategy might be to try to modify behavior associated with trait levels through targeted coaching or counseling efforts. For example, returning to the example of optimism-pessimism, an individual who is more pessimistic (i.e., lower on Optimism) could focus on developing strategies to increase optimism (see, e.g., [48]), or he could try to better use his pessimistic disposition by employing a defensive pessimism strategy [49, 50], especially if he is also anxious, as this could allow him to manage his anxiety more effectively.

Limitations

Several limitations of the present study should be noted. First, the sample was self-selecting, so it cannot be considered representative of the population of librarians. The study was limited to a small subset of personality variables chosen on the basis of consulting subject experts in the information professions. It is possible that other variables, such as image management or agreeableness, would enter into career and job satisfaction as well. While personality variables were the focus of this study, a number of extrinsic and intrinsic job characteristics could also be studied in relation to career and job satisfaction. Also, separate analyses for the different types of information professionals were not performed; however, the authors will undertake this in future research.

Directions for Future Research

An interesting topic for future research is to examine potential differences among the various types of information professionals in relation to personality traits and career and job satisfaction. It would also be worthwhile to determine the relationships between information professionals’ personality characteristics and other key job criteria, such as absenteeism, turnover, and job performance. It would be interesting to study other classes of information professionals not included in this study. By way of illustration, the 2002–3 Occupational Outlook Handbook [51] reported that there were approximately 21,000 jobs for archivists, curators, and museum technicians in 2000 and 149,000 jobs for librarians. Network and computer systems administrators’ jobs numbered about 229,000. These are just a few of the occupations opened to information science graduates. Other occupations include chief information officers, intellectual capital specialists, information brokers, indexers, and Web miners.
Conclusion

The present study indicates that a number of personality traits are significantly related to both career and job satisfaction for a sample of 1,352 information professionals. Information professionals who were more optimistic, emotionally resilient, team minded, visionary in their work style, and hard working were more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction in this study. Individuals who were more satisfied with information professions as their careers were significantly more optimistic, emotionally resilient, hard working, and assertive than those who were less career satisfied. These results also replicate and extend the finding of Lounsbury et al. [2] concerning the importance of Emotional Resilience, Work Drive, and Optimism in relation to both job and career satisfaction. Administrators in the information profession who are involved in hiring and managing employees might want to consider using personality information in their work. We plan to develop a tool that would be helpful for such purposes.
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