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In the current recessionary cycle in which individuals find themselves, it is interesting to see whether organisations and individuals have changed their strategies or whether they pursued their tried and tested inherent mechanisms of recruitment/work selection. In recessionary times, organisations would usually have a bigger pool to select from whilst employees, in turn, would try to position themselves in a stable work environment.

From an organisational perspective, organisations have also undergone major transitions such as downsizing, merges and acquisitions, right sizing, restructuring, and re-engineering. These changes have a direct impact on employees’ level of motivation and job satisfaction (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000). The concept of a traditional career that an employee occupies for a lifetime performing one type of work in an organisation no longer exists. Instead, employees now work for more than one organisation in their lifetime. These changes entail that employees need to be flexible and adaptive in making career decisions (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

Career anchors can be operationalized as a representation of self- perceived talents, motives, values and abilities that guide employees to make career decisions. Schreuder and Coetzee (2006), are of the opinion that if employees are not familiar with their career anchors, they could find themselves trapped in work environments that are not satisfactory and would continually be questioning themselves. Suutari and Taka (2004) emphasize the fact that there needs to be a fit between the careers of employees and the work environment.
If there is no fit between the career anchors of employees and the work environment then employees are likely to become dissatisfied which may result in a high turnover of staff with a corresponding low productivity rate. This study investigates and explores the phenomenon of career anchors based on Schein’s 1978 career anchor theory and how these career anchors affect employees level of job satisfaction. The Career Anchor Inventory and the Job Descriptive Index were administered to a sample of 154 employees at a leading retail organisation who completed the questionnaires.

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant relationships between biographical factors and career anchors as well as between biographical factors and job satisfaction and similarly between typology of career anchors and dimensions of job satisfaction.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Post 1994, South Africa has been welcomed into the Global Village. This heralded change on all fronts, be they social, political or economical. In line with all these changes, the nature of work has changed dramatically due to technological and organizational changes, amongst others. In order to stay abreast of these changes, employees have to develop core competencies and skills that assist adaptation throughout their career. In the Knowledge Economy, people no longer occupy one job for a lifetime, as there is no guarantee of job security. Career anchors assist an individual to make career related decisions effectively and hence is a critical tool to improve employee satisfaction within the workplace (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

The concept of career anchors was derived from a longitudinal study carried out by Schein from 1961 to 1973, in which he assessed the career motivations, educational and occupational histories, work values, future aspirations, values and self-concepts of 44 randomly selected graduates at the Sloan School of Management (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000). The outcome led to the development of his career anchor theory. Career anchors play a fundamental role in organizing and guiding an individual’s career. They have become more important in the current economy and labour market as individuals are continuously faced with thorny and difficult career decisions (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).
In conjunction with this, employees also rate job satisfaction high on their agenda. Job satisfaction can be defined as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Nelson & Quick, 2006, p. 120). In other words, job satisfaction is the compilation of mind-sets or attitudes that employees have about their occupation. Spector (1997) refers to job satisfaction in terms of people’s feelings towards their jobs and various aspects relating to their jobs. The various theories of motivation should also be taken into account to gain a better understanding of the employee’s level of job satisfaction.

1.2 MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

The retail industry as a whole is constantly evolving and consequently undergoing major transitions all the time. In an effort to maintain a competitive advantage, organisations need to adhere to certain established business practises to survive and thrive. As one of the major pillars of business, Human Resources are an asset no organisation can afford to neglect or ignore. This study was conducted to establish whether employees were aware of the relationship between their level of job satisfaction and career anchors. This could be beneficial to employees, as it will provide them with a barometer depicting personal information about their career choices and their level of job satisfaction. Employers on the other hand, could benefit in that they will be able to assess how employees’ perceive the work environment currently and how they (employers) might be able to assist their employees with developing their careers whilst creating a better work environment. Ellison and Schreuder (2000) postulated that the value placed on a career anchor is important in career decisions as it impacts directly on one’s level of job satisfaction. Danziger and
Valency (2006), further inferred that counsellors, as well as employers, need to be aware of employees’ career anchors in order to have a better understanding of the employee especially when taking cognisance of their talents, values and motives. Once this is established and acted upon, it could culminate in a supportive work environment conducive to all parties.

Since its development, the career anchor model conceptualized by Schein (1975) has drawn considerable attention from researchers and organizations. Although research has focused on the career anchors of professional males and females, studies have also examined the instruments used to measure career anchors and the reciprocal influence between career anchors and the age and occupation of subjects as well as the employer sector of subjects and their managerial level (Naidoo, 1993). Research (Schein, 1978; Delong, 1982; Slabbert, 1987; Boshoff et al., 1994; Erwee, 1990; Naidoo, 1993) indicates that biographical variables, such as marital status, dependents, age, gender, grade and type of occupation can play a significant role in the preferred career anchors of employees. Although many researchers have researched the role of these variables in career fit, this particular study will use the career anchor concept, as identified by Schein (1990). In terms of Schein’s (1978) model, a person’s central career anchor comprises the set of needs, values and talents, which are at the top of the person’s hierarchy within his or her self-image. Accordingly, a specific career anchor may fulfil a central part in a person’s self-concept that he would not give it up, even if forced to make a difficult choice.
1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY

To establish the career anchors of a selected group of employees within a retail organisation in the Western Cape.

To ascertain if a selected group of employees within a retail organisation are satisfied with their current occupation.

To assess whether there is a relationship between career anchors and job satisfaction amongst employees within a retail organisation in the Western Cape.

1.4 HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1:

A significant relationship exists between career anchors and job satisfaction amongst employees in a retail organisation.

Hypothesis 2:

There are significant differences in employees’ level of job satisfaction with regard to biographical factors such as gender, age, race, tenure, education, current occupation and desired occupation within a retail organisation.
Hypothesis 3:

There are statistically significant differences in career anchors of employees within a retail organisation with regard to biographical factors such as gender, age, race, tenure, education, current occupation and desired occupation within a retail organisation.

1.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There is a relative paucity of specific studies pertaining to career anchors and job satisfaction conducted within the retail industry. The sample of this study focused on respondents in the retail industry in the Western Cape, thus generalisations, comparisons and assumptions cannot be made about other retail organisations elsewhere. This study was cross-sectional and thus, only focused on respondents’ perceptions about career anchors and job satisfaction at a particular time.

1.6 OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS

Chapter 1 introduces the research problem as well as the constructs being researched that it career anchors and job satisfaction. It also highlights the aims and objectives of the study as well as the hypotheses. The chapter also denotes the limitations of this research study.

Chapter 2 presents a synopsis of the theoretical background of career anchors and job satisfaction, providing the basis of this research study. Particular attention is devoted to the definitions of career anchors and of job satisfaction, as well as the typology of career anchors and the theories of motivation.
Chapter 3 explains the research design that is utilised to investigate the research problem. Specific attention is devoted to measuring instruments namely that of the biographical questionnaire, Career Orientation Inventory (COI) and the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) that were utilised in this research study to collect the data. The chapter also highlights the use of statistical methods such as the Pearson Product Moment Correlation, multiple regression, and ANOVA that were used to analyse the data in this research study.

Chapter 4 reveals the research results that were retrieved from the analysis of data collected in the research study and concludes with the delineation of the hypotheses, which were subjected to statistical testing.

Chapter 5 discusses the most salient findings relevant to this research study and with regard to the results in Chapter 4. Conclusions are made based on the findings in the previous chapter and previous research is utilised to support findings. Lastly, this chapter highlights the limitations of the study offering recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Work can be characterised as a means of biological survival for some proletariats, whilst sustaining the quality of life for the elite or bourgeoisie. Work can thus be defined as the importance that employment plays in the lives of individuals. For new entrants into the labour market work can be depicted as a means whereby they would be able to develop their practical skills. Work in the 21st century in South Africa has changed in the sense that enclave development is outdated and no longer exists; instead, the country is competing on a global scale with other developed and developing countries. From an organisational perspective organisations have also undergone major transitions such as downsizing, merges, acquisitions, right-sizing, restructuring and re-engineering to name but a few. These changes have a direct impact on employees’ level of motivation and job satisfaction (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000).

In order to be able to be abreast with these changes, employees have to develop core competencies and skills that assist adaptation throughout their working career. The concept of a traditional career that an employee occupies for a lifetime, performing one type of work in an organisation, no longer exists. Instead, employees now work for more than one organisation in their lifetime and hence requires employees to be flexible and adaptive in making career decisions (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).
The internal career of employees is based on their subjective opinion of what is actually going on in their personal working lives, whilst the external career of employees is based on the formal structure of the organisation, the roles that they should be performing as well as the policies and procedures associated with the organisation (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

Schreuder and Coetzee (2006) are of the opinion that if employees are not familiar with their career anchors they could find themselves trapped in work environments that are not satisfactory and would continually be questioning themselves. Career anchors therefore play a fundamental role in holding the internal career together whilst transformational changes occur in the external career environment. This is particularly significant in today’s workplace. Suutari and Taka (2004) emphasize the fact that there needs to be a fit between the careers of employees and the work environment. Prior to understanding career anchors, it is crucial to understand a range of terms which are utilised within the field of career psychology.

2.2 Career Psychology

Career psychology can be depicted as the study of career development and career behaviour, which are interrelated components that effect human development. According to Schreuder and Coetzee (2006), career development is the continuous process whereby individuals progress through a sequence of stages, each consisting of unique tasks, functions and issues. This means that a career comprises of various stages where individuals are faced with different issues at some point in each juncture.
The psychological, social, cultural and economic circumstances have a direct impact on the career development process of employees concerning their career behaviour and ability to make career related decisions as well as their level of career maturity (Coetzee, 1996).

### 2.3 Career Management

According to Schreuder and Coetzee (2006), career management can be described as the continuous process whereby individuals are able to gain information about themselves as well as information about the workplace. They can also be empowered to formulate career related goals, develop a plan in which to achieve these goals as well as aspire to implement and experiment with these career goals whilst obtaining constructive feedback from either a career psychologist, counsellor, or supervisor. Career anchors allow individuals to gain self-knowledge about their career values and interests. Career counsellors on the other hand, can assist individuals with obtaining information about the workplace and about certain occupations. From an organisational perspective, the career development process creates a win-win situation in the sense that employees are continuously able to develop their careers and in turn enrich the human resources of the organisation (Lussier, 2003).

### 2.4 Psychological Career Resources:

The increasing complexity in the fast paced business environment and ensuing labour demand in the so called ‘knowledge economy’ has resulted in severe changes occurring in the business milieu globally and in turn placing new challenges on the career development front. These changes are postulated to result in downsizing, rightsizing, flattening of the hierarchy and increasing loss of job security (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009).
According to Coetzee and Schreuder (2009), individual’s psychological resources are closely related to their career consciousness. Career consciousness can be defined as an individual’s conscious career related self-reflections concerning career values, career preferences and self-awareness and competencies and skills that extend further than core technical skills needed to perform a job. Psychological career resources are associated with the individual’s experiences concerning job satisfaction, life satisfaction, knowledge about the job, as well as career related challenges that might occur. Concrete psychological career resources allow individuals to proactively adopt a sense of career self-management as well as to enable them to eventually enhance their level of job performance, coupled with their subjective career related accomplishment within the socio-cultural environment. Hence, career preferences (that is career anchors) which direct and guide people’s career movements and career values are the driving force for a particular career motive. Career drivers and career enablers are two important components associated with career psychological resources (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009).

Career drivers formulate an individual’s sense of career rationale as well as career goals, career direction and attitudes that motivates the individual to test various career choices and employment options. Individuals’ attitudes towards their job are based on the future prospective opportunities in the workplace as well as the role, which they may eventually fulfil. Those individuals who connect well with their jobs and work environments are purported to experience higher levels of job satisfaction and lower levels of absenteeism, as opposed to people who simply have a career orientation. Career enablers refer to the individual’s transferable skills that assist and facilitate in helping to achieve the career goals be it practical skills or creative skills (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009).
2.5 Career Choice Theories

The concept of career choice is twofold in the sense that it could be based on subjective preferences of the person such as that of values, aspirations and orientations, or it could be based on objective factors related to economic and social environments of the individual. The major career-choice theories are those of content theories and process theories (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

Figure 2.1: The theoretical link between psychological career resources and career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008).

The diagram above, developed by Coetzee and Schreuder (2008), indicates how psychological career resources relate to career anchors. Psychological career anchors reflect people’s dominant
career consciousness as well as their various career preferences, values, carer-related skills, attitudes and behaviours.

Coetzee and Schreuder (2008) are of the opinion that psychological career resources act as the energy or thrust which direct and facilitate people to pursue their career needs and goals. In relation to this, career anchors act as a cognitive compass that steers people to make certain career related decisions.

2.5.1 CONTENT THEORIES

2.5.1.1 Roe’s Theory

Roe’s Theory was derived from the perception that occupational choice centralises around needs. Roe was of the opinion that an individual’s job plays a pivotal role in terms of providing some satisfaction at all need levels (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006). Roe postulates that Maslow’s hierarchy of needs provides a fundamental framework for understanding the significance of needs associated with career related behaviour.

Maslow was of the opinion that needs attain motivational meaning in a specific order. This was referred to as the hierarchy of needs that can be depicted in the following order: the need for physiological well-being, the need for safety and security, the need for affiliation and love, esteem needs, and lastly self-actualisation needs.
A need on one level does not necessarily have to be completely satisfied in order for the next need to materialize. In relation to this, the need should be satisfied to some degree in order so that a motivational value is attached to the need (Nelson & Quick, 2006). Work can satisfy needs in various ways. For example: the need for love and affiliation my be satisfied by the amiability of being part of a team or group in the organisation, and the need for esteem might be satisfied when one is given a great deal of autonomy and responsibility associated with the job. An occupation could encompass both lower and higher level needs of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Nelson & Quick, 2006). Roe classified occupations into eight categories; each of which encompasses certain tasks and interpersonal relationships. The Classification of the occupational types is as follows:

**Service**- which focuses on occupations that centralise around doing something for another;

**Business contact** – this focuses on occupations, which are associated with trading and providing services (Nelson & Quick, 2006).

**Organisation**- that focuses primarily on the value and importance of management procedures and formalised relationships of personnel in organisations;

**Technology**- focuses on careers related to production and maintenance, as opposed to interpersonal relationships; mainly focuses on things and not people

**Outdoors**- occupational types would include aspects such as cultivating and collecting natural resources. Interpersonal relationships are not very significant.

**Science**- encompasses occupations that are mainly concerned with work of a scientific nature. Interpersonal skills are either largely irrelevant or somewhat relative.

**General Culture**- occupations related to cultural heritage; the emphasis is placed on human relations rather than individuals.
**Art and Entertainment** – which include occupations related to creative arts and entertainment, interpersonal relationships, are very important in this industry (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

Roe further classified each occupation into levels of responsibility and difficulty as follows:

**Professional and managerial 1** - this level is categorized by a high degree of autonomy and independence, a lot of responsibility and a great deal of decision-making. These would usually include top managers and professionals (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

**Professional and managerial 2** - this level is categorized by less autonomy, responsibility, and decision – making. A degree would be needed to be classified as a professional.

**Semi-professional and small business**: this level includes low levels of responsibility.

**Skilled** - These would include occupations related to apprenticeships and specialised skills training.

**Semi-skilled** - these include occupations, which require some training such as typists and filing clerks.

**Unskilled** - these would include occupations that do not need any formal training such as messengers (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

### 2.5.1.2 Dawis and Lofquist’ s Theory

Dawis and Lofquist’s theory of work adjustment is because work encompasses the interaction between the individual as well as the work environment. The responsibility of the employee is to perform effectively in the workplace and the responsibility of the employer is to continuously motivate and compensate the employee for work that has been performed accordingly. Coupled to this, it is necessary for the employer to provide employees with the appropriate and effective supervision that is needed to perform their tasks. There are two factors related to correspondence
such as, the satisfaction of the individual with the workplace and the satisfaction of the employer with the employee. Dawis and Lofquist believe that if the requisitions are met then the employee as well as the employer is mutually responsive. This essentially means that they have accomplished correspondence. It is essential to be aware of the fact that both components need to be achieved in order for the employee to be retained and maintain an optimal level of job satisfaction in the organisation. Thus, it is evident in that tenure is an important indicator in work adjustment (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

2.5.1.3 Decision-Making Determinants

Generic components that affect individuals’ choice of career are factors such as special abilities, race, gender, and physical capabilities. Environmental factors such as social, cultural, political and economic factors also play a major role in influencing career choices. Learning experiences could also impact on career choices. This is commonly known as instrumental learning and associative learning (Nelson & Quick, 2006).

2.5.1.4 Brown’s Theory

Brown’s Theory of career development focuses on the importance of values in career decision-making. Values are the norms, beliefs, and preferences which individuals assess their behaviour as well as that of others. Brown’s theory is supportive of the career anchors theory in the sense that individuals make certain choices dependent on their subjective environments (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).
2.5.2 PROCESS THEORIES

2.5.2.1 Super’s Theory

Super’s theory hypothesized that occupational choice allows individuals to play a significant role equivalent to their self-concept. Therefore, a noteworthy career decision would include a match between the self-concept of the individual and the perception of the organisation. Tom (1971) cited in Schreuder and Coetzee, (2006) is supportive of Super’s theory on career choice and he is of the opinion that there should be congruence between the individuals’ self-concept and the workplace.

Schein maintained that individuals also develop a career self-concept in order to direct and guide them in terms of their talents, and abilities and motives (Suurtari & Taka, 2004). The term Schein assigned to the construct occupational self-concept is known as career anchors (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000).

2.6 ORIGIN OF THE CAREER ANCHOR

Although numerous models and explanations of adult career development exist (Dalton, Thompson and Price, 1977; Levinson, Klein, Darrow, Levinson and McKee, 1978; Veiga, 1983), many of these earlier models concentrate on life stages, which are now viewed as less appropriate in a turbulent external environment where age-related progression is no longer typical (Herriot and Pemberton, 1996). Career anchor theory was developed by Schein (1978) at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in the 1960s. The theory stemmed from a 10-12 year longitudinal study of 44 MBA graduates using in-depth interviews to examine job histories and the reasons
behind career decisions. Career anchors emerged as a way of explaining the pattern of reasons given by the graduates as they progressed through their careers. While the research was built around a study of managers, career anchors are now widely applied to all levels of employees.

Schein (1978, 1990) suggests a typology of "career anchors" that can be used to understand career motivations. Schein's work suggests that there are important differences between a person's initial choice of occupation and the subsequent formation of a career identity. While early career decisions are often based on inaccurate information about career paths, after several years in the workforce individuals, develop more accurate assessments of their abilities, needs, and values. Schein labels these stable constellations of job preferences as "career anchors" suggesting that they set reasonably strong parameters within which future career decisions will be made.

According to the original conceptualization, Schein (1978) posits the existence of five career anchors: (1) technical/functional competence; (2) managerial competence; (3) security and stability; (4) autonomy and independence; and (5) entrepreneurial creativity. As individuals move through their careers, they develop a self-concept of their needs, values and talents. It is a combination of these needs, values and talents which Schein (1978, p. 125) refers to as a person’s career anchor. Schein (1978) terms these self-perceptions career anchors, since they tend to firmly attach individuals’ careers to their underlying abilities, needs and values. Schein (1978, p. 125) defines an anchor as: “...a pattern of self-perceived talents, motives and values that serve to guide, constrain, stabilise and integrate individual careers”. These three elements of the anchor are outlined more specifically as:

1. Self perceived talents and abilities (based on actual successes in a variety of work settings).

2. Self perceived motives and needs (based on opportunities for self-tests and self-
diagnosis in real situations and feedback from others).

3. Self perceived attitudes and values (based on actual encounters between self and the norms and values of the employing organisation and work settings).

Anchors are therefore broader than just values as they emphasise discovery through work experience and the importance of feedback in shaping development. They serve to explain how and why an individual interacts with the organisation, as the theory states that an individual will not give up their predominant career anchor if a choice is available - i.e. an employee will not take on a job where the needs of their career anchor are not met, if there is an alternative. This view is supported by Hall (1976) who states that an individual’s values are acquired through work experience and can come to direct subsequent career behaviour and choice. Schein’s initial research identified five career anchors, to which he later added three more - lifestyle, service/dedication to a cause and entrepreneurial challenge.

The career anchor plays a fundamental role in organising and guiding the individuals’ career. Career anchors have become more important in the current economy and labour market as individuals are continuously faced with thorny and difficult career decisions (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

2.7 DEFINITIONS OF CAREER ANCHOR

Initially Schein (1978) identified the following five career anchors: technical / functional competence, managerial competence, security, autonomy and creativity. The security career anchor was subsequently divided into security of job tenure and security of geographical location.
(stability). In addition, Schein (1978) and Delong (1982) identified three other career anchors, namely service, identity and variety.

Despite being widely used within organisations and cited widely in management literature (Dessler, 1991; Leibowitz, Farren and Kaye, 1986; Mayo, 1991) few research studies have replicated Schein’s original research. The majority of subsequent research on the theory of career anchors has focused on investigating whether other anchors exist. Research into the five original anchors showed their presence in a study of federal managers (Barth, 1993) and suggested a sixth public sector motive, which is now incorporated in Schein’s Service/dedication to a cause anchor. Schein (1990) also cites two potential anchors - variety and power, but claims that both of these form elements of existing anchors and are not an overriding influence in them.

Schein (1975; 1978) and Derr (1986) disagree in the extent to which they believe anchors (or orientations) change over the course of a person’s life. Schein (1978) studied 15 of the original sample group into their 40s and evidence suggests an individual’s career anchors remain consistent throughout life. However, he argues that anchors may appear to be changed through a work experience that leads to greater self-discovery, allowing the original anchor to emerge. Derr (1986) on the other hand argues that career orientations can change with age and due to external influences.

The other main criticism of Schein’s research is that it took place on a relatively small sample of highly educated people, who were all men in their late 20s/early 30s. The transferability to women, racial groups, or less educated groups is therefore in question. However, Schein himself has undertaken further research and has produced a table of distributions of the anchors in certain occupational groups (Schein, 1990). Although including women, this research also appears to be
based on small sample groups and largely well educated professionals. The cumulative results of this distribution data (n = 348) show that the technical functional and general management anchors predominate (with 30.2 per cent and 27 per cent of the sample respectively), while relatively few people were anchored in service, challenge or lifestyle (5.5 per cent, 2.9 per cent and 1.9 per cent respectively).

2.8 THE FORMATION OF A CAREER ANCHOR

Derr (1980) formulated a diagram to explain the formation of a single stable career anchor over time.

Figure 2.2: The Formation of a career anchor by Derr (1980).

This is depicted in figure 2.1:

The pre-career anchor represents young adults who are at the early stages in their careers and have various needs, values, and attitudes, which are beginning to coalesce into certain different patterns (refer to figure 1: a). When individuals approach their late twenties and early thirties the formation
of a mid-career anchor would occur (refer to figure 1: b). This means that a distinct career anchor pattern would emerge for most individuals. Derr (1980) was of the opinion that during this stage individuals are not as amenable to the different potential career opportunities as opposed to if that were in the earlier stage.

Therefore, people at this stage would have a better understanding about what they value in a career, as well as career options, while also displaying an opinion as to which are satisfying and which are not. During the mid-career stage to early late stage, a distinct career anchor would become even clearer (refer to figure 1: c). The consolidating and strengthening of the career patterns could elicit certain reactions by the individual such as the event of a mid-life crisis. A mid-life crisis would occur when there is incongruence between an individual’s authenticity of the workplace or job and their career anchor. According to Derr (1980) the formation process of the career anchor is flexible due to various changes that might occur in the workplace as well as in the personal life of individuals during the earlier stages of their career. In relation to this the needs, values and attitudes of the individual tend to become more stable and dominant over time and in essence direct their career decisions. Schein (1978) highlighted that the plateauing tendency is fundamental and synonymous to the career anchor concept.

2.9 TYPOLOGY OF CAREER ANCHORS

Schein developed eight career anchors namely that of technical/functional competence, general managerial competence, autonomy/independence, and security/stability, and entrepreneurial creativity, service/dedication to a cause, pure challenge, and lifestyle (Schreuder & Cotezee, 2006).
2.9.1 Technical/Functional Competence

Employees who value the technical/functional competence as a career anchor would usually desire a career that is challenging and allows them to utilise their skills effectively. Employees with this career anchor may excel in managing others in their area of specialisation, but not as general managers. The career path associated with this competence is commonly known as expert career patterns, because of the fact that individuals pursue and develop a specific identity associated with a particular profession. Individuals with this career anchor depict the intrinsic content of the job as being predominantly important. Employees with this dominant career anchor value self-development, as they want to continuously improve their skills within their area of expertise. Hence, some employees who value the technical/functional competence desire the need to be compensated according to their skills (Yarnell, 1998). According to Schein (1996), a number of individuals realize as their careers unfold that they have both a strong talent and high motivation for a meticulous kind of work. Schein (1996) postulates that these types of people were motivated and aroused by their ability to exercise their talents and obtain satisfaction from knowing that they are experts in their particular field. It is evident that this can occur in any type of occupation.

In some instances, as people progress through their career paths, they might discover that they move into areas of work that are less satisfying and less skilled. In these cases, these people feel as though they are constrained and drawn back to their areas of competence and satisfaction. These employees may formulate and assemble a sense of meaning and distinctiveness around the content of their work, the technical/functional areas in which they are ensuing and accomplishing, developing and thus, enhance skills in those areas (Coetzee et al., 2007). Individuals who are inclined towards the technical/functional career anchor are argued to commit themselves to a life of specialization and diminish any issues that pertain to the general manager role, although they
are keen to become functional managers if it facilitates and permits them to practise in their fields of expertise (Schein, 1996). Even though the majority of careers at inception appear to be technically/functionally directed, and orientated towards a specialised area of expertise, only a few people are actually intrinsically motivated and excited by the phenomenon of specialisation. In some instances, specialisation is perceived as a means whereby employees would seek affiliation with the organisation, or a means of security. On the other hand, some employees might view specialisation as a stepping-stone to achieve higher organisational and personal goals by means of vertical advancement. Therefore, it is evident that some people might utilise the technical/functional anchor to launch their career and gain the suitable and relevant skills and knowledge needed to work on future prospective career opportunities, such as the development of new entrepreneurial business propositions.

People who value this career anchor believe that work-related tasks need to be challenging. If this does not occur, then they generally seek other assignments and projects, which would allow them to be able to utilise their skills and abilities more effectively. In relation to this, these peoples’ self-esteem centralises around their ability to exercise their talent, thus they need to perform tasks, which facilitate this. Unlike others, these people value the intrinsic content of the job rather than the context of the job. Employees who have a strong preference for technical/functional competence are more inclined to be committed to the organisation and participate in the goal setting process of the organisation, as opposed to employees who value the autonomy career anchor, as they want to be flexible and uncommitted (Swanepoel et al., 2008).

Once individuals become successful in their current role, they are usually promoted to a managerial or supervisory role. However, they might not be suitable for the managerial or supervisory role as they would probably not have the appropriate leadership and managerial skills
to lead and controls others, as well as not be able to utilise their skills and abilities effectively. This can have a ripple effect on the organisation, as these employees may not be very productive and motivated to perform their task and subsequently their level of job satisfaction may decrease over time. The organisation would then need to develop initiatives to redesign the task of the individuals so that they would be more stimulated and challenged to make use of their skills and talents. These kind of initiatives can also be utilised to retain talent within the organisation. According to Schein (1996), organisations do not facilitate the jump from general management back to specialisation very easily.

Technical/functional anchored individuals usually prefer to be compensated according to their skill levels. These types of employees are more prone to external equity, which essentially means that they will inevitably compare their salaries to that of other employees, in external organisations, who are in the same or similar positions as them (Schein, 2000). In some circumstances even if these employees form part of the highest paid income bracket within the organisation, they tend to perceive the fact that others in similar roles in other organisations are being paid more as an unsatisfactory situation. People, who are technically/functionally anchored, value promotions that are not necessarily based on rank but rather established to enhance and increase the scope of the job at hand (Coetzee et al., 2007).

According to Schein (1996) these employees value professional promotional systems that operates in an equivalent and analogous manner to that of the representative managerial career path. They dislike promotional systems that focus on progression and development, which is comparable to moving into managerial or administrative roles.
The changing nature of work as well as external factors such as technological, socio-economical factors might be problematic to these anchored individuals, as their skills would be perceived as being obsolete and redundant. Consequently, these individuals face the fact that there is no assurance and guarantee of training and development. Therefore, it is necessary for organisations to continuously train and revise the skills of employees in order to avoid obsolescence. Hence, the employee as well as the organisation should take accountability and onus in elucidating each role (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

Recognition is also important to these types of employees in their jobs in terms of self-development as well as ensuring that they are allocated appropriate resources needed to perform the job more effectively and efficiently. Thus, factors such as organisation-sponsored sabbaticals, promoting professional conferences, budgets for purchasing books, office equipment and material are highly valued by these employees (Schein, 1996).

2.9.2 General/Managerial Competence

Employees with general/managerial competence as a career anchor, value high levels of responsibility as well as striving to attain a position in which they could have some influence over others in order to achieve organisational goals (Greenhaus, Callanan & Godshalk, 2000).

Employees with this trait value the need to see how they have contributed to the overall success of the organisation. Individuals who value this career anchor often differ from those who prefer the technical/functional career anchor in the sense that they view specialisation as an entrapment. Hence, individuals who value the general /managerial competence are able to identify the significance of knowing and understanding different functional areas effectively. They more often
than not acknowledge that individuals must be professional in both industry and business alike in
order to fulfil the role of a general manager (Schein, 1996).

Individuals with this career anchor typically also have the following fundamental attributes
namely that of the analytical competence, the interpersonal and intergroup competence and the
emotional competence in order for them to become successful general managers (Schein, 1990).

2.9.2.1 Analytical Competence

Analytical competence focuses on the ability of employees to analyse, to amalgamate and resolve
problems, which are difficult. General Managers are able to identify and differentiate what is
actually going on, to sift the most important information out of a large amount of irrelevant data,
and get to the core of the matter at hand. These individuals are expected to be able to make
reliable and valid judgements using their analytical skills and to be able to handle crucial problems
facing the organisation. The various business components such as marketing, finance, and human
resources of the organisation have merged into one conglomerate whereby possible problems in
one sector have an effect on the other. Therefore, analytical competence focuses on the ability to
understand the general functioning of the organisation. Consequently, general managers need to
think and solve problems cross-functionally and holistically (Coetzee et al., 2007).
2.9.2.2 Interpersonal and Intergroup Competence

The interpersonal and intergroup competence refers to the ability to communicate and influence others decisions at all levels of the organisation towards the attainment of organisational goals. General managers are required to be able to utilise their skills to elicit sufficient and compelling information from other employees in the organisation in order to be provided with a collaborative and cooperative response, that allows all employees to be involved in the decision –making process. They create an environment in which synergy is enhanced. General managers are expected to act as facilitators and should continuously be monitoring processes, taking precautionary and proactive action to address any issue that might dampen or hinder the problem solving process (Schein, 1996). Marshall and Bonner (2003) are supportive of the fact that managers require high levels of interpersonal skills.

2.9.2.3 Emotional Competence

Managers are required to be able to remain neutral and impartial when utilising their power, responsibility and authority, and they must not feel guilty or embarrassed when they make complex and difficult decisions. In order for employees to become successful general managers, they need to be able to display self-assurance and self-confidence in their capability and skills to manage their own feelings. In addition to this if, general managers are aware of how their actions, decisions and feelings affect others in the organisation, then they are likely to become emotionally competent managers. The central component of a general manager’s position entails dealing with
matters that demand a high degree of emotional stability in uncertain times. The responsibility and interpersonal conflict that comes with the territory are cardinal factors that have to be dealt with. The emotional competence focuses on how to manage a crisis effectively (Schein, 1996).

Employees, who regard general / managerial competence as a career anchor, are motivated by rewards based on merit. Thus, promotion ultimately leads to a level of higher responsibility (Greenhaus et al., 2000). These employees are more inclined to be motivated by climbing the corporate/career ladder rapidly and have a career preference for linear career paths (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

Employees who value this career anchor may prefer to occupy a job whereby they will be able to work in an integrative environment, leading others to achieve organisational goals. Individuals who are inclined to the general/managerial career anchor evaluate their success in relation to their pay. Hence, these managers expect to receive high levels of pay (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006). People who value the general/managerial career anchor would most probably be more prone to achieve internal equity in comparison to those employees who value the technical/functional career anchor value (Schein, 1996).

Employees who prefer the general/managerial career anchor would be more satisfied when they receive compensation considerably higher than those employees who are at lower levels in the organisational hierarchy. These managers also benchmark themselves to other managers in alternative organisations who perform similar roles to them, in order to assess whether they are remunerated appropriately and fairly (Swanepoel et al., 2007).

Those who view the general/managerial career anchor as important share a common understanding with those individuals who are more service oriented, as both groups of employees
are motivated and stimulated by the so called ‘golden handcuffs’ analogy. Their satisfiers essentially are the security aspect, especially the ability to be part of a secure workplace as well as securing good retirement/severance packages (Schein, 1996). The common forms of recognition that are associated with general/managerial anchored individuals are factors such as higher levels of responsibility, position in the organisational hierarchy, span of control, size of budget, title, and remuneration packages. Progress towards the correct occupation is a pivotal form of recognition to general managers in business. This means that organisations need to implement development programmes whereby employees will be able to get the appropriate exposure to the various departmental functions such as human resources, marketing, and finance (Spector, 2000). Essentially, they need to be placed in a position to be fast-tracked into higher managerial roles. If promotions were not correlated to a career path then employees, would eventually become despondent and feel as though they were not performing effectively or as if they were ‘off-track’ (Schein, 1993).

In a study carried out by Suutari and Taka (2004) focusing on career anchors of managers with global careers, the results revealed that the managerial competence is a fundamental component for managers who operate in a changing global business environment and problems of uncertainty are a paramount component thereof. According to Suutari and Taka (2004) ranking seemed to be very important to managers, and there seemed to be a dire need for certain employees to occupy higher-level management positions.

Coetzee and Schreuder (2009), agree with Suutari and Taka (2004) that change and uncertainty are predominant factors, which affect management tremendously. According to Coetzee and Schreuder (2009), employees who have a strong inclination towards the general/managerial
competency are predisposed to perform and operate whilst being flexible and adaptive to work in a changing workplace.

In relation to this, both the entrepreneurial creativity and general managerial career anchors display a negative association with change, as well as the ability to handle obstacles and disappointment. This is most probably because these employees have an enormous desire for achievement, status, power, and control which are synonymous with the entrepreneurial creativity and general/managerial career anchor (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

2.9.3 Autonomy/Independence

During the early stages of their careers, some individuals establish that they are not particularly in favour of being constrained by rules and regulations imposed by others, working hours, dress codes, as well as all the other factors such as organisational norms, which are intrinsic to the organisation (Coetzee et al., 2007).

According to Schein (1996), these employees view the organisational environment being too bureaucratic, restrictive, unreasonable, and invasive of their personal life.

Employees who regard autonomy/independence as a competence are more likely to excel in an occupation where they have the opportunity to perform tasks in their own way. They prefer work environments, which allow them to work independently as well as at their own pace (Swanepoel et al., 2007).

Schein (1996) was of the opinion that certain employees who were given a choice either to stay in their current position as it offered a great amount of autonomy or to move to a more superior role
that would allow them to have better career prospects, would opt to stay in their current job. The rationale behind this is that these employees would not want to sacrifice their independence.

By implication employees with this career anchor preference would value promotions, which are results driven, based on merit and autonomy, oriented (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000).

Schein (1996) maintains that employees who have a strong preference for the autonomy anchor are scared of the so-called golden handcuffs analogy, as they are, do not view a secure workplace as being crucial. Employees who prefer the autonomy/ independence career anchor value portable types of recognition such as medals, testimonials, prizes, letters of recommendation and awards (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

From a human resource perspective, most organisations do not contain reward systems that are accommodative of the autonomy/ independence type of employee. This negatively impacts on the organisation and results in many employees with this type of career anchor leaving. Many may infer that there might be too much bureaucratic red tape. One way to overcome this problem would be to redesign the rewards system so that it accommodates contract or part-time employees as well as being appealing to the autonomy-anchored employee (Schein, 2000).

According to a research study carried out by Ituma and Simpson (2006) on Schein’s typology on individual career anchors in Nigeria, it is evident that the main objective of some employees is to be able to work at their own pace and at their own time. Ituma and Simpson (2006) categorized this as ‘being free’. These authors were of the opinion that autonomy-anchored people would essentially have a strong orientation towards adopting a career as an entrepreneur. Subsequently, these employees had a prevailing aspiration to become independent and make their own decisions about their careers. The results of the research study carried out by Ituma and Simpson (2006)
reveal that some employees find the organisational life very restrictive and constraining. However, they remain in the organisation on a short-term basis in order to gain the relevant experience needed. They also use this period to develop appropriate social networks that they can utilise, they then eventually branch out and start up their own business.

Schein (1996) postulated that autonomy-anchored people view the occupational world as an uncomplicated place to explore, discover and navigate. The autonomy anchor is supportive, at least for the current, with the majority of organisational policies and procedures that offer prospective options of employability. The self-reliance, which may be pivotal to the future, is already intrinsic and synonymous to the psychological entity of this group of people. These employees might even develop into future role models for new potential employees.

Greenhaus et al. (2000) postulated that autonomy has become an important ideology in the work environment currently as employees have become more familiar with the value of freedom and autonomy. These employees are thus more concerned with the value and freedom attached to deciding and selecting work-related projects as well as the tools needed to complete the task successfully. Hence, employees who value this career anchor have learnt to become more self-reliant and responsible in shaping their own career path.

2.9.4 Security/ Stability

Employees with security/stability as a career anchor are more inclined to work in a stable and predictable workplace. They are usually more concerned with the context of the work, and value rewards based on seniority and tenure. These employees are typically loyal and would usually carry out tasks accordingly as well as not question the employers’ authority. They thrive in
bureaucratic work environments, and have a strong preference for security/stability, which makes them appear less flexible, adaptable, and thus unable to work in changing environments (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

Some people have an overriding desire to arrange and manage their careers in such a manner that they are able to feel safe and secure. They want to manage/control any future episodes and incidents with a sense of predictable and conventional wisdom. This in order for them to feel secure, calm and relaxed, knowing that they have achieved their goals (Coetzee et al., 2005).

People who prefer the security/stability career anchor search for occupations in organisations that provide job tenure. These types of people value and acquire some form of self-satisfaction from becoming part of the organisation despite the fact that they might not possess a great amount of status or high ranking, or even occupy superior roles (Schein, 1996).

Employees who have a strong preference for the security/stability type of career anchor are supportive of the ‘golden handcuffs’ analogy and they are typically enthusiastic to give their employers the sole liability and responsibility for the management of their careers. In substitute of tenure or long service with the company, these employees are usually agreeable to being delegated any task, even the way that it is carried out as well as when it should be completed. In some instances, achievement is highly valued in the organisational culture and because of this, these employees would often be considered as lacking drive and ambition. The very talented individuals from this group might often move into top managerial roles, but would still prefer operating in work environments that are stable and predictable. The less talented individuals on the other hand, might move into middle managerial or subordinate roles, steadily becoming less involved in the
organisation. Security/stability anchored individuals are content with any level of the organisation as long as they able to operate in a secure environment (Inkson, 2007).

It is evident that job enrichment, job challenge and other inherent aspects of the job are not that pivotal to them, as opposed to improved remuneration packages, and sufficient working conditions (Schein, 1996).

These employees value recognition based on loyal service and steady performance. The security/stability anchored employees value seniority based promotion systems with notable and descriptive ranks defining how long an employee should work in the organisation in any given category before they are able to achieve suitable promotions (Schein, 1996).

2.9.5 Entrepreneurial Creativity

Some individuals discover early in their working years that they have an overriding need to start up new businesses acquisitions either by means of starting up their own companies or by building new organisations through. Employees who have considerable entrepreneurial creativity as their career anchor, enjoys creating and developing new products or services. Employees with this career anchor value the need to work in a challenging and changing work environment (Danziger & Valency, 2006). Schein (1978) and Barth (1993) are both supportive of the ideology that individuals who have a strong inclination for the entrepreneurial creativity anchor have a need to start or construct something original and innovative. According to Schein (1996), ownership is pivotal for individuals who value this career anchor and value promotions, which permits them to be able to be anywhere they would like to be at any stage of their career.
It is pivotal to distinguish this career anchor from the autonomy/independence career anchor. Several people desire to run their own businesses because of autonomy needs. The difference between the autonomy career anchored person and the entrepreneur is their obsession with attesting and proving that they can in fact create businesses. This invariably means forfeiting both autonomy and stability, predominantly in the early stages before the business is thriving and successful. On the other hand, some entrepreneurs might not be successful at being an entrepreneur, whilst spending the majority of their careers searching for new and innovative explanations despite the fact that they have conventional occupations (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

Entrepreneurs are synonymous for their need to create new things be it products or services and they often become bored and uninterested easily. With regard to their own enterprises and businesses, they may persist and carry on with inventing products or services, or in some instances, they may even lose interest, trade the enterprises, and start off new ones. Entrepreneurially career anchored individuals are usually restless and impatient and frequently need new creative and innovative challenges (Schein, 1996).

Entrepreneurs do not usually compensate themselves sufficiently; nevertheless, they preserve and maintain the control of the organisations stock. Big corporations that attempt to retain entrepreneurs often misconstrue the greatness of their needs. Unless guaranteed of being in control and able to manage the new company, the entrepreneurially career anchored, individuals are less liable to remain in the organisation (Coetzee et al., 2007).

According to a research study carried out by Marshall and Bonner (2003) pertaining to career anchors and the effects of downsizing, it is evident that the entrepreneurial creativity career anchor is pivotal to the development of businesses as well as the formation of new jobs for people who value other types of career anchors.
2.9.6 Pure Challenge

Employees who value pure challenge as a career anchor always strives to work in challenging organisations whereby they are able to perform difficult tasks. These employees characterise success and satisfaction by means of accomplishing seemingly impossible tasks and solving difficult intricate unsolvable problems. These employees also value rewards based on whether the job provides sufficient opportunities for self-tests (Danziger & Valency, 2006).

According to Ituma and Simpson (2006), employees who valued this career anchor are in favour of changing jobs in order to maximise the opportunities to work on challenging projects and in some instances are even prepared to give up high salaries. Hence, employees would therefore rather give up high paid jobs because they were mundane and repetitive. They considered these jobs as being a hindrance and a constraining factor to their inventiveness and creativity. They even claimed that it lessened their bargaining power in some extreme cases. In relation to this Schein (1993) was of the opinion that individuals who value this trait seek even tougher challenges on a continual basis. Once they solve the one unsolvable problem, they seek the next problematic situation. High-level managers who value the technical /functional competence as well might fit this pattern in the sense that they desire the need to solve difficult strategic projects and assignments in order to remain economical. Other employees value the challenge from either a competitive or an interpersonal perspective.
2.9.7 Service/Dedication

Employees who regard service/dedication as a career anchor are likely to thrive in work environments where they are able to render a service that improves life in general. Some of the professions associated with this career anchor include amongst other nurses, doctors, teachers and the ministry (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

Employees with this career anchor are employed in organisations and firms where the employer chooses to develop and improve the well-being of their human capital by implementing various initiatives such as employee assistance programmes as well as facilitating mentoring, counselling, and coaching sessions (Greenhaus et al., 2000).

Employees who have a strong preference for this career anchor may even change companies in order to carry on doing this type of work. These employees are not in favour of promotions, which might dampen their ability to perform their work related tasks as well as those that are contrary to their belief system. These employees value rewards that focus on recognition and appreciation of one’s contribution to the organisation (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000).

Employees with this career anchor value fair remuneration packages and portable benefits. Service/dedication anchored individuals generally desire recognition and support from both their qualified and skilled colleagues as well as their superiors. Hence, they want top management to recognise their contributions towards the organisation. In some circumstances management do not provide employees with the appropriate acknowledgment that they deserve and this may cause them to move towards a more autonomous career path such as consulting (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000).
According to Coetzee and Schreuder (2008), it is imperative to be aware of the fact that the business environment in South Africa has shifted from a declining manufacturing industry to a somewhat more predominant service industry. Subsequently the retail industry would form part of this service sector within the South African economy. One should therefore take cognisance of the fact that a number of managers and skilled employees working in the retail industry might value the pure challenge as career anchor as they would want to remain economically employable and competitive in order to be able to operate in a global competitive retail sector.

2.9.8 Lifestyle

Employees who have a strong preference for the lifestyle career anchor are apt to attempt to balance their personal life and career obligations. These employees value personal and career development and strive to find occupations whereby they are able to work and commute when it is more suitable for them and their family. Employees who prefer this career anchor have a strong desire to arrange their existence around lifestyle (Ellison & Schreueder, 2000).

They attempt and continually strive to strike a balance between their work and family in order for them to achieve a state of equilibrium and thus maintain their career anchor. Employees who have a strong preference for the lifestyle career anchor desire to work for organisations which have a culture that is very accommodating towards families and inter alia, offer company benefits such as family sabbaticals, maternity and paternity leave and day care options (Ellison & Schreueder, 2000). Employees who regard lifestyle as a career anchor are unlikely to desire any promotion that would involve a geographical move as they depict their career as being an integral part of their personal life. They subsequently aim to incorporate and balance both work and personal life into one.
Marshall and Bonner (2003) postulated that the potential escalating number of employees who prefer lifestyle as a career anchor would tremendously affect the relationship between organisations and employees in terms of attaining and maintaining their work and career related values.

It is essential therefore to provide employees falling into these categories with the relevant training and development programmes as well as initiatives that promote and strengthen the relationship between the individuals’ personal wellbeing and that of their career in an attempt to retain them whilst simultaneously keeping them stimulated (Marshall & Bonner, 2003).
Feldman and Bolino (1996) reconceptualised Schein’s eight career anchors into three discrete groups according to the innate motivations associated with them. The motivations associated with each group are that of talent-based career anchors, needs-based career-anchors and lastly the values-based career anchors.
The talent-based career anchors would compose of the following career anchors namely; managerial/general competence, the technical/functional competence and the entrepreneurial creativity. The managerial/general competence consists of employees who have a strong inclination to decipher complex problems as well as lead others in the organisation. The career anchor entrepreneurial creativity forms part of this group. Employees that prefer this career anchor have a tendency to start up new business propositions and ventures in the company. People who enjoy being able to work in environments whereby they would be able to utilise their skills and abilities to their maximum potential would most properly have a preference for the technical/functional career anchor (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008).

The needs-based career anchors comprise of the following career anchors namely that of autonomy, security and stability and lastly lifestyle. Employees who have a strong tendency for this career anchor would thrive in work environments that are flexible and do not have a lot of supervision. The security/stability career anchor also forms part of the needs-based career anchors because some employees desire or need to feel secure in their work environments. Therefore, employees with security/stability as a career anchor would work best in organisations that are not undergoing rapid change and in which they are confident of permanent employment (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008).

The values-based career anchors consist of the two career anchors, which are service/dedication to a cause and improving the social perspective of the workplace and lastly the pure challenge trait that pertains to solving difficult problems and tasks in the workplace (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008).
2.10. THE EFFECT OF BIOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES ON CAREER ANCHORS

Carrell, Elbert, Hatfield, Grobler, Marx & Van der Schyf (1998) espouse the view that the quality of an organisation’s human resources represents a critical factor. Accordingly, one of the challenges facing modern organizations is to attract, retain, motivate and develop individuals with talent. In line with current South African legislation e.g. the Employment Equity Act, the dynamic nature of South African organizations and their concomitant changing demographic profiles, are creating a new, diverse, changing workforce, characterized by more single parents, working couples, women and employees of colour. As the needs of employees and employers undergo changes, it becomes more important to establish a better fit between the career goals of employees and their organizations. This research stream suggests that individuals are more successful in their jobs when their jobs are compatible with their interests, values, and abilities (Wilk, Desmarais, and Sackett 1995). An improved fit is more likely to the needs of employees being better satisfied, culminating in higher job satisfaction which may also lead to better job involvement with positive consequences for both individual and organization (Fagenson, 1989). According to Hall (Schreuder & Flowers, 1992) a career fit can be described as the way in which a person’s career enables him to fulfil his interests, satisfy his needs and values and to enable him to express himself or to become self-actualized. Hall (1976) identified four characteristics, namely interest, self-concept, personality (for example needs, personal orientation, values) and social background that may play a role in career fit.
2.10.1 AGE AND CAREER ANCHORS

Slabbert (1987) researched the relationship between career anchors and management training amongst those who obtained postgraduate degrees in business administration / business leadership. However, the survey comprised merely 0.9% females and as such, cannot be regarded as representative. Slabbert (1987) found that certain career anchors emerged among particular age groups in her sample of males. Male managers aged 65+ indicated a preference for variety, those aged 60-64 preferred security based on job tenure, those aged 50-59 indicated a preference for service, identity, technical and functional competence, whilst those aged 40-45 preferred managerial competence, and those between 30-39 indicating a preference for managerial competence, entrepreneurship and autonomy.

Erwee (1990), however, conducted research on career anchors of a sample of South African business and professional women, reporting the career anchor profile of the sample in order of dominance as: service, variety, security (job tenure), managerial competence, autonomy, identity, technical functional, entrepreneurship and security (geographical location). Erwee (1990) reported that the age distribution of the sample of business and professional women indicated that the various age groups might prefer different career anchors. The sample of women was in their late twenties and thirties. They realize they are “full contributors” to the organization and can then develop “meaningful images” of themselves as members of the organization or occupation and their career anchors begin to crystallise (Erwee, 1990, p. 11).

Naidoo (1993) found a positive correlation between age and security (stability). This indicates that as people grow older they desire to spend more time with their families and remain within the community in which they have established their roots. Slabbert (1987) reported that respondents in
her managerial sample in the age group 45 to 49 showed a strong association with security based on geographic stability. She suggests that these respondents may have children of school going ages, whom they do not wish to take out of school (Slabbert, 1987, p. 109). Naidoo (1993) also found a negative relationship between education and security of tenure. This signifies that lower educated respondents placed greater emphasis on security issues relating to their careers. Slabbert’s (1987) study showed that male MBA / MBL graduates placed low emphasis on security based on geographical location. However, the sample of professional and businesspersons utilized by Erwee (1990) showed a relatively high concern for security (stability). Naidoo (1993) found that there was a negative relationship between education and service, indicating that lower educated respondents placed a greater emphasis on helping others. Moreover, the high level sample groups in the study by Slabbert (1987) and Erwee (1990) expressed a relatively high preference for service as a career anchor.

2.10.2 GENDER AND CAREER ANCHORS

Boshoff et al. (1988) investigated the career anchors of male and female engineers. The results from the study indicate that male and female engineers differ significantly in at least four of the nine career anchors. Female engineers had a stronger preference for technical / functional competence and for security of geographical location. On the other hand, male engineers were more closely associated with managerial competence and entrepreneurship. Slabbert (1987) also found her sample of male engineers to be closely associated with variety as a career anchor. As regards the difference in career anchors of female subjects in non-managerial positions and female subjects in managerial jobs, Boshoff et al. (1988) found female managers had a strong preference for managerial competence and variety. Females in non-managerial jobs were more closely
associated with technical / functional competence and service. In comparison, Erwee (1990) reported that female mangers preferred the career anchors of managerial competence and service.

Naidoo (1993) found a significant difference between males and females in their preference for managerial competence, although cognizance should be taken of the fact that the number of females sampled in the study is unrepresentative. This indicates that the male respondents showed a preference for managerial work compared to females. According to research (Schein, 1978; Delong, 1982; Slabbert, 1987; Boshoff et al. 1988; Erwee, 1990), males and females engaged in managerial work show a preference for managerial competence.

There was also a difference between males and females in their preference for entrepreneurship / creativity based on Naidoo’s (1993) research. This signifies that males show a preference for creating a new product or service or starting a new business. According to Schein (1978), people who show a preference for entrepreneurship / creativity want to be autonomous, managerially competent, able to exercise their special talents and build a fortune in order to be secure. Female engineers in the study by Boshoff et al. (1988), female business, and professional women in the study by Erwee (1990 showed a low preference for entrepreneurship / creativity. However, male managers in the study by Slabbert (1987) showed a relatively high preference for entrepreneurship / creativity.
2.10.3 GRADE AND CAREER ANCHORS

Research (Naidoo, 1993) indicated there is a significant difference between grade and the identity career anchor. Naidoo (1993) compared the career anchors of individuals engaged in a human resources development programme according to their grades, classified in three different grades. One possible explanation cited is that the identity career anchor emphasizes being associated with a large and prestigious organization (Delong, 1982), as was the case involved.

2.10.4 RACE AND CAREER ANCHORS

In terms of races, Naidoo (1993) found a significant difference based on race (Blacks and Asians) on the security (tenure) career anchor. Asian respondents showed a higher preference to tie their career goals with the goals of the organization compared with Black respondents. He also found a significant difference between Asians and Whites on managerial competence and entrepreneurship / creativity, with Asian respondents indicating a higher preference for managerial competence as compared to their White counterparts. A similar result was found about entrepreneurship / creativity, with Asian signifying a higher preference for entrepreneurship / creativity compared with Whites.

2.10.5 POSITION AND CAREER ANCHORS

Naidoo (1993) found a significant difference on the respective career anchors among different position levels, including supervisory, technical and administration. Respondents differed significantly on managerial competence and identity.
2.11 THE EFFECT OF OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS ON CAREER ANCHORS

The research on career anchors suggests there are widely different career paths within a given general occupation (Albertini 1982; Anderson and Sommer 1980). For example, an individual in the field of marketing could pursue a technical career track in marketing research, a managerial career track in brand management, an entrepreneurial career track in new product development, an autonomous career track as a marketing consultant, or a more secure career track as a marketing professor (Feldman & Bolino 1997).

Slabbert (1987) found managers and non-managers had the propensity to differ in the strength of their association with different career anchors. Other associations mentioned by Slabbert (1987) include natural scientists that were strongly associated with security of job tenure, educators with security of geographical location, human scientists with service and autonomy and engineers with variety as a career anchor. The differences in career anchors among various occupational groups were also reported by Erwee (1990). Erwee (1990) (Table 2.1) reported the dominant career anchors and occupational groups of her sample as follows:
Table 2.1: Occupational groups and career anchors of a sample of business and professional women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Career anchors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Specialists</td>
<td>Service, Variety, Security of Job tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretaries</td>
<td>Security of Job tenure, Service, Variety, Managerial Competence, Security of geographical location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Service, Managerial Competence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketers</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship, Service, Managerial Competence, Variety, Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>Service, Variety, Security of Job tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Variety, Service, Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Variety, Security of Job tenure, Service, Autonomy, Identity, Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to Erwee (1990), the low priority given to security of geographical location seem to imply that women are willing to move to any functional area the company assigns them or to make geographical moves whenever there is a demand.
2.12 THE EFFECT OF WORK EXPERIENCE ON CAREER ANCHORS

Erwee (1990) provides a profile of business and professional women in terms of their career anchors. In terms of her sample comprising female middle managers with five to twenty years work experience, 35% indicated a preference for managerial competence, 15% for creativity, 35% for autonomy, 5% for service and 10% were unclear. However, the investigation of the career anchor profile of female vice presidents indicated 35% preferred technical / functional competence, 20% management competence, 20% security, 5% service and 20% were unclear.

2.13 JOB SATISFACTION

During the last thirty years, a vast amount of research has been conducted in the area of job satisfaction. Furthermore, I/O psychologists and other human resource professionals have spent a substantial amount of time and effort in attempting to increase the satisfaction of employees (Aamodt, 1999; Govender & Parumasur, 2010).

The reason for the considerable attention that has been paid to job satisfaction may be sought in at least four factors:

Firstly, in a competitive market, where optimal performance is required for survival, employee job satisfaction becomes a critical issue with which management continues to struggle. Although there is a great deal of controversy regarding the causal relationship between job satisfaction and performance, there is general agreement that some job factors do influence the amount of satisfaction that employees derive and ultimately, their job performance (Chambers, 1999).
The second reason for the interest in job satisfaction rests on the fact that strong correlations between job satisfaction and withdrawal behaviours, such as turnover, absenteeism and tardiness appear in previous studies (Organ, 1991; Swanepoel, Erasmus, van Wyk, & Schenk, 1998). Consequently, job satisfaction deserves the attention of any organization wishing to reduce such behaviours.

Thirdly, Kreitner and Kinicki (1992) point out that the importance of job satisfaction extends to the effects that working in organizations has on people and the humanitarian concern for the kind of psychological experiences that people have during their working lives. Indeed, job satisfaction has been linked to both the physical and mental well-being of employees (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992; Landy, 1989; Vecchio, 2000). As pointed out by Sousa-Poza (2000a), job satisfaction is one of the three most important predictors of overall well-being. This alone provides quite a strong case for the importance of studying job satisfaction.

The last good reason for the study of satisfaction can be found in the strong shift that is occurring from manufacturing to service industries in the majority of countries. As pointed out by Sousa-Poza (2000a), a direct and strong positive relationship has been shown to exist between employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction in service organizations.

In light of the above, it becomes obvious that no organization can afford to ignore the importance of job satisfaction. The key to the company’s long-term survival and growth rests primarily on the effective utilization of its human resources and, as pointed out by Boshoff and Mels (1995), job satisfaction can play an active role in the optimization of this important resource.
2.13.1 Job satisfaction defined

Job satisfaction is generally regarded as an employee’s perception of, and attitude toward the job and job situation. Job satisfaction can be defined as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Nelson & Quick, 2006, p.120). In other words, job satisfaction is the compilation of mind-sets or attitudes that employees have about their occupation. Spector (1997) refers to job satisfaction in terms of people’s feelings towards their jobs and various aspects relating to their jobs.

According to Spector (1997), job satisfaction could be considered as an attitudinal variable. Previously the main component of job satisfaction that was researched was viewed from the perspective of what was needed. In today’s society, this approach has become obsolete in the sense that researchers have shifted their attention to cognitive processes, as opposed to that of the underlying needs of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction can be associated with a universal feeling about the workplace or the various job-related tasks that form part of the organization. Spector (1997) is of the opinion that the global approach is utilized when the entire or bottom line attitude is concerned.

Robbins (2003) states that job satisfaction can be depicted as the disparity between the amount of rewards employees receive and the amount that they think they are supposed to receive. Robbin’s (2003) ideology of job satisfaction highlights the fact that a satisfied employee will be more productive and beneficial to the organization as opposed to dissatisfied employees. Therefore Robbins (2003) is supportive of Spector’s definition of job satisfaction.
Aamodt (1999) simply defines job satisfaction as the attitude that employees have toward their jobs. Moorhead and Griffen (1992), however, elaborate on this definition by stating that job satisfaction refers specifically to a positive attitude held by employees, while job dissatisfaction results when this attitude is negative. Dipboye, Smith and Howell (1994), who regard job satisfaction as an attitude, further state that this attitude remains relatively constant and is formed primarily by interpersonal and social processes in the working environment.

The majority of definitions of job satisfaction provided in the literature, however, identify three major dimensions of job satisfaction (Luthans, 1992).

Firstly, job satisfaction may be regarded as an emotional or affective response. Kreitner and Kinicki (1992, p.58) define job satisfaction as “an affective or emotional response toward various facets of one’s job.” McCormick and Ilgen (1985) also employ this definition. Williams and Hazer (1986) define job satisfaction similarly. These authors maintain that job satisfaction entails the affective orientation of individuals to the work roles and characteristics of their jobs. Saal and Knight (1988) hold a similar view, and consider job satisfaction to be an emotional, affective, or evaluative response.

Larwood (1984) and Milkovich and Boudreau (1991) also define job satisfaction in terms of an affective reaction to the job, but elaborate further by stating that job satisfaction can be regarded as entailing the extent to which individuals find pleasure in their job experiences. Job satisfaction is also often defined primarily in terms of equity. Authors that define job satisfaction in this manner consider satisfaction to be determined primarily, by how well outcomes meet or exceed expectations (Luthans, 1992).
Camp (1994), for example, defines job satisfaction with reference to the needs and values of individuals and the extent to which these needs and values are satisfied in the workplace. Klein and Ritti (1984) employ a similar definition and consider job satisfaction to be a positive feeling towards a job that arises because of fulfilled expectations. Robbins (1998, p25) is also of the opinion that job satisfaction is an attitude towards one’s job and further states that it is “the difference between the amount of rewards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive.” Such definitions assume that both the needs of individuals as well as the characteristics of the job remain relatively stable (Camp, 1994).

Yet other definitions of job satisfaction emphasize its multifaceted nature. These analysts define job satisfaction in terms of several related attitudes (Luthans, 1992). That is, they describe the complex nature of job satisfaction by taking into account that it is multidimensional and consist of a number of distinct, relatively independent components (Saal & Knight, 1988). One such definition is that offered by McCormick and Ilgen (1985, p309). These authors define job satisfaction as “a specific subset of attitudes held by organization members.” Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) hold a similar view by defining job satisfaction as the extent to which employees have a positive affective orientation or attitude towards particular facets of their jobs.
Smith, et al. (1969) have further identified five facets that represent the most important characteristics of a job about which people experience affective responses:

2.13.1.1 The work itself.

This refers to the extent to which the job provides the employee with opportunities for learning, challenging tasks, and responsibility. Robbins et al. (2003) refer to the concept of work itself as the degree to which an occupation provides employees with motivating and challenging assignments, and facilitates learning and development in terms of personal growth, as well as allows them to be accountable and conscious of the outcome. It is evident that employees desire jobs that allow them to utilise their competencies on a variety of tasks that are mentally stimulating. On the other hand, some jobs that are unchallenging, simple and to a lesser extent straightforward, often leading employees to feel somewhat frustrated in their occupation, have a sense of low morale and even in extreme circumstances leading to employee dissatisfaction (Koekemoer & Mostert, 2010).

Luthans (2005) is of the opinion that work content is as an important determinant of job satisfaction. Similarly, Lussier (2003) is supportive of this, as work content is a major source of job satisfaction within the workplace. Carrell et al. (1998) postulate that the work content is a pivotal facet of job satisfaction and maintains that work environments, which afford employees with challenging work and some degree of autonomy, will enhance employee satisfaction and retention within the organisation.
2.13.1.2 Pay

Pay refers to the amount of financial compensation that an individual receives as well as the extent to which such compensation is perceived to be equitable. Pay pertains to the amount of compensation employees receive from performing their jobs (Lussier, 2003). Pay determination is essential in order to assess and determine how much each employee receives. An external approach would be to benchmark current occupations in the internal organisation with other external organisations (Lussier, 2003). Spector (1996) is supportive of this as pay satisfaction is determined in terms of the fairness and equality about its distribution, as opposed to the actual amount that employees receive. This means that pay satisfaction is predisposed by comparing each person’s salary to that of others in similar occupations, as opposed to all employees in general (Koelemoer & Mostert, 2010).

Job evaluation is the process of establishing the worth of each job relative to that of other jobs within the organisation (Lussier, 2003). Organisations notably make use of pay-grade systems to assess how much employees are paid. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, specifically the need for physiological or physical well being, highlights the fact that pay is the most basic requirement for the employee in terms of survival (Nelson & Quick, 2006). Herzberg’s theory of motivation refers to pay as a hygiene factor, and because of this, does not view it as a motivator but rather as a necessity in order to avoid employee dissatisfaction within the workplace.

According to research carried out by Bassett (1994), it is evident that there is insufficient empirical information concerning the correlation between pay and worker satisfaction or dissatisfaction, whereby pay is the sole indicator of either reducing or increasing satisfaction in the workplace. Basset (1994) further infers that higher paid employees may also experience
dissatisfaction within the workplace as they might loathe and detest the nature of the job and believe that they cannot enter a more satisfying occupation. Witt and Nye (1992) postulate that employees aspire to be part of organisations whereby they perceive pay systems as being fair, and concur with Bassett (1994) that employees are not all motivated by money. It is apparent that some employees would even occupy jobs with lower salaries if they receive other benefits. Other factors that could possibly affect employees’ level of job satisfaction within the organisation include aspects such as flexible working hours, lower workloads, geographic location of the work, and the amount of autonomy given in their work (Witt & Nye, 1992). In contrast to the above authors, Carrell et al. (1999) view pay as a major indicator of job satisfaction being low in job satisfaction surveys.

2.13.1.3 Opportunities for promotion

This refers to the employee’s chances for advancement in the organizational hierarchy. Robbins (1996) infers that employees search for promotion policies and procedures in organisations that they believe is fair and explicit, as well as concurs with what they believe they should receive, which results in job satisfaction. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, specifically the need for self-esteem and self-actualization, as well as McClelland’s theory of achievement best explains why some employees desire attaining more status within the organization in order to achieve and maintain job satisfaction (Nelson & Quick, 2006). Witt and Nye (1992) concur with the above theories and state that promotion presents employees with opportunities for personal growth and development as well as a greater amount of responsibility and even, to some extent, social status and increases the levels of job satisfaction for some employees in the organization.
2.13.4 Supervision

This facet incorporates the ability of the employee’s superior to provide technical assistance and support. According to Robbins et al. (2003), supervision is a fundamental function regarding job satisfaction in the workplace, if supervisors assist employees with guidance, technical and emotional support they complete any work related task effectively and efficiently. Kreitner, Kinicki, and Buelens, (1999) agree with Robbins et al.(2003) as they view supervisors as agents of the organization that are responsible for providing employees with sufficient information concerning organizational goals, scheduling work standards, values, as well as providing definite performance standards within the organization. In relation to this, employees like to work with a supervisor whom they perceive as being fair, empathetic and continue to allow them to participate in decision-making, and displays supportive behaviour (Kreitner, Kinicki & Buelens, 2002).

2.13.5 Co-workers

This involves the degree to which fellow employees are technically competent and socially supportive (Luthans, 1992; Smith, et al., 1969). According to Locke (1976) cited in Sempane et al., (2002), co-workers can be depicted as another element of job satisfaction. McClelland’s need theory, specifically paying attention to the need for affiliation, as well as Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, particularly the need for love and belonging, emphasizes the fact that individuals’ social need can be fulfilled within the workplace. This is based on the premise that a supportive social environment whereby co-workers are helpful and accommodating would increase employees’ level of job satisfaction within the organisation. Numerous research studies reveal that co-workers relationships need to be cooperative, mutual and supportive in order to assist employees and allow them to perform their tasks effectively and in essence facilitate job satisfaction.
Robbins (1996) postulates that work are not merely a means to make a living and to obtain an income; instead, it also provides an environment for collective relationships. Gerber, Nel and Van Dyk (1987) are of the opinion that proper induction programmes should be established in order for new employees to be appropriately socialized into the organisation, as well as be able to develop excellent co-worker relationships. This is necessary as it provides a supportive environment for employees, and allows them to understand what is expected of them.

Unlike the previous authors, Luthans (2002) cited in Booysen (2008), postulates that co-worker relationships are not a crucial component of job satisfaction, however, in certain circumstances whereby employees find themselves in co-worker relationships that are stressful and strenuous, then this would become detrimental to job satisfaction, as it will decrease levels of job satisfaction.

Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992), however, propose a comprehensive definition of job satisfaction that takes the above-mentioned dimensions of this attitude into account. According to Cranny, et al. (1992) job satisfaction is a combination of affective and cognitive reactions to the differential perceptions of what employees want to receive compared with what they actually receive.

2.14 Theories of job satisfaction

Over the years, researchers have devised a number of theoretical approaches to explain the causes and effects of job satisfaction. The theories attempting to explain job satisfaction are numerous and are generally concerned with motivation (Saal & Knight, 1988). The theories most frequently addressed in the literature, however, are as follows (Aamodt, 1999; McCormick & Ilgen, 1985; Saal & Knight, 1988; Smither, 1988; Staw, 1995). To be able to comprehend job satisfaction
effectively, it is essential to recognise and understand what motivates individuals working in organisations. Motivation pertains to why individuals behave the way they do, as well as why certain individuals abstain from behaving in a certain manner while others persist. The theories of motivation can be divided into two, namely that of, the content theories of motivation, and the process theories of motivation. The content theories of motivation centralise around factors that allegedly motivate people. Some of the content theories of motivation include: Maslow’s need hierarchy, Herzberg’s two factor theory, Alderfer’s ERG theory, and McClelland’s achievement motivation theory (Govender & Parumasur, 2010). In contrast to this, the process theories of motivation focuses on the analysing of the actual processes involved in actually getting people to be motivated. Examples of the process theories include Vroom’s expectancy theory, Equity theory, and McGregor’s theory X and theory Y, and Locke’s Goal setting theory (Nelson & Quick, 2006).

2.14.1 Discrepancy theories

According to Aamodt (1999) discrepancy theories postulate that individuals’ satisfaction with a job is determined by the discrepancy between what they want, value, and expect and what the job actually provides. Employees are unlikely to experience satisfaction where discrepancies exist between what they want and what the job provides. Theories that focus on employee needs and values include Maslow’s needs hierarchy, ERG theory, two-factor theory, and McClelland’s needs theory.
2.14.2 Maslow’s needs hierarchy

Maslow (1954) holds that employees will only experience job satisfaction if certain needs are met. Five major types of needs exist and these needs are hierarchical. This implies that the lower-level needs must be satisfied before an employee will become concerned with the next level of needs (Aamodt, 1999; Maslow, 1954). The five major needs are as follows:

Figure 2.4: Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Landy & Conte, 2004).

2.14.2.1 Basic biological needs

According to Maslow (1954) individuals are concerned first and foremost with satisfying their basic biological needs for food, water and shelter. An unemployed individual will, for instance,
be satisfied with any job, provided it serves these basic biological needs (Aamodt 1999; Maslow 1954).

2.14.2.2 Safety needs

Once individuals’ basic biological needs have been satisfied, they become concerned with meeting their safety needs. This implies that individuals will only remain satisfied with a job if it provides them with a safe working environment (Maslow, 1954). Safety needs include not only the need for physical safety, but also the need for psychological safety, in other words, job security (Aamodt, 1999; Maslow, 1954).

2.14.2.3 Social needs

Social needs refer to the individual’s need to work with others, to develop friendships, and to feel needed (Aamodt, 1999; Maslow, 1954). After an individual’s safety needs have been fulfilled, the individual will remain satisfied only if the job also satisfies these social needs (Maslow, 1954).

2.14.2.4 Ego needs

Once a job satisfies individuals’ social needs, they begin to concentrate on satisfying their ego needs. Ego needs include the need for recognition and success (Maslow, 1954). According to Aamodt (1999) organizations can satisfy such ego needs through praise, promotions, and salary increases.
2.14.2.5 Self-actualization needs

According to Maslow (1954) the fifth and final need that an individual strives to satisfy is the need for self-actualization. The need for self-actualization refers to individuals’ need to reach their full potential. Once employees’ ego needs have been met, they will not remain satisfied with a job unless it also provides them with the opportunity to self-actualize (Aamodt, 1999; Maslow, 1954).

Saal and Knight (1988), however, point out that because the fulfilment of one level of needs activates the next level, the employee will always have an active need, making long term job satisfaction unlikely in terms of this theory.

2.14.3 ERG theory

In response to the technical problems experienced with Maslow’s needs hierarchy, Aldefer (1972) developed a theory that has only three levels (Aamodt, 1999). The three levels are existence, relatedness, and growth (Aldefer, 1972).

Figure 2.5: Alderfer’s ERG Theory (Lussier, 2003).
Aldefer (1972) further holds that progression from the lower to higher level needs is not fixed, and that an individual may skip levels. The theory also provides an explanation as to why a higher level need does not always become a priority once a lower level need has been satisfied. According to Aldefer (1972) advancement to the next level is not always possible because of factors such as company policy. Consequently, the employee becomes frustrated and attaches priority to the previous level of needs.

ERG theory removes several of the problems experienced with Maslow’s theory and has received at least some empirical support (Aamodt, 1999).

### 2.14.4 Two-factor theory

**Figure 2.6 represents the two-factor theory schematically.**

![Herzberg’s two-factor theory](image)

**Figure 2.6**  Herzberg’s two-factor theory

*(Saal & Knight, 1988, p.302)*
Herzberg (1966) proposes that job satisfaction is dependent upon a certain set of conditions, while job dissatisfaction results from an entirely different set of conditions. The theory therefore implies that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction do not exist on a continuum extending from satisfaction to dissatisfaction. Rather, two independent continua exist, one running from satisfaction to neutral and another that runs from neutral to dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966; Staw, 1995).

According to the two-factor theory job-related factors can be divided into two categories, motivators and hygiene factors (Aamodt, 1999; Herzberg, 1966). Hygiene factors refer to those elements that result from but do not involve the job itself (Aamodt, 1999; Herzberg, 1966). Herzberg (1966) identified the following hygiene factors:

- Supervision
- Interpersonal relations
- Physical working conditions
- Salary
- Company policies and administrative practices
- Benefits
- Job security
Motivators, on the other hand, refer to job elements that do concern the actual job tasks and duties (Aamodt, 1999; Herzberg, 1966). Motivators include the following (Herzberg, 1966; Saal & Knight, 1988):

- Achievement
- Recognition
- Work itself
- Responsibility
- Advancement

Herzberg (1966) maintains that hygiene factors are necessary but not sufficient for job satisfaction. Only in the presence of both motivators and hygiene factors will the employee experience satisfaction. Research has, however, lent very little support to this theory and has raised serious doubts concerning its validity (Aamodt, 1999; McCormick & Ilgen, 1985; Staw, 1995).
Table 2.2 provides a comparison of the Maslow, Herzberg, and ERG theories.

Table 2.2 Comparison of the Maslow, Herzberg, and ERG theories (Aamodt, 1999, p.381)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASLOW</th>
<th>ERG</th>
<th>HERZBERG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualization</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Motivators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hygiene Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Existence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.14.5 McClelland’s needs theory

According to McClelland (1961) individuals differ in terms of their needs for achievement, affiliation, and power. Employees who have a strong need for achievement desire jobs that are challenging and over which they can exert control.

These individuals are most likely to be satisfied when they are solving problems and accomplishing job tasks successfully (Aamodt, 1999; McClelland, 1961; Saal & Knight, 1988). In contrast, employees low in the need for achievement are likely to be more satisfied in jobs that involve little challenge and have a high probability for success (Aamodt, 1999; McClelland, 1961).

Individuals who are high in the need for affiliation prefer working with and helping other people (Aamodt, 1999; McClelland, 1961). Employees high in this need will be most satisfied by maintaining social relationships with their co-workers (Saal & Knight, 1988).

Finally, individuals who have a high need for power have a desire to influence others as opposed to simply being successful (Aamodt, 1999; McClelland, 1961). According to McClelland (1961) fulfilment of these needs will result in job satisfaction.
2.14.6 Equity theory

Equity theory, developed by Adams (1965), proposes that the level of job satisfaction experienced by individuals is related to how fairly they perceive that they are being treated in comparison to others. Three components are involved in the perception of fairness (Aamodt, 1999; Adams, 1965, Govender & Parumasur, 2010):

2.14.6.1 Inputs

Inputs refer to those personal variables that employees put into their jobs. Examples include time, effort, experience, and education (Aamodt, 1999; Adams, 1965).

Outputs. Outputs are those elements that individuals receive from their jobs, such as pay, benefits, responsibility, and challenge (Aamodt, 1999; Adams, 1965).

2.14.6.2 Input/output ratio

According to Adams (1965) employees subconsciously calculate their input/output ratio by dividing output value by input value. Individuals will then compare this ratio with the input/output ratio computed for other employees and work experiences. The theory holds that if their ratios are similar to those of others, employees will experience satisfaction. However, should the ratios be lower than those of other individuals, employees will become dissatisfied and will be motivated to restore equity (Aamodt, 1999; Adams, 1965; Staw, 1995).

Adams (1965) holds that employees may attempt to bring about greater equity in a variety of ways. Employees may attempt to increase their outputs by, for example, requesting greater
responsibility, or they may reduce their inputs. A less probable approach that an individual may employ involves changing the ratios of other employees by, for example, attempting to increase another employee’s inputs by encouraging the employee to work harder (Aamodt, 1999; Adams, 1965).

Equity theory has, generally, received research support. The theory is, however, difficult to implement in practice (Aamodt, 1999).

2.14.7 Social learning theory

Social learning theory postulates that employee attitudes and behaviour are socially derived, that is, employee attitudes are determined in part by an examination of the behaviour of other employees (Saal & Knight, 1988; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977; Smither, 1988). Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) hold that by observing co-workers, employees infer their attitudes toward the organization, the job as a whole, as well as specific job facets. This position is supported by Weiss and Shaw (1979) who maintain that an employee simply infers a level of job satisfaction by observing others.

Social learning theory therefore emphasizes the importance of the social environment in shaping individual behaviour. Research, however, indicates that social learning is likely to be a better predictor of job satisfaction in certain situations and for certain people than for others (Saal & Knight, 1988; Smither, 1988).
2.14.8 Evaluation of job satisfaction theories

As pointed out McCormick and Ilgen (1985), there is a relative dearth of comparative research on the different job satisfaction theories. However, despite the limited empirical support generally enjoyed by the discrepancy theories, they do appear to explain more variance in job satisfaction than the other theories (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985; Saal & Knight, 1988). McCormick and Ilgen (1985), however, maintain that the equity and social learning theories should not be disregarded since they appear to influence job satisfaction over and above the influence exercised by the discrepancy theories. In fact, in work settings in which social comparisons are prominent, equity and social learning theories may dominate (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985).

Furthermore, it is probable that the development of work attitudes, such as job satisfaction, is influenced by such a multiplicity of personal and situational variables that a single theory is unlikely to provide a complete explanation. A combination of perspectives may ultimately provide the most accurate picture of job satisfaction (Saal & Knight, 1988).

2.15 Determinants of job satisfaction

Staw (1995) argues that organizations can only increase job satisfaction and reap the subsequent benefits thereof if the factors causing and influencing this attitude can be identified. Research indicates that satisfaction is a function of both the person and the environment in which the individual operates. Accordingly, the determinants of job satisfaction can be divided primarily into extrinsic and intrinsic sources of satisfaction (Vecchio, 2000).

In addition to these internal and external sources of satisfaction, researchers have also identified a number of demographic variables that have been found to exert an important influence on job satisfaction (Robbins, 2001; Staw, 1995; Vecchio, 1988).
2.16 Extrinsic sources of job satisfaction

According to Vecchio (1988) extrinsic sources of satisfaction originate from outside the individual, that is, they originate from the environment. The frequency and magnitude of extrinsic sources of satisfaction are determined predominantly by conditions and forces that are beyond the control of the employee. The following factors constitute external sources of satisfaction:

2.16.1 The work itself

The nature of the work performed by employees has a significant impact on their level of job satisfaction (Landy, 1989; Larwood, 1984; Luthans, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992). According to Luthans (1992) employees derive satisfaction from work that is interesting and challenging, and a job that provides them with status (Koekemoer & Mostert, 2010).

Aamodt (1999) is also of the opinion that job satisfaction is influenced by opportunities for challenge and growth as well as by the opportunity to accept responsibility. The authority to assume responsibility and to make decisions concerning their work leads to higher satisfaction in employees.

Landy (1989) shares this view and maintains that mentally challenging work, that the individual can successfully accomplish, is satisfying. In fact, research indicates that employees prefer jobs that provide them with opportunities to use their skills and abilities and that offer a variety of tasks, freedom, and feedback regarding performance (Larwood, 1984; Luthans, 1992; Robbins, 1998, Tziner & Latham, 1989). Robbins (1998, p152) argues that these characteristics make work
mentally challenging, and that “Under conditions of moderate challenge, most employees will experience pleasure and satisfaction.”

Job challenge, as a predictor of job satisfaction, continues to receive research support. A recent study by Jinnett and Alexander (1999) suggests that challenging work may actually produce satisfied employees. This finding is supported by Gunter and Furnham (1996) who argue that challenge is likely to be a more important determinant of job satisfaction than are gender, age, salary, or work history.

Landy (1989) further argues that work that is personally interesting to the employee is likely to contribute to job satisfaction. This view is shared by Aamodt (1999), who contends that employees who find their work interesting are more satisfied and motivated than are employees who do not.

Closely related to the above-mentioned variables are task variety and skill variety. Existing research suggests that these factors may facilitate job satisfaction (Eby, Freeman, Rush, & Lance, 1999). Findings by Lambert, Hogan and Barton Lubbock (2001) indicate that employees generally appear to be more satisfied with jobs that provide them with variety rather than repetition. A study by Ting (1997) further shows skill variety to have strong effects on job satisfaction. The greater the variety of skills that employees are able to utilize in their jobs, the higher their level of satisfaction.

In addition to the above, Landy (1989) is of the opinion that the physical demands inherent in the job are also likely to have an impact on the employee’s level of job satisfaction. In other words, work that is physically or emotionally exhausting is less likely to produce satisfaction. Judge,
Bono and Locke (2000, p.237), on the other hand, argue that it is possible that “individuals with positive self-evaluations may see their jobs as more challenging simply because they are predisposed to perceive all aspects of their jobs positively.” This implies that the individual’s own sense of challenge may impact on job satisfaction. In such a case, however, challenge represents an intrinsic source of job satisfaction (Vecchio, 1988).

2.16.2 Working conditions

Working conditions are another factor that has a moderate impact on the employee’s job satisfaction (Luthans, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992). According to Robbins (1998) working conditions refer to such aspects of the work situation as temperature, ventilation, lighting, and noise.

Landy (1989) is of the opinion that satisfaction is determined in part by the match between the working conditions of employees and their physical needs.

According to Robbins (1998) employees are concerned with their work environment for both personal comfort and for facilitating good job performance. Studies have demonstrated that employees prefer physical surroundings that are not uncomfortable or dangerous. Furthermore, temperature, light, noise, and other environmental factors should not be at either extreme (Robbins, 1998). Luthans (1992) holds that under such conditions, employees will find it easier to perform their tasks.
Furthermore, research indicates that employees prefer to work relatively close to home, in clean and modern facilities, and to have adequate tools and equipment at their disposal (Robbins, 1998; Visser, 1990).

Literature, however, indicates that employees seldom consider their working conditions, and in fact, often take them for granted (Luthans, 1992; Visser, 1990; Vorster, 1992). Indeed, working conditions are only likely to have a significant impact on job satisfaction when:

- the working conditions are either extremely good or extremely poor (Luthans, 1992; Vorster, 1992);
- in addition, when employees have some or other frame of reference or standards, which enable them to judge their present circumstances (Vorster, 1992). According to Visser (1990) such standards may become available when the working conditions change over a period. Such as when employees move from one building into another or when the employee changes jobs.

Additionally, numerous authors are in agreement concerning the fact that employee complaints regarding working conditions are, more often than not, actually manifestations of other, underlying problems (Luthans, 1992; Visser, 1990; Vorster, 1992). It has been found that such complaints often disappear when the underlying frustrations are identified and resolved.

According to Visser (1990) women are prone to attach greater importance to their working conditions than is the case with male employees. Moreover, the number of hours worked by employees is also an important factor. Satisfied employees are inclined to complain that they do
not have sufficient time to perform all their duties. In contrast, dissatisfied employees are likely to want their workday done with as soon as possible.

2.16.3 Pay

Another factor that is likely to play an important role in the satisfaction of employees is pay (Larwood, 1984; Luthans, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992).

Indeed, research consistently supports a positive relationship between satisfaction with pay and overall job satisfaction. Recent studies by Cramer (1993), Money, and Graham (1999) revealed salary to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Furthermore, in a study involving federal government employees, Ting (1997) found pay satisfaction to have significant effects on increasing the satisfaction of employees at all levels. This author is, in fact, of the opinion that pay satisfaction is one of the most important predictors of job satisfaction. Lambert, et al. (2001) also found financial rewards to have a significant impact on job satisfaction.

Such findings are largely consistent with the idea that most employees are socialized in a society where money, benefits, and security are generally sought after and are often used to gauge the importance or the worth of a person. Thus, the greater the financial reward, the less worry employees have concerning their financial state, thereby enhancing their impression of their self-worth to the organization (Lambert, et al., 2001).

Several other authors, however, maintain that the key in linking pay to satisfaction is not the absolute amount that is paid, but rather, the perception of fairness (Aamodt, 1999; Landy, 1989; Robbins, 1998). According to Robbins (1998) employees seek pay systems that are perceived as just, unambiguous, and in line with their expectations. When pay is perceived as equitable, based
on job demands, individual skill level, and community pay standards, satisfaction is likely to be the result.

The above-stated view has been supported in a number of studies. Gunter and Furnham (1996), for example, found employee perceptions concerning the equity with which the organization rewards its employees to be better predictors of job satisfaction than is the case with gender, age, or actual salary. Similarly, Miceli, Jung, Near, and Greenberger (1991), cited in Hendrix, Robbins, Miller, and Summers (1998), validated a causal pathway leading from fairness of the pay system to improved job satisfaction. In fact, in a study by Sousa-Poza (2000a), perceived income, that is, whether the respondent considered his income high or not, was found to have the third largest effect on the job satisfaction of male employees.

Salary level may, however, be valued less for its actual amount than for the status and prestige inherent therein. Pay is therefore also instrumental in providing for upper-level need satisfaction (Luthans, 1992; Smither, 1988; Vorster, 1992). Visser (1990) supports this view and states that money may serve as a symbol of achievement, recognition and status, as well as a means of acquiring luxuries. For certain employees money may also provide security or imply greater freedom (Visser, 1990). In this sense, however, a high salary holds intrinsic or psychological value for the employee.

Smither (1988) further points out that the satisfying effect of pay is likely to vary in relation to different situations. Tolbert and Moen (1998), for instance, found age to be a mediating variable between salary and job satisfaction. Younger workers were significantly more likely to rank a high salary as an important job characteristic. Furthermore, Oshagbemi (1997) suggests that the
extent to which employees are satisfied with their pay may be strongly related to the size of the family and lifestyles.

Another aspect of compensation that is important is fringe benefits. Benefits, however, do not have a strong influence on job satisfaction for most employees (Landy, 1989; Luthans, 1992). According to Luthans (1992) the reason for the weak link between fringe benefits and satisfaction may be sought primarily in the fact that the majority of employees are unaware of how much they are receiving in the form of benefits. Furthermore, employees tend to undervalue such benefits because their practical value cannot be seen.

Therefore, the safest generalization that can be made with regards to pay is that it represents different things to different employees, and is certainly not the most important motivator for many individuals. While, few individuals are in a position to ignore the financial aspects of a job, most individuals appear to select their occupations based on the work itself, rather than the financial rewards thereof (Smither, 1988).

### 2.16.4 Supervision

Literature consistently indicates that the quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationship will have a significant, positive influence on the employee’s overall level of job satisfaction (Aamodt, 1999; Kinicki & Vecchio, 1994; Luthans, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Robbins, 1998).

Studies have shown that individuals are likely to have high levels of job satisfaction if supervisors provide them with support and co-operation in completing their tasks (Ting, 1997). Similar results were reported by Billingsley and Cross (1992) as well as Cramer (1993). These researchers generally hold that dissatisfaction with management supervision is a significant predictor of job
dissatisfaction. The above findings are further supported by Staudt (1997) in a study involving social workers. Respondents who reported satisfaction with supervision were also more likely to be satisfied with their jobs in general.

A number of supervisory antecedents have been found to exert a particularly salient influence on job satisfaction (Boshoff & Mels, 1995; McCormick & Ilgen, 1985). These include leadership style, technical adequacy, consideration, initiating structure, participation in decision-making, autonomy, performance feedback, and communication.

Supervisory consideration refers to leader behaviours that are concerned with promoting the comfort and well-being of subordinates. It concerns the degree to which managers are supportive, friendly, considerate, consult with employees, and recognize their contribution (Boshoff & Mels, 1995).

Research makes a strong case for the use of supportive behaviours by supervisors (Chieffo, 1991; Packard & Kauppi, 1999). The general argument is that democratic leadership styles, which are high in consideration, are consistently associated with higher levels of employee satisfaction. The results of a study by Packard and Kauppi (1999), for example, indicate that subordinates with autocratic supervisors experience significantly lower levels of job satisfaction than do those with democratic leaders. Boshoff and Mels (1995) also reported consideration to be positively associated with job satisfaction. Results from a similar study by Pool (1997) concur with this view.

According to Boshoff and Mels (1995) initiating structure refers to leader behaviours that clearly define the roles of the supervisor and subordinates. By initiating structure, the supervisor strictly
directs subordinates, clarifies their roles, co-ordinates, solves problems, criticizes, and pressurizes them to perform. Initiating structure therefore closely resembles task-oriented behaviour.

Research is somewhat inconsistent regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and initiating structure. Boshoff and Mels (1995) argue that initiating structure has a significant positive influence on satisfaction. Pool (1997), on the other hand, reports an inverse relationship between initiating structure behaviour and employee satisfaction, suggesting that supervisors who use an initiating structure style will see a decrease in their employees’ level of job satisfaction.

It is, however, suggested by Howell and Dorfman (1986), cited in Boshoff and Mels (1995), that initiating structure is likely to have differential effects on professional and non-professional employees. Professionals are likely to resent what they perceive to be interference from formal leaders, while non-professionals tend to be more positively inclined towards initiation of structure.

Participation in decision-making entails the degree to which employees are able to influence decisions about their jobs (Boshoff & Mels, 1995). Boshoff and Mels (1995) found participation in decision-making to be a particularly important cause of job satisfaction. Results from a study by Chieffo (1991) support this view. Luthans (1992) too, is of the opinion that supervisors who allow their employees to participate in decisions that affect their own jobs will, in doing so, stimulate higher levels of employee satisfaction. Moreover, Luthans (1992) maintains that a participative climate created by the supervisor will have a more substantial impact on job satisfaction than will participation in a specific decision.

According to Boshoff and Mels (1995) performance feedback refers to a superior’s communication to a subordinate regarding the quality of job performance. Researchers generally
agree that performance feedback is positively correlated with job satisfaction (Luthans, 1992). Pool (1997) found that employees who receive feedback concerning accomplishments demonstrate higher levels of job satisfaction than do employees who are not provided with such feedback. Boshoff and Mels (1995) reported similar findings.

The latter authors maintain that feedback is positively associated with job satisfaction mainly because employees who are properly informed concerning their supervisor’s evaluation of their performance are more likely to hold realistic expectations regarding remuneration and promotion possibilities.

Communication is the degree to which management communicates with subordinates and the extent to which employees perceive that they are being properly informed with regards to the aspects of the job that affect them (Boshoff & Mels, 1995; Koekemoer & Mostert, 2010).

In a study by Miles, Patrick, and King (1996) superior-subordinate communication demonstrated significant predictive power in predicting job satisfaction, irrespective of job level. It is suggested that such communication reduces role ambiguity and role conflict, which in turn facilitates job satisfaction. Managers are thus well advised to consider communication practices as part of any effort to improve the job satisfaction of employees. Luthans (1992) supports this view, but is also of the opinion that communication with employees should extend beyond the official level to include communication of a more personal nature as well.

Autonomy implies that employees experience a certain amount of freedom in their jobs, including freedom of choice in decision-making, freedom of expression in work, and freedom from close supervision. Taber and Alliger (1995) point out that a task that is not closely supervised will give
the employee a sense of autonomy and personal accomplishment. Consequently, it is held that freedom from supervision is positively correlated with job satisfaction. A recent study by Lambert, et al. (2001), however, contradicts this view. The results of this study indicate that autonomy has an insignificant impact on job satisfaction. Lambert, et al. (2001) are therefore of the opinion that the literature has overemphasized the role of autonomy in determining job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction research therefore generally supports relationship-oriented leadership styles that are characterized by supervisory consideration, participation in decision-making, performance feedback, and communication.

2.16. 5 Co-workers

Co-worker relations include all interpersonal relations, both positive and negative, that occur within the work situation. It may include among others, the competence, friendliness, helpfulness, and co-operation of fellow employees (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985). According to Hodson (1997) such social relations constitute an important part of the “social climate” within the workplace and provide a setting within which employees can experience meaning and identity. Luthans (1992) further holds that the work group serves as a source of support, comfort, advice, and assistance.

Therefore, for most employees, work also fulfils the need for social interaction. Consequently, it is not surprising that literature consistently indicates that having friendly and supportive colleagues leads to increased job satisfaction (Aamodt, 1999; Larwood, 1984; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Robbins, 1998). Landy (1989) is further of the opinion that employees will be satisfied with colleagues who are inclined to see matters in much the same way as they themselves do.
Research continues to lend support to the important role that co-workers play in either facilitating or hampering satisfaction within the organization (Jinnett & Alexander, 1999). In one such a study, for example, results indicate that co-worker conflict is associated negatively with job satisfaction, while co-worker solidarity generates high levels of this attitude (Hodson, 1997). These findings are substantiated by Ting (1997) who argues further that this association is likely to gain in importance as the tasks performed by individuals become increasingly interrelated.

Moreover, Ducharme and Martin (2000) point out that co-worker relations are a source of both affective and instrumental support, and that these prove beneficial in counterbalancing a relative lack of intrinsic or extrinsic rewards that the employee may be deriving from work. Workplace relationships may, however, also represent a source of satisfaction in and of themselves and may contribute directly to the employee’s overall level of job satisfaction (Ducharme & Martin, 2000).

Luthans (1992), however, contends that satisfactory co-worker relations are not essential to job satisfaction, but that in the presence of extremely strained relationships, job satisfaction is more than likely to suffer. Nevertheless, the growing body of literature on the subject seems to indicate that co-worker relations are taking on an ever-increasing role, not just in the realms of productivity, but also in determining the experience of work and its meaning (Hodson, 1997). These findings strengthen the argument that organizations should engage in the integration of employees so as to create group cohesion among employees and departments within the organization (Lambert, et al., 2001).
2.17 Intrinsic sources of job satisfaction

Intrinsic sources of job satisfaction primarily originate from within the individual and are essentially self-administered (Vecchio, 1988). These sources are generally intangible and have intrinsic and psychological value because of what they symbolize.

According to Vecchio (1988) intrinsic sources of job satisfaction include opportunities for promotion and feelings of recognition since these factors have symbolic or psychological meaning for the individual. It should be noted, however, that since these sources originate largely from the individual’s environment, they might also be viewed as extrinsic sources of satisfaction. In actual fact, they may therefore be said to serve a dual purpose.

2.17.1 Opportunities for promotion

The employee’s opportunities for promotion are also likely to exert an influence on job satisfaction (Landy, 1989; Larwood, 1984; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Vecchio, 1988). This pertains to the fact that promotions provide opportunities for personal growth, increased responsibility, and increased social status (Robbins, 1998).

According to McCormick and Ilgen (1985) employees’ satisfaction with promotional opportunities will depend on a number of factors, including the probability that the employee will be promoted, as well as the basis and the fairness of such promotions. Visser (1990) adds to this by stating that satisfaction pertaining to promotion can also be regarded as a function of the individual’s needs and the relative importance that the employee attaches to promotion.
Similarly, as is the case with pay, employees seek promotion policies that are equitable. If promotion decisions are perceived as being fair, employees are likely to derive satisfaction from their jobs (Robbins, 1998). Aamodt (1999) shares this view.

As pointed out by Visser (1990), however, perceived equity is not the only factor that will have a bearing on satisfaction. It is possible that the employee may be satisfied with the company’s promotion policy, yet be dissatisfied with the opportunities for promotion. Visser (1990) indicates that such an individual’s standards for promotion will depend chiefly on personal and career aspirations. Moreover, not all employees wish to be promoted. The reason therefore is related to the fact that promotion entails greater responsibility and tasks of a more complex nature, for which the individuals may consider themselves unprepared. It may therefore also happen that individuals consider the promotion policy as unfair, but since they have no desire to be promoted, they may still be satisfied.

According to Visser (1990) an employee’s need for promotion will depend largely on the following factors:

- the need for psychological growth, which is made possible by greater responsibility;
- the need for equity, where promotion is deserved;
- the need or desire for a higher income; and
- the desire for increased social status.

Nonetheless, opportunities for promotion appear to have a significant positive correlation with job satisfaction (Tolbert & Moen, 1998). In a study by Jayaratne and Chess (1984), cited in Staudt (1997), the opportunity for promotion was found to be the best and only common predictor of job satisfaction in child welfare, community mental health, and family services agencies.
Luthans (1992) further maintains that promotions may take a variety of different forms and are generally accompanied by different rewards. The author points out, for example, that individuals who are promoted on the basis of seniority often experience job satisfaction, but less so than is the case with employees promoted on the basis of performance. Promotional opportunities therefore have differential effects on job satisfaction, and it is essential that this be taken into account in cases where promotion policies are designed to enhance employee satisfaction.

2.17.2 Recognition

Recognition chiefly pertains to an expression of acknowledgement, appreciation and approval of services, deeds and achievements (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2000). Literature consistently indicates that employee satisfaction is positively influenced by the extent to which individuals receive recognition for their efforts (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2000; Gunter & Furnham, 1996; Robbins, 1998; Vecchio, 1988).

Arnolds and Boshoff (2000) and Visser (1990) hold that the positive relationship between satisfaction and recognition can be attributed to the fact that recognition is a potent satisfier of esteem needs. Visser (1990) further elaborates by stating that a positive self-concept is to a large extent dependent on the approval of others. In this sense recognition plays an important role in contributing to the employee’s self-image and, in so doing, also leads to higher job satisfaction. Consequently, it may be deduced that employees with a poor self-concept are more likely to be dependent upon recognition, and that their job satisfaction is more likely to be profoundly affected by it. By the same token, it follows that cultural socialization dictates that women are inclined to be more sensitive to the receipt of recognition from others (Visser, 1990).
Further support for the positive association between recognition and satisfaction was found in a study by Fako (2000) in which a moderate positive relationship was found between the satisfaction experienced by nurses and the extent to which their efforts were recognised by supervisors. Moreover, the study suggests that recognition may, to a certain extent, influence satisfaction by playing an instrumental role in offsetting the adverse effects of work overload and stress.

The above views are supported by Vorster (1992) who regards recognition as a necessary precondition for raising the job satisfaction of employees. It is held that such recognition may be attained by recognising employee contributions, taking employee suggestions into account, and inculcating an understanding amongst managers that the company is dependent upon the employee for organizational goal attainment.

2.18 The influence of demographic variables

A number of demographic variables have been identified as important for understanding job satisfaction. Research indicates that these variables influence satisfaction in one way or another and are therefore often included in job satisfaction models. These demographic variables include, age, gender, tenure, level of education, job level, and marital status.

2.18.1 Age

Research has consistently found age to exert an influence on job satisfaction (Chambers, 1999; Cramer, 1993; Robbins, 2001; Staw, 1995; Tolbert & Moen, 1998). While studies have yielded
mixed evidence in certain cases, the overwhelming body of research suggests a positive association, that is, older employees tend to experience higher levels of job satisfaction (Belcastro & Koeske, 1996; Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Cramer, 1993; Jones Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Larwood, 1984; Loscocco, 1990; Saal & Knight, 1988).

The positive correlation between age and satisfaction was also reported in a study by Oshagbemi (1997) involving 554 university teachers. Academics below the age of 35 years reported the lowest levels of satisfaction, followed by academics between the ages of 35 and 44 years. Academics above 55 years reported being the most satisfied with their jobs. Ting (1997), however, found age to only have significant effects on the job satisfaction of employees at lower job levels.

Numerous explanations may be presented for the positive association between employee age and satisfaction:

- prestige and confidence are likely to increase with age, as a result older employees are more likely to report high levels of job satisfaction;
- younger employees are likely to hold higher expectations that may remain unfulfilled, as jobs prove insufficiently challenging or meaningful;
- young college or university graduates may, in certain cases, be overqualified for their jobs;
- young employees may, in sharp contrast to what they previously experienced at home or in school, have insufficient control or authority over their work;
- older employees are more likely to have found jobs with which they are content; and
• instead of focusing only on employment for overall satisfaction, other factors, such as, family, friends, and involvement in civic organizations, are likely to take on a greater role as employees age (Hellman, 1997; Lambert, et al., 2001; Luthans, 1992).

In a correlation analysis, involving age and the separate subscales of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), Chambers (1999) found significant positive relationships between age and the work, co-worker, pay, and supervision subscales. However, a significant inverse relationship was reported between the promotions subscale and age, indicating that older employees were less satisfied with their opportunities for promotion than were their younger counterparts. Moreover, Tolbert and Moen (1998) found that younger employees were significantly more likely to rank income and promotion opportunities as important job characteristics. Older employees attached a higher value to achieving a sense of accomplishment from a job.

While the majority of researchers are in agreement regarding a positive relationship between job satisfaction and age, certain studies have suggested a curvilinear relationship between these two variables, that is, high satisfaction among young and old employees and low satisfaction among middle-aged employees (Staw, 1995). Robbins (2001) suggests that this inconsistency may be due to the fact that studies have been intermixing professional and non-professional employees. When the two types are separated, satisfaction tends to continuously increase among professionals as they age, while it drops among non-professionals during middle age and then rises again in the later years.
2.18.2 Gender

Considering the increase in the number of women in the workforce, gender differences in job satisfaction warrant attention. This conclusion has particular bearing on the service industry, where the high percentage of women have shown to be particularly affected by job satisfaction (Sousa-Poza, 2000b). However, the literature on the impact of gender on job satisfaction has been inconsistent, with some studies finding that females have lower job satisfaction than males, others finding that males have lower job satisfaction, and numerous others finding no gender differences.

According to Coward, Hogan, Duncan, Horne, Hiker, and Felsen (1995), cited in Jinnett and Alexander (1999), female employees demonstrate higher levels of job satisfaction than their male counterparts across most work settings. Indeed, a number of studies involving several different populations support this argument (Lambert, et al., 2001; Loscocco, 1990; Ma & MacMillan, 1999).

According to Loscocco (1990) women most value the type of job rewards that are more readily available from their jobs, such as relationships with co-workers. Consequently, they will be more easily satisfied than men who desire the less available autonomy and financial rewards. The same author also suggests that women may lower their job expectations because they are well aware of labour market realities. A further explanation for the higher levels of job satisfaction among women is offered by Lambert, et al. (2001). According to these authors men are more likely to stay in a job where they are not satisfied because they are socialized to view themselves as the primary breadwinner. The same socialization process stresses that for women, family and children should take priority over work satisfaction.
In contrast to the above view, researchers such as Miller and Wheeler (1992), cited in Lim, Teo, and Thayer (1998), maintain that women are inclined to be less satisfied in their jobs because they tend to hold positions at a lower level in the organizational hierarchy where pay and promotion prospects are less attractive. The same argument is presented by Lim, et al. (1998) who found that female police officers experience lower levels of job satisfaction than do male police officers. The findings of the latter study must, however, be generalized with caution. Women who are employed in male dominated professions are likely to experience different work-related attitudes as compared to their male counterparts since they may have to do without same-sex role models or established norms.

Numerous studies across a variety of occupational settings have, however, found no significant gender differences in job satisfaction, despite the fact that women on average have inferior jobs in terms of pay, status, level of authority, and opportunities for promotion (Hull, 1999; Jones Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Rout, 1999). Various theories have emerged to account for what has often been referred to as the “paradox of the contented working woman”. One of the most popular explanations is that men and women attach value to different aspects of the job. In addition to placing greater emphasis on co-worker relations, women are also more inclined to assign priority to work that provides them with a sense of accomplishment (Tolbert & Moen, 1998). Furthermore, women may compare themselves only with other women or with women who stay at home rather than with all other employees (Hull, 1999).

Saal and Knight (1988) as well as Scandura and Lankau (1997) substantiate the above-mentioned studies and indicate that gender differences in job satisfaction disappear when differences in perceived job characteristics, age, tenure, education, income, and occupational level are controlled.
2.18.3 Job level

According to Oshagbemi (1997) relatively few studies have been designed to investigate the nature of the relationship between job level and corresponding levels of satisfaction. However, Miles, et al. (1996) found job level to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. These researchers examined job level as a structural determinant of role behaviour and suggest that job level moderates the communication-job satisfaction relationship.

Several other researchers have also found support for a positive association between job level and satisfaction. Results from a study by Robie, Ryan, Schmieder, Parra, and Smith (1998) revealed a consistent and significant positive relationship between these two variables. Furthermore, Oshagbemi (1997) demonstrated that the job satisfaction of academics increases progressively with each higher rank. Smither (1988) and Vecchio (1988) also support this view and state that job satisfaction tends to be lowest among employees who are employed in jobs that are characterized by hot or dangerous conditions.

Robbins, et al. (1998) maintain that the positive correlation between rank and satisfaction may be attributed to the fact that higher-level jobs tend to be more complex and have better working conditions, pay, promotion prospects, supervision, autonomy, and responsibility. Vorster (1992) presents a similar argument.

The evidence from the literature seems to suggest, therefore, that job level is a reliable predictor of job satisfaction with employees at higher ranks being generally more satisfied with their jobs than employees at lower levels are.
2.18.4 Tenure

Tenure refers to the length of time for which the individual has worked for the organization (Lim, et al., 1998). Extant research indicates that tenure is likely to have an impact on job satisfaction (Jones, Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Saal & Knight, 1988).

In fact, literature overwhelmingly indicates that a positive correlation exists between tenure and job satisfaction, that is, employees with longer tenure are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs than employees with shorter tenure (Jinnett & Alexander, 1999; Jones Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Staw, 1995; Vecchio, 1988). Robbins (2001, p.36) shares this view, but states further that “when age and tenure are treated separately, tenure appears to be a more consistent and stable predictor of job satisfaction than is chronological age.”

Moreover, a study by Chambers (1999) established that employees with longer tenure were more satisfied with their work itself as well as their level of pay. From this it might be concluded that satisfaction increases with time and that those benefits that increase in time, such as security and experience, are likely to have an important influence on employee satisfaction.

On the other hand, Lambert, et al. (2001) argue that an inverse relationship exists between tenure and job satisfaction. The reason the literature is both inconsistent and inconclusive in this regard may be because the relationship between these variables depends on the specific organization and how tenure is viewed. In some organizations, senior employees are highly respected, while high tenure is viewed as a liability in other organizations (Lambert, et al., 2001).
2.18.5 Level of education

Studies investigating the relationship between job satisfaction and educational level have produced mixed results (Camp, 1994; Loscocco, 1990; Ting, 1997; Vorster, 1992). Certain authors maintain that the relationship between education and job satisfaction is positive in nature (Larwood, 1984; Saal & Knight, 1988; Vorster, 1992). Vorster (1992) found this association to be largely indirect, that is, the higher an individual’s qualifications, the higher that individual’s job level and, consequently, so too the employee’s degree of satisfaction.

On the other hand, Lambert, et al. (2001) found education to have no significant effect on job satisfaction. The authors explain these results, however, by stating that the study considered a number of different occupations, and educational levels are likely to differ by occupation and organization. Yet, other studies have supported the idea that no significant relationship exists between job satisfaction and education. Ting (1997) found education to have no effect on the satisfaction of federal government employees. Similarly, Rogers (1991) failed to find support for a link between the satisfaction and educational level of correctional service employees.

In a study by Loscocco (1990), however, education was found to exert a significant negative impact on the job satisfaction of women, but not on that of men. This could be explained by the fact that the educational experience is different for women than it is for men, thereby raising the job expectations of women to a greater extent. If these job expectations are not fulfilled, job satisfaction will be impacted on negatively.
Recent studies suggest, however, that educational level is positively related to job satisfaction, subject to a successful match being made between the individual’s work and qualifications (Battu, Belfield, & Sloane, 1999; Jones, Johnson & Johnson, 2000). This implies, therefore, that better educated employees are only likely to experience higher levels of job satisfaction when the duties performed by them are in line with their level of education.

2.18.6 Marital status

Research has consistently indicated that married employees are more satisfied with their jobs than are their unmarried co-workers (Chambers, 1999; Loscocco, 1990; Mehrabian, 1998; Robbins, 2001). More specifically, Chambers (1999) found being married to be significantly correlated with increased satisfaction in the pay, work, supervision, and co-worker subscales of the JDI.

Loscocco (1990) suggests that married men and women are more satisfied with their jobs than their single counterparts, presumably because marriage increases responsibilities and limits alternatives. Moreover, Vorster (1992) argues that employees’ personal lives are narrowly integrated with their work lives. As a result an employee’s dissatisfaction at work may at times be due more to personal problems than the characteristics of the job itself. This position is also held by Mehrabian (1998). However, the question of causation remains unclear, since it is possible that satisfied employees are more likely to be married (Robbins, 2001).
2.19 The influence of personality characteristics

There appears to be some consistency in job satisfaction across time and jobs. As such, the individual-difference approach postulates that a series of personality variables are related to employees’ job satisfaction (Aamodt, 1999). According to Judge, et al. (2000) job satisfaction is determined, in part, by core self-evaluations. These authors define core self-evaluations as “fundamental assessments that individuals make about themselves and their self-worth.” (p.237)

Incorporated into this concept are four dispositional traits: individuals’ outlook on life (affectivity), view of their self-worth (self-esteem), ability to master their environment (self-efficacy), and their ability to control their environment (external vs. internal locus of control) (Aamodt, 1999; Judge, et al., 2000).

Judge, et al. (2000) maintain that employees who are prone to be satisfied with their jobs tend to have high self-esteem, high self-efficacy, high positive affectivity, and an internal locus of control. Furthermore, a study by Lim, et al. (1998) revealed that individuals with an internal locus of control reported significantly higher mean scores on job satisfaction.

The influence of personality variables on job satisfaction has, however, remained largely unexplored by researchers. Consequently, more research is needed before firm conclusions can be drawn (Aamodt, 1999; Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992).
2.20 Consequences of job satisfaction

Human resource professionals are concerned with job satisfaction primarily because of the positive effects that it is expected to have on work behaviours. This is evidenced by the substantial amount of time spent by researchers in investigating the relationships between satisfaction and withdrawal, and between satisfaction and performance (Saal & Knight, 1988).

2.20.1 Withdrawal behaviours

According to Saal and Knight (1988, p.313) withdrawal is a “general term used to refer to behaviors by which workers remove themselves, either temporarily or permanently, from their jobs or workplaces.” Three forms of withdrawal have generally been linked to job satisfaction: tardiness, absenteeism, and turnover.

2.20.2 Tardiness

While it cannot be assumed that chronic tardiness is invariably due to dissatisfaction, certain forms of employee tardiness, such as that caused by lingering in the parking lot or restroom, may be attributed to low levels of satisfaction (Vecchio, 1988).

Smither (1988) further points out that tardiness has been described as a precursor to absenteeism, while absenteeism has in turn been viewed as a precursor and an alternative to turnover. The
author states that “the tardy employee will eventually become absent more frequently, and these absences will eventually lead to turnover” (p.317).

However, research has largely focused on the relationships between job satisfaction and absenteeism, and between satisfaction and turnover. Consequently, little evidence exists to support the relationship between job satisfaction and tardiness.

2.20.3 Absenteeism

Studies have consistently demonstrated an inverse relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism (Belcastro & Koeske, 1996; Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992; Luthans, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Organ, 1991; Saal & Knight, 1988). However, researchers appear to be in disagreement concerning the strength of this relationship.

Luthans (1992) and Moorhead and Griffen (1992) are of the opinion that a relatively strong relationship exists between these variables. This view is supported by Organ (1991) who maintains that job satisfaction should be an important focus of any organization that wishes to reduce absenteeism.

The above argument has, however, been refuted by a number of researchers who state that the correlation between job satisfaction and absenteeism is generally weak. In such a case, managers should not expect to realize any significant decrease in absenteeism by increasing the satisfaction of employees (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992; Smither, 1988). Saal and Knight (1988), for example,
report correlations between satisfaction, as measured by the JDI, and absence that range from -.09 to .08.

One of the reasons offered for the poor relationship between satisfaction and absenteeism is that conditions other than those that influence satisfaction influence absenteeism (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985). This view is shared by Luthans (1992) who is of the opinion that moderating variables, such as the degree to which people feel that their jobs are important, are likely to play a role. Employees who consider their jobs to be important are unlikely to have high rates of absenteeism.

Vecchio (1988), however, indicates that it is important to distinguish between voluntary and involuntary absenteeism. Staw (1995) expects satisfaction to affect only voluntary absences; therefore, satisfaction can never be strongly related to a measure of overall absence. In fact, those studies that have separated voluntary absences from overall absences have found that voluntary absence rates are more closely correlated with satisfaction than are overall absence rates (Staw, 1995).

Given the above, it might therefore be concluded that while high job satisfaction will not necessarily result in low absenteeism, low job satisfaction is likely to bring about high absenteeism (Luthans, 1992).
2.20.4 Turnover

Research has shown, with a reasonable degree of consistency, that dissatisfied employees are more likely to quit their jobs (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Organ, 1991; Robbins, 2001; Smither, 1988; Staw, 1995; Vecchio, 1988). In fact, Robbins (2001) argues that the correlation between job satisfaction and turnover is stronger than the correlation between satisfaction and absenteeism.

While certain researchers maintain that a direct relationship exists between job satisfaction and turnover (Clugston, 2000; Lambert et al., 2001), a growing body of literature suggests that the relationship is neither simple nor direct (Saal & Knight, 1988; Somers, 1996). Camp (1994), for example, found that job satisfaction exerts an insignificant direct influence on turnover.

Studies generally indicate that dissatisfaction leads to turnover intent which, in turn, is the direct precursor to actual turnover (Jinnett & Alexander, 1999; Morrison, 1997; Pasewark & Strawser, 1996; Quarles, 1994; Saal & Knight, 1988). In fact, in a study by Hellman (1997) it was implied that every unit of decrease in job satisfaction reflects approximately a one-half standard deviation increase in intent to leave. It is further maintained by Smither (1988) that such turnover intent is the best predictor of actual turnover.

The relationship between job satisfaction and turnover is further complicated by the presence of moderating variables such as labour market conditions, expectations about alternative job opportunities, the length of tenure with the organization and organizational commitment (Lum, et al., 1998; Robbins, 2001). Of these variables the most salient influence is exercised by the
availability of alternative employment opportunities (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985; Vecchio, 1988). This is substantiated by Staw (1995, p.94), who states that “Even if an employee is very dissatisfied with his job, he is not likely to leave unless more attractive alternatives are available.”

As in the case of absenteeism, job satisfaction will not, in and of itself, keep turnover low. On the other hand, however, if there is considerable job dissatisfaction, high turnover is likely to be evidenced (Luthans, 1992). It would therefore be accurate to say that job satisfaction is an important consideration in employee turnover.

2.20.5 Productivity

One of the biggest controversies in organizational behaviour centres on the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity. Despite a strong association found by some researchers, available evidence suggests that the relationship between satisfaction and productivity is a weak one (Klein & Ritti, 1984; Organ, 1991, Vecchio, 1988).

Several explanations have been forwarded as to why some studies have found a significant relationship between satisfaction and performance. The first is that the relationship itself is rather weak. A meta-analysis by Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) indicated that the average correlation between performance and satisfaction is only .15.

Moreover, it is suggested by MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne (1998) that the findings are indeterminate because some researchers have controlled for common antecedents of satisfaction.
and performance while others have not. Robbins (1998), on the other hand, is of the opinion that the discrepancy may be accounted for by the presence of moderator variables, that is, the introduction of moderator variables is inclined to improve the relationship.

Saal and Knight (1988) support the view held by Robbins (1998) and state that the relationship between satisfaction and performance is likely to be influenced by the manner in which rewards are distributed in the organization. When rewards are based on performance, the satisfaction-performance correlation is stronger. Furthermore, it has been suggested by Fisher (1980), cited in Morrison (1997), that stronger correlations between performance and satisfaction may result with the use of more specific measures for each of these constructs.

Another point of contention concerns the causal relationship between satisfaction and performance. According to Staw (1995) recent research suggests that the relationship between the two variables is probably due to performance indirectly causing satisfaction. In this sense job satisfaction becomes an incentive associated with the outcomes of job performance.

Researchers have also argued that satisfaction and performance influence each other (Vecchio, 1988). According to this viewpoint the relationship between satisfaction and performance is largely indirect. Satisfaction may, for example, indirectly influence performance through the belief that performance will be equitably rewarded.

Yet, other researchers have argued that satisfaction exerts an influence on productivity (Klein & Ritti, 1984). To date, however, empirical support for this perspective has been scant. Robbins (2001), however, suggests that the reason for the lack of support for the satisfaction-causes-
productivity thesis may be that studies have focused on individuals rather than the organization and that individual-level measures do no take all the interactions and complexities in the work process into account.

Given the above, it appears as if the nature of the relationship between satisfaction and performance is still in doubt and that it warrants further testing. Nevertheless, Vecchio (1988) suggests that managers should strive to create linkages between satisfaction and performance by offering attractive and equitable rewards that are tied to performance.

2.20.6 Effects on quality of life

In addition to organizational performance objectives, there are also important humanitarian reasons for enhancing the satisfaction of employees. Firstly, satisfaction at work carries over to the employee’s life outside the workplace. Consequently, job satisfaction has been found to have a positive effect on the individual’s satisfaction with life in general (Aamodt, 1999; Landy, 1989; Robbins, 1998).

Furthermore, the physical and mental well-being of employees appear to be related to job satisfaction. Although the evidence is strictly correlational in nature, highly satisfied employees tend to have better physical and mental health records (Luthans, 1992; Vecchio, 2000). More specifically, serious job dissatisfaction, as manifested in stress, may give rise to a multiplicity of physiological disorders, including headaches, ulcers, arterial disease, and heart disease (Robbins, 1998; Vecchio, 2000).
2.21 Conclusion

Job satisfaction not only affects employee well-being and quality of life, but also has an important impact on organizational effectiveness and productivity. Research indicates that job satisfaction can contribute not only to productive output, but to organizational maintenance objectives as well.

Employees’ decisions about whether they will go to work on any given day and whether they will quit are affected by their level of job satisfaction. Furthermore, absenteeism interrupts scheduling, while the costs of recruiting and training replacement employees are phenomenal. However, because satisfaction is manageable and influences absenteeism and turnover, organizations can control such withdrawal behaviours (Staw, 1995).

Furthermore, studies suggest that by keeping employee satisfaction high an organization may be able to enhance the job performance of its workforce and harvest the consequent benefits hereof (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992). Service organizations in particular, stand to benefit from high levels of job satisfaction among their employees. Research has demonstrated that job satisfaction plays a particularly salient role in such organizations, in that an increase in the satisfaction of employees may directly raise the satisfaction of customers as well (Sousa-Poza, 2000a).

In conclusion therefore, it may be said that when the potential benefits and consequences of employee satisfaction are taken into account, organizations cannot, within the context of continued growth and survival, afford to ignore job satisfaction.
2.22 Summary of Chapter

This chapter focused on the various career anchors and the motivational theories associated with job satisfaction. It provides an overview of the literature relating to career anchors and job satisfaction. It also highlights the definition of career anchors as well as explains the origin of formation of career anchors. Hence, this section presents a theoretical background of this research study, and will be utilised to test and support the hypotheses.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapter focuses on previous studies and provides in-depth literature on the phenomenon of career anchors and job satisfaction. This chapter draws attention to the research problem. Highlighting the sampling method used to select participants. This chapter also emphasizes the importance of the various research tools and psychometric instruments utilised in order to gather the data effectively. Questionnaires were the main source used to gather information, and include the use of a biographical questionnaire; the career anchors inventory questionnaire; as well as the Job Descriptive Index (JDI).

3.2 Population

According to Sekaran (2000), a population comprises of the group of individuals, events or factors of concern to the researcher. “A population is the collection of all the observations of a random variable under study and about which is trying to draw conclusions in practice” (Wegner, 2002, p. 4).

Therefore, a population should be described in a very detailed manner in order to only include those sampling units with attributes that pertain to the problem (Wegner, 2002). In this research study the population would comprise of all the staff members of this specific retail organisation that are situated at Head Office. It is evident that only 757 employees are classified as having
Head Office as a sub area on SAP the HR information system in this organisation. In order to be more precise and include other employees that do also in fact work physically at Head Office but for different divisions that form part of the retail group then the appropriate size of the population is that of 1276.

3.3 Sample

A sample can be defined as the subset of the population from which observations can be made. The main reason that a sample should be drawn from the population is due to the fact that not every member of the population can be observed or measured, as this would be time consuming and costly (Wegner, 2002). It is also imperative that the sample is representative of the population. The sample in this research study consists of a group of employees of this specific retail organisation.

3.3.1 Selection of Sample

Sampling is the process used to select various factors, characteristics, people and things in a study. In this instance the unit of analysis is the participants that took part in this study that were from the retail organisation within the Western Cape. This clearly means that individuals are the unit of analysis, as each individual’s response will be compared with that of the other. A non-probability sampling method is used in this study particularly in the form of convenience sampling. The justification and validation for the use of this sampling method was due to the large accessible pool of participants that were at hand, as well as being easier and less time consuming to collect the data, and lastly it is inexpensive (Sekaran, 2000).
3.3.2 Sample Size

There were 180 questionnaires handed out to various employees in the retail organisation within the Western Cape, and only 154 employees (n=154) completed and returned the questionnaires. Therefore, a response of rate 85.5% was accomplished. Sekaran (2000) is of the opinion that a sample size between thirty and five hundred participants is suitable and appropriate for most research.

3.4 Procedure of Collecting Data

The Director of the Human Resource department within the retail organisation permitted the collection of data. A cover letter attached to each research questionnaire, elucidating the aim and the nature of the research study, was distributed to the employees. The cover letter also assured the individuals that their participation in this study was voluntary and that their responses would be confidential and anonymous. Employees were guaranteed that their responses would not hinder their job in any matter, as their responses were unidentifiable.

3.5 Measuring Instruments

The utilisation of questionnaires is considered suitable and appropriate for collecting information in this research study. The rationale for the use of surveys and questionnaires are mainly for descriptive, exploratory and explanatory purposes. Surveys are mainly used when individuals are the unit of analysis. Surveys are used when a researcher is working with a large sample and hopes to find quick results. Surveys are used to try to ascertain respondent’s attitudes concerning some phenomena (Sekaran, 2003). According to Babbie and Mouton (2006) some disadvantages of the
use of a questionnaire include aspects such the inability to make generalisations about the
population, as well as the fact that some responses of the participants might elicit sociably
desirable responses and hence not be a true reflection of how they actually feel. Even though there
are some disadvantages to the use of a questionnaire as a measurement instrument, it still serves as
the main source of data collection.

Three types of questionnaires were included in this study namely that of:

A biographical questionnaire
The Job Descriptive Index (JDI)
The Career Orientation Inventory (COI)

3.5.1 Biographical Questionnaire
A questionnaire was developed to determine respondent’s characteristics with respect to gender,
age, marital status, race, tenure, and level of education.

3.5.2 Career Orientation Inventory (COI)

The Career Orientation Inventory (CDI) was developed by Schein and it measures eight career
anchors as follows: technical/functional competence, general/managerial competence,
autonomy/independence, security/stability, entrepreneurial creativity, service/dedication, pure
challenge, and lifestyle. The Career Orientation Inventory consists of 41 items which assesses
each individual’s career anchor preference. Each of the items is of equal value, and individuals
must respond in terms of how significant the statement is (Schein, 1990). A five point likert scale is use to assess the individual’s response. All the scores of the career anchors are added from each category and an average is calculated in order to determine a score for each career anchor. The two highest scores are used to ascertain the career anchor of the person.

The questions on the Career Orientation Inventory include the following:

Questions 1 to 21, includes a Likert scale, which ranges from one to five, where 1 is considered as being of absolutely no importance and 5 being very important.

Questions 22 to 41, includes a Likert scale, which ranges from one to five, where 1 is not true and 5 is considered as being completely true.

3.5.2.1 Validity of the Career Orientation Inventory (COI)

The validity of an instrument refers to what the test measures as well as how well it measures what it is supposed to (Babbie & Mouton, 2006).

There are different ways of measuring validity that can be adopted to assess the validity of an instrument such as:

- Face Validity
- Content Validity
- Construct Validity
- Criterion-related Validity

Face validity highlights the extent to which an instrument or test appears to provide a reasonable and acceptable measure. Content validity is the degrees to which a measure comprises of all the different meanings of the concept under discussion. Whilst construct validity is utilised in order to
assess whether the constructs in the instrument or test measures relates to other variables as expected within a system of theoretical relationships. Criterion-related validity is the degree to which a measure relates to some other external criterion (Babbie & Mouton, 2006).

According to a research study carried out by Danziger et al. (2008) on the construct validity of the Career Orientation Inventory (COI), a confirmatory factor analysis was done to assure convergent validity, discriminatory validity and unidimensionality. The convergent validity was assessed by loading their factors and the reliability (Cronbach Alpha) and discriminatory validity were assessed by methods by Anderson and Gerbing (1988), cited in Danziger et al.(2008) . The overall measurement of the Career Orientation Inventory (COI) as stipulated by the indices is supportive of the construct validity of each construct. It is apparent that each indicator loads significantly in relation to its relevant construct and implies that the measurement scale for each construct displays high convergent validity. Inter-factor correlations were adopted to measure discriminant validity (Danziger et al., 2008). It is apparent that the Career Orientation Inventory (COI) as stated by the indices supports the discriminant validity of each construct.

The validity of this questionnaire is feasible as it predicts an array of factors as opposed to just individual differences (Kaplan, 1990 cited in Ellison & Schreuder, 2000). The Career Orientation Inventory displays high internal validity (Burke 1983; Custodio 2004; Delong 1982a & 1982b, Wood, Winston & Polksnik cited in Coetzee and Schreuder, 2009). According to Slabbert (1978) the Career Orientation Inventory (COI) is acceptable and valid for the South African managers, as the factor analysis done generated similar results to those reported by Schein (1990).
3.5.2.2 Reliability of the Career Orientation Inventory

Reliability pertains to the quality of the measurement method, and suggests that the same information would be collected if the test had to be carried out on another occasion. Therefore, reliability focuses on the consistency of the measurement instrument of anything it assesses (Babbie & Mouton, 2006). If test scores display different scores each time that it is used then the reliability will be low. The results reveal that the Cronbach Alpha ranges are moderately high, and internal consistency has been achieved, with the exception of the reliabilities of the technical competence and the lifestyle integration (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000). A sought-after reliability coefficient would fall into the ranges of 0.80 to 0.90 (Anatasi, 1976 cited in Ellison & Schreuder, 2000). It is apparent that instances whereby individual testing occurs, reliabilities appear to be low as 0.30 but are still satisfactory and adequate when the measurements are utilised to collect group data (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000).

Subsequently the Career Orientation Inventory is used in this research study as it was considered as valid and reliable in terms of the various psychometric properties.

3.5.3 The Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

Smith, Kendall and Hulin developed the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) in 1969 and it is an internationally well-known measurement tool used to describe employees’ level of job satisfaction within organisations (Malherbe & Pearse, 2003). The JDI assesses specific facets of job satisfaction as opposed to job satisfaction from a global perspective, and it also permits the job to be autonomously assessed (Spector, 2000). It allows the participants to express their feelings about their job by selecting options on each question, as opposed to having open-ended questions.
relating to their level of job satisfaction. The JDI therefore ensures that the participants’ responses have a job-orientated response about their levels of job satisfaction, as opposed to a mere self-directed response.

The Job Descriptive Index utilises 72 items to measure five components of job satisfaction. The five components of job satisfaction include supervision, promotion, and relationships with co-workers, pay as well as the work itself. It comprises of nine items, which focuses on the components of promotion, pay, and eighteen items that encompasses on work, supervision and co-workers (Malherbe & Pearse, 2003).

The participants responses are scored according to their responses on each statement, regarding their occupations. The individual’s responses are scored as follows:

Positively discriminating items are reflected in terms of the following:

- ‘YES’, as being the highest figure,
- ‘?’ as sitting on the fence and
- ‘NO’, as the lowest figure.

Negative discriminating items are reflected in terms of the following:

- ‘YES’ as the lowest figure
- ‘?’ as sitting on the fence and
- ‘NO’ as the highest figure (Cherrington, 1994).

All of these ratings of job satisfaction are then merged in order to provide an overall assessment of job satisfaction. The Job Descriptive Index was revised by Roznowski (1989) cited in Fields
(2002) in order to accommodate for the changing work environment such as that of technology and the job content.

3.5.3.1 The Validity of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

According to Okpara (2004) there is evidence that the JDI instrument is valid. The validity of the Job Descriptive Index indicates that satisfaction with co-workers, the work itself, promotion, pay, and supervision are all positively related. Roznowski (1989) cited in Fields (2002) carried out a factor analysis on the Job Descriptive Index, and emphasized that the five factors were loaded, as well as that the factors on each subscale were single loaded. The construct validity of the JDI was supported by acceptable inferences of internal consistency, t-retest reliability and thus the results display convergent and discriminatory validity Roznowski (1989) cited in Fields (2002).

According to Magnussen (1966), cited in Smit (1996), the validity of a measure pertains to the accuracy with which meaningful and relevant measurements can be made with it, to the extent that the instrument actually measures the aspects that it was intended to measure.

The validity of the JDI as a measure of job satisfaction was extensively researched by Smith, et al. (1969). These studies involved determining convergent and discriminant validity for the JDI, correlations with objective measures of job satisfaction, as well as factor analysis. Empirical evidence for the validity of the JDI was consistently demonstrated. Furthermore, the validation studies conducted by Smith, et al. (1969) have received support from a number of other researchers. Swart (1980), cited in Vorster (1992), for example, reports validity coefficients for the JDI that vary between 0.5 and 0.7.
In light of available evidence, the JDI may, therefore, be regarded as a valid instrument for the measurement of job satisfaction.

### 3.5.3.2 Reliability of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

The reliability of the Job Descriptive Index ranges from 0.75-0.94 for satisfaction due to pay, 0.78-0.91 satisfaction due to supervision, 0.87-0.92 satisfaction due to promotions, 0.82-0.87 satisfaction of co-workers, 0.87-0.92 on Cronbach Alpha. The overall range of the Cronbach Alpha is between 0.87-0.92.

According to Anastasi and Urbina (1997, p. 84) reliability “refers to the consistency of scores obtained by the same persons when they are re-examined with the same test on different occasions, or with different sets of equivalent items, or under other variable examining conditions.” In short, the reliability of an instrument attests to the stability and consistency with which it measures the construct (Sekaran, 2000).

The test-retest reliability of a measure is found by repeating the same test on a second occasion. It indicates the extent to which scores can be generalized over different occasions. The higher the coefficient, the less susceptible scores on the measuring instrument are to random daily fluctuations (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997; Smit, 1996).

Time and cost precluded Smith, et al. (1969) from establishing test-retest estimates for the JDI. Schreider and Dachler (1978), however, established test-retest reliability for the JDI of between
0.45 and 0.76. Johnson, Smith and Tucker (1982), cited in Saal and Knight (1988), on the other hand, reported higher retest coefficients, ranging between 0.68 and 0.88.

Split-half reliability is determined by splitting the test into two halves and then obtaining the correlation between the two. It is, therefore, a measure of internal consistency (Smit, 1996). Smith, et al. (1969) calculated split-half coefficients for the subsections of the JDI using a sample of eighty male employees from two electronic plants. The coefficients, as estimated by the Spearman-Brown formula, are provided in Table 3.1. All estimates are over 0.80.

Table 3.1 Internal Consistency Coefficients for the JDI, as estimated by the Spearman-Brown Formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI-SCALE</th>
<th>SPEARMAN-BROWN COEFFICIENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of the job</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interitem consistency of a measuring instrument is based on the consistency of responses to all items in the measure (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). In a study by Richmond, McCrosley and Davis (1982), cited in Vorster (1992), the interitem consistency reliability of the JDI was investigated. The Cronbach-Alpha reliability coefficients that were reported for the different subscales of the JDI are presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Cronbach-Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the different subscales of the JDI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI-SCALE</th>
<th>CRONBACH-ALPHA COEFFICIENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of the Job</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of the above information, the JDI may be considered a reliable instrument for the measurement of job satisfaction.
3.6 STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES

3.6.1 Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics is used in order to present the data in a manageable and convenient manner and describe the interest or phenomena of interest. The descriptive statistics used in this study include; mean, standard deviation, percentages, and frequency. Descriptive statistics is utilised in this research study in order to describe the biographical variables in relation to career anchor and job satisfaction and highlight common trends (Babbie & Mouton, 2006).

3.6.2 Inferential statistics

Inferential statistics are used to make generalisations about the population, as well as to assess whether the findings are significant or not. Sekaran (2000) maintains that inferential statistics assist the researcher in making inferences from the information collected by means of analysing the relationship between two variables, about the disparity amongst subgroups as well as the effects and variances that the different independent variables have on the dependent variable. The following inferential statistics were utilised to test the hypotheses in this research study such as the Pearson Product- Moment Correlation Coefficient, Multiple Regression Analysis, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

The Hypotheses are tested in this study in order to assess whether generalisations could be inferred about the population, in terms of the Pearson Product- Moment Correlation Coefficient, Multiple Regression Analysis, and Analysis of Variance (Babbie & Mouton, 2001).
3.6.2.1 The Pearson Product Moment Correlation

Pearson’s correlation coefficient is used in order to assess the relationship between 2 ratio scale variables, whereas the Spearman’s rank correlation is used to ascertain the correlation between 2 ordinal scale variables (Wegner, 2002). In this research study the Pearson Product Moment Correlation is used in order to be provided with detailed descriptions about the relationship between career anchors and job satisfaction. The Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient Presents an indication of the extent to which the variables being assessed are related to each other or not, and it allows one to also determine the directionality and strength of the correlation.

The computational formula for the Product Moment Correlation Coefficient is as follows (Zellar & Carmines, 1978, p. 141):

\[
r = \frac{N \sum xy - \sum x \sum y}{\sqrt{[N \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2][N \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2]}}
\]

The product moment correlation coefficient was the appropriate technique for use in this study since it is an index that is used to detect the linear relationship that exists between two variables (Keppel & Zedeck, 1989; Mason & Bramble, 1989; Sekaran, 2000). Two important pieces of information can be derived from the coefficient.
The first is the direction of the relationship between the variables. A positive coefficient indicates that the two variables vary in the same direction, that is, the higher the scores in the one variable, the higher the scores in the other variable. When a perfect positive correlation exists between the variables, the value of the coefficient is +1.00. A negative coefficient, on the other hand, indicates that the two variables vary in opposite directions. As the one variable increases, so the other decreases. A perfect negative relationship between the variables will, thus, be indicated by a correlation coefficient of –1.00 (Keppel & Zedeck, 1989; Mason & Bramble, 1989).

The second piece of information that can be gained from the Pearson correlation coefficient is the strength of the relationship between the two variables. Values near zero indicate a weak linear relationship. The strength of the relationship increases as the value of the coefficient (r) moves toward either –1.00 or +1.00. If r is close to +1.00, it indicates a strong, positive linear correlation and if r is close to –1.00, it is indicative of a strong, negative linear correlation (Viljoen & Van der Merwe, 2000).

The product moment correlation coefficient is, therefore, suitable for the purposes of the present study since the study attempted to describe the relationship between job satisfaction and career anchors.

3.6.2.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple Regression Analysis is utilised in order to assess the concurrent effects of a number of variables on a dependent variable that is interval scaled. It assists in understanding how much of the variance in the dependent variable is elucidated by an array of predictors (Sekaran, 2003). The
different types of multiple regression methods that could be used are namely, stepwise multiple regression analysis, the partial multiple regression analysis and the curvilinear regression analysis. The stepwise multiple regression analysis is utilised in this research study in order to attempt to explain all the facets of career anchors and job satisfaction, which considerably explain the variance in career anchors and job satisfaction amongst employees within a retail industry.

Multiple regression, also known as general linear modelling, is a multivariate statistical technique that is used for studying the relationship between a single dependent variable and several independent variables (Allison, 1999; Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black, 1995). More specifically, Hair, et al. (1995) point out that the objective of multiple regression analysis is to predict the changes in the dependent variable in response to changes in more than one independent variable. In this manner, multiple regression provides a means of objectively analysing the magnitude and direction of each independent variable’s relationship to the dependent variable. Consequently, the relative importance of each predictor is determined. However, in addition to their individual contribution to the variance in the dependent variable, multiple regression also allows for the determination of the collective contribution of the independent variables (Hair, et al., 1995).

Allison (1999) and Sekaran (2000) indicate that multiple regression analysis is specifically designed for separating the effects of more than one independent variable on the dependent variable when the independent variables not only simultaneously influence the dependent variable, but are also intercorrelated with one another. Therefore, in determining the extent to which the independent variables explain the variance in the dependent variable, the independent variables are jointly regressed against the dependent variable (Sekaran, 2000).
3.6.2.3 Analysis of Variance

Analysis of Variance is used in order to assess the statistical significant difference among the means of two or more groups (Kranzler, 2003). ANOVA was utilised in this research study in order to assess whether there are significant difference in employees career anchors and level of job satisfaction based on biographical factors such age, gender and education.
3.7 Summary of the Chapter

This chapter explained the research design, the nature of the sample, the procedure used to gather the data, the description of the measurement instruments, and the statistical techniques that were used to test the hypotheses in this research study. The next chapter provides an overview of the most important findings.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines the results of this research study and confers the findings of the results. This chapter commences with an analyses of the biographical data that was collected from the research sample (n=154). The data is graphically presented and analysed by means of bar charts. It is notable that explanations are provided on the most salient sample characteristics in terms of frequencies and percentages. Thus, descriptive and inferential statistics are presented, and discussed thereafter.

4.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The Descriptive statistics calculated for the sample are present in the subsequent sections that follow.

4.2.1 RESULTS OF THE BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Descriptive statistics is used in order to present the biographical data in a more manageable manner in the form of bar charts and then interpreted the salient sample characteristics with regards to frequencies and percentages.
Figure 4.1 depicts the graphic presentation of the gender distribution of the sample. There are a greater number of females respondents (n=88), and this constitutes for 57% of the sample. The male respondents comprises of (n=66) of 43% of the sample.
Figure 4.2 present the frequency distribution of the age of the respondents of the sample. It is evident that the majority of the sample (n=89) falls into the age category 20 to 29 years old. Hence, this forms 58% of the sample. Subsequently, this is followed by the age category 30-39 years old (n=43), which comprises of 28% of the sample. The minority of the sample fall into the +50-age category.
Figure 4.3 indicates that there are more single (n=76) respondents that took part in this study, as it constitutes for 49% of the sample. Whilst there 48% of the sample are married. The variance between the amount of single and married respondents is diminutive. Only (n=3) of the respondents are classified as being divorce, and this comprises of merely 2% of the sample.
The frequency distribution in Figure 4.4 depicts that there are (n=67) White respondents that participated in this study. This means that 44% of the sample is White, in terms of the racial distribution. This is followed by Coloureds (n=64), that constitutes 41%, Blacks (n=19) that comprises of 12 %, and Indians (n=4) that is 3% of the sample.
Figure 4.5 presents the years of service of the respondents. The majority of the respondents (n=58) or 38% have >5 years of service within the organisation, and (n=45) or 29% of the respondents have between 2 to 3 years service within the organisation. The minority of the respondents (n= 15) have < 1 years service with the organisation. Hence, this comprises of 10% of the total sample.
The frequency distribution in Figure 4.6 indicates the level of education of the sample. The graphic illustration shows that respondents with Matric represent the larger proportion (n=53) of the sample of respondents, which is 34%. The employees with Diplomas (n=44) comprises of 29% of the sample. Whilst those with Bachelor Degrees (n=41) comprises 27%, those with Honours Degrees (n=11) comprises 7%. Only five respondents have a Masters Degree, this is also the lowest proportion of the sample group, which is 3%.
Figure 4.7 focuses on the frequency distribution of the current occupation of the employees of the sample. It is evident that the majority of the respondents (n=56) or 36% occupy positions as clerks currently. This is followed by junior managers (n=43) or 28%, consultants (n=23) or 15%, senior managers (n=17) or 11%, and specialists (n=12) or 8%. Thus, only 2% of the sample forms part of top management.
Figure 4.8 infers that most of the respondents (n=39) or 25% desire to be senior managers. Thereafter, (n=37) or 24% desire to be specialists, 22% desire to be junior managers, and 19% desire to be part of top management. Whilst, only a few of the respondents (n=5) or 3% desire the occupation of a clerk.
4.2.2 RESULTS OF THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX (JDI)

The descriptive statistics in the form of arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated for the various dimensions assessed by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Career Orientation Inventory (COI).

4.2.2.1 TABLE 4.1: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE DIMENSIONS OF JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cases (n)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 displays that the arithmetic mean for the total job satisfaction of the sample is 43.0 with a standard deviation of 17.7. The arithmetic means of the subscales for Supervision is 13.0, Colleagues or Co-workers is 11.0, and Work Itself is 10.6. Thus, an estimated mean of 11.5 would be regarded as an average level of job satisfaction on these subscales. This infers that the employees at the retail organisation are relatively satisfied with the supervision that they receive from management. It is evident that the employees display a certain amount of satisfaction with their colleagues and co-workers as the mean for this subscale is just below the average mean of the subscales of discussion.
The means of subscales pay and promotion are that of 4.4 and 4.0 respectively. The average levels of job satisfaction on these subscales display a mean of 4.2. It can therefore be inferred that the employees in this retail organisation are satisfied with their pay, but not satisfied with their opportunities for promotion.

### 4.2.2.1 TABLE 4.2: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE DIMENSIONS OF CAREER ANCHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cases(n)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Security</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of Career Anchors</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With reference to table 4.2, it is evident that the average mean for the total career anchors is 31.0 with a standard deviation of 7.3. The mean of the Technical/Functional competence is 3.5. The mean of General Managerial is 3.6, and the mean of the Autonomy competence is 3.3. Hence, the average mean of these subscales is 3.5 with an average standard deviation of 0.1. This means that the employees at this retail organisation have a strong preference for the General Managerial...
career anchor and some preference for the Technical/Functional competence. The subscales of Job Security and Geographic Security have means of 3.9 and 2.9. Subsequently, the average mean of these subscales is 3.4. The Job Security career anchor has the highest mean value, which is 3.9 out of all the career anchors. The subscales Service /Dedication, Pure Challenge, Lifestyle, and Entrepreneurial Creativity, have mean scores of 3.8, 3.2, 3.8, and 2.9 respectively. It is inferred that the career anchors Geographical Security and Entrepreneurial Creativity have the same mean value of 2.9, as well as the lowest in comparison to the others.

4.3 INFERENTIAL STATISTICS

The following part of this chapter focuses on the inferential statistics that was utilised in this study. The hypotheses were tested by means of Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, Multiple Regression Analysis, ANOVA and MONVA. By making use of these statistical techniques, relevant findings are made about the sample, and conclusions are drawn concerning the hypotheses.
Hypothesis 1: A Significant relationship exists between career anchors and job satisfaction amongst employees in a retail organisation.

**TABLE 4.3 INTER-CORRELATIONS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CAREER ANCHORS AND THE DIMENSIONS OF JOB SATISFACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER ANCHORS</th>
<th>Work Itself</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r – value</td>
<td>p – value</td>
<td>r – value</td>
<td>p – value</td>
<td>r – value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>.1603</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.2010</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.1049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>.0887</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.1830</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-.0322</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>-.0891</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.0375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>-.0561</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>-.2240</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.0736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Security</td>
<td>-.1425</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.0508</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.0296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/ Dedication</td>
<td>-.0769</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>-.3037</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.0384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>.0784</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.0427</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.0251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>-.0425</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>-.0972</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>-.0185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>-.2850</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.3494</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.1932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 indicates the results of the inter-correlation between career anchors and job satisfaction. According to table 4.3 there is a significant correlation between the Technical/Functional career anchor and work itself \((r=0.1603)\) with a significant level of confidence \((p=0.47)\). There is a very negative correlation \((r=-0.2850)\) between the Entrepreneurial Creativity career anchor and Work itself or the nature of work. There is a significant positive correlation \((r=0.2010)\) between the Technical/Functional competence and Pay. Hence, there is a significant level of confidence \((p=0.12)\) between The Technical/Functional competence and Pay. There is also a statistically significant positive \((p=0.23)\) relationship between the General Managerial competence and Pay. There is a negative correlation \((r=-0.3037)\) between the Service/Dedication career anchor and Pay. It is evident that there is a negative relationship \((r=-0.3494)\) between Entrepreneurial
Creativity and Pay with a significant confidence level of (p=0.00). However there is a positive correlation (r=0.2343) and (p=0.03) between the Technical/Functional competence and Promotion. The correlation between General Managerial competence and Promotion is (r= 0.2949) and the level of significance is (p=0.00). The relationship between the Entrepreneurial Creativity career anchor and Colleagues or co-workers is negative (r= -0.2060).
Hypothesis 2: There are significant differences in employees’ level of job satisfaction with regard to biographical factors (gender, age, race, tenure, education, current occupation and desired occupation) within a retail organisation.

**TABLE 4.4: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND BIOGRAPHICAL FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work Itself</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r - value</td>
<td>.0174</td>
<td>-.1173</td>
<td>-.0565</td>
<td>-.0796</td>
<td>.0297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r - value</td>
<td>.1870</td>
<td>.0831</td>
<td>.1112</td>
<td>-.0188</td>
<td>.0127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p - value</td>
<td>p=.020</td>
<td>p=.306</td>
<td>p=.170</td>
<td>p=.817</td>
<td>p=.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r - value</td>
<td>.0815</td>
<td>.1712</td>
<td>-.0302</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>-.0332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p - value</td>
<td>p=.315</td>
<td>p=.034</td>
<td>p=.710</td>
<td>p=.985</td>
<td>p=.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r - value</td>
<td>.0599</td>
<td>.2522</td>
<td>.0257</td>
<td>.1824</td>
<td>.0640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p - value</td>
<td>p=.461</td>
<td>p=.002</td>
<td>p=.752</td>
<td>p=.024</td>
<td>p=.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r - value</td>
<td>.2513</td>
<td>.2433</td>
<td>.1788</td>
<td>.1148</td>
<td>.0244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p - value</td>
<td>p=.002</td>
<td>p=.002</td>
<td>p=.027</td>
<td>p=.156</td>
<td>p=.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r - value</td>
<td>.1740</td>
<td>.0671</td>
<td>.1582</td>
<td>-.0062</td>
<td>.0554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p - value</td>
<td>p=.031</td>
<td>p=.408</td>
<td>p=.050</td>
<td>p=.939</td>
<td>p=.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r - value</td>
<td>.0109</td>
<td>.0451</td>
<td>-.0610</td>
<td>.0435</td>
<td>-.1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p - value</td>
<td>p=.893</td>
<td>p=.579</td>
<td>p=.453</td>
<td>p=.592</td>
<td>p=.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desired Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r - value</td>
<td>-.0119</td>
<td>.0056</td>
<td>.0344</td>
<td>-.0923</td>
<td>.1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p - value</td>
<td>p=.884</td>
<td>p=.945</td>
<td>p=.672</td>
<td>p=.255</td>
<td>p=.182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: * p<0.05  
    ** p<0.01
Table 4.4 indicates the relationship between job satisfaction and biographical factors. It is evident that there is a significant relationship \((r=0.1870, p=0.20)\) between age and work itself or the nature of work. There is a positive correlation \((r=0.2513)\) between the years of service and the work itself of the sample of employees. Hence the level of confidence of this correlation is highly significant \((p=0.02)\). The relationship between the respondents’ level of education and the nature of work is also significant \((p=0.31)\). The correlation between employees’ marital status and their level of pay displays a significance level of \(p=0.34\). There is a positive correlation \((r=0.2433)\) between the years of service that employees have within the organisation and the amount of pay that they receive, with a significance level of \(p=0.002\). According to the table 4.4 there is also a significant relationship \((p=0.27)\) and \((r=0.1788)\) between tenure and years of service of the employees and the supervision that they receive in this retail organisation. The results also reveal that there is a positive correlation \((r=0.1824)\) between race and promotion.
Hypothesis 3: There are statistically significant differences in career anchors of employees within a retail organisation with regard to biographical factors (gender, age, race, tenure, education, current occupation and desired occupation) within a retail organisation.

**TABLE 4.5a GENDER AND CAREER ANCHORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.556712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>4.703</td>
<td>0.031672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.550092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.356501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Security</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>0.223422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication</td>
<td>1.814</td>
<td>1.814</td>
<td>2.517</td>
<td>0.114699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>0.192827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.725251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>3.791</td>
<td>3.791</td>
<td>4.092</td>
<td><strong>0.044835</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5a presents a summary of the differences in career anchors based on gender. The results indicate that there are statistically significant differences in the General Managerial career anchor based gender (p<0.05). The table also depicts that there is a significant difference in Entrepreneurial Creativity and gender (F = 4.092, p=0.044).
### TABLE 4.5b AGE AND CAREER ANCHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional</td>
<td>4.1441</td>
<td>1.3814</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>0.105338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial</td>
<td>3.4486</td>
<td>1.1495</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.176649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2.2806</td>
<td>0.7602</td>
<td>1.757</td>
<td>0.157977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.401423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Security</td>
<td>6.4572</td>
<td>2.1524</td>
<td>1.9598</td>
<td>0.122488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication</td>
<td>5.5236</td>
<td>1.8412</td>
<td>2.609</td>
<td>0.053681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>0.6168</td>
<td>0.2056</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.682910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>0.9739</td>
<td>0.3246</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.471833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>7.0010</td>
<td>2.3337</td>
<td>2.5440</td>
<td>0.058368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5b illustrates the differences in career anchors based on age. The results indicate that there are no statistically significant differences in career anchors based on age.
### TABLE 4.5c  RACE AND CAREER ANCHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech/Functional Manager</td>
<td>2.4938</td>
<td>0.8313</td>
<td>1.2310</td>
<td>0.300559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial</td>
<td>3.3519</td>
<td>1.1173</td>
<td>1.6184</td>
<td>0.187517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1.8460</td>
<td>0.6153</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>0.241445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>5.5023</td>
<td>1.8341</td>
<td>2.480</td>
<td>0.063332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Security</td>
<td>2.2690</td>
<td>0.7563</td>
<td>0.6716</td>
<td>0.570744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication</td>
<td>6.9022</td>
<td>2.3007</td>
<td>3.304</td>
<td><strong>0.021996</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>1.1710</td>
<td>0.3903</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.414425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
<td>0.1458</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.770694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>4.5380</td>
<td>1.5127</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>0.187143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5c indicates, that an ANOVA was carried out and that there is a significant difference in Service/Dedication based on race ($F = 3.304$, $p < 0.05$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARITAL STATUS AND CAREER ANCHORS</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional</td>
<td>0.7422</td>
<td>0.3711</td>
<td>0.5438</td>
<td>0.581646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial</td>
<td>1.6556</td>
<td>0.8278</td>
<td>1.1876</td>
<td>0.307792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1.8840</td>
<td>0.9420</td>
<td>2.1778</td>
<td>0.116839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>2.8693</td>
<td>1.4346</td>
<td>1.9076</td>
<td>0.152001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Security</td>
<td>2.7325</td>
<td>1.3662</td>
<td>1.2246</td>
<td>0.296776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication</td>
<td>1.8461</td>
<td>0.9230</td>
<td>1.2727</td>
<td>0.283071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>0.7890</td>
<td>0.3945</td>
<td>0.9684</td>
<td>0.382046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>0.5575</td>
<td>0.2788</td>
<td>0.7244</td>
<td>0.486313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>7.4961</td>
<td>3.7481</td>
<td>4.1279</td>
<td><strong>0.017971</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5d depicts that there is a significant difference in Entrepreneurial Creativity based on marital status (F = 4.1279, p < 0.05).
Table 4.5e indicates that there are statistically significant differences in Autonomy based on tenure (F = 2.102, p < 0.01).
Table 4.5f indicates that there are significant differences in technical/functional ($F = 4.231, p < 0.01$), general managerial ($F = 4.675, p < 0.01$), autonomy ($F = 2.708, p < 0.05$) and service/dedication ($F = 3.270, p < 0.05$) based on level of education.
### TABLE 4.5g CURRENT OCCUPATION AND CAREER ANCHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT OCCUPATION</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional</td>
<td>8.7513</td>
<td>1.7503</td>
<td>2.726</td>
<td>0.021856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial</td>
<td>6.0850</td>
<td>1.2170</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>0.119021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.2832</td>
<td>0.6566</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>0.186797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>13.2081</td>
<td>2.6416</td>
<td>3.787</td>
<td>0.002949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Security</td>
<td>4.6742</td>
<td>0.9348</td>
<td>0.8308</td>
<td>0.529686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication</td>
<td>8.5755</td>
<td>1.7151</td>
<td>2.470</td>
<td>0.035084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>4.0377</td>
<td>0.8075</td>
<td>2.051</td>
<td>0.074787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>2.4990</td>
<td>0.4998</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>0.259965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>4.7299</td>
<td>0.9460</td>
<td>1.0010</td>
<td>0.419360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5g indicates that there are statistically significant differences in technical/functional (F = 2.726, p < 0.05), Job security (F = 3.787, p < 0.01) and Service/dedication (F = 2.051, p < 0.05), based on current occupation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Occupation/Career Anchors</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional</td>
<td>15.1830</td>
<td>3.0366</td>
<td>5.072</td>
<td>0.000254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial</td>
<td>15.2249</td>
<td>3.0450</td>
<td>4.915</td>
<td>0.000343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.6637</td>
<td>0.9327</td>
<td>2.208</td>
<td>0.056522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>6.671</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>1.799</td>
<td>0.116463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Security</td>
<td>8.5365</td>
<td>1.7073</td>
<td>1.5534</td>
<td>0.176842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication</td>
<td>8.167</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td>2.343</td>
<td>0.044254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>2.2715</td>
<td>0.4543</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>0.352267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>5.369</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>2.982</td>
<td>0.013548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>12.4068</td>
<td>2.4814</td>
<td>2.7780</td>
<td>0.019830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table reveals that there are statistically significant differences in technical/functional (F = 5.072, p < 0.01), general managerial (F = 4.915, p < 0.01), service/dedication (F = 2.343, p < 0.05), lifestyle (F = 2.982, p < 0.05) and entrepreneurial creativity (F = 2.7780, p < 0.05) based on desired occupation.
Hypothesis 4: There is a significant relationship between career anchors and job satisfaction.

**TABLE 4.6 MULTIPLE REGRESSION OF CAREER ANCHORS AND JOB SATISFACTION.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Beta</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std.Err. of B</th>
<th>t(144)</th>
<th>p-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional</td>
<td>0.122453</td>
<td>0.087656</td>
<td>0.56373</td>
<td>0.403540</td>
<td>1.39697</td>
<td>0.164571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial</td>
<td>0.097923</td>
<td>0.085935</td>
<td>0.44417</td>
<td>0.389798</td>
<td>1.13949</td>
<td>0.256389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-0.008478</td>
<td>0.081772</td>
<td>-0.04850</td>
<td>0.467843</td>
<td>-0.10368</td>
<td>0.917571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>-0.021372</td>
<td>0.088522</td>
<td>-0.09289</td>
<td>0.384758</td>
<td>-0.24143</td>
<td>0.809562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Security</td>
<td>-0.215687</td>
<td>0.080501</td>
<td>-0.77313</td>
<td>0.288553</td>
<td>-2.67932</td>
<td>0.008236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication</td>
<td>0.120021</td>
<td>0.095846</td>
<td>0.53341</td>
<td>0.425969</td>
<td>1.25224</td>
<td>0.212513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>0.098809</td>
<td>0.078689</td>
<td>0.58711</td>
<td>0.467554</td>
<td>1.25570</td>
<td>0.211259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>0.049187</td>
<td>0.081685</td>
<td>0.30118</td>
<td>0.500162</td>
<td>0.60216</td>
<td>0.548017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>-0.408789</td>
<td>0.089034</td>
<td>-1.59436</td>
<td>0.347251</td>
<td>-4.59137</td>
<td>0.000010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6 indicates that a multiple regression was carried out in order to ascertain the relationship between career anchors and job satisfaction. According to Table 4.6 it is evident that there is a very high significant relationship between Geographical Security and Job Satisfaction with a Beta value of -0.215687 and a statistical significance level of p=0.008236. There is a highly significant relationship between Entrepreneurial Creativity and Job Satisfaction with a Beta value of -0.408789 and a significance level of p=0.000010. With reference to Table 4.6 it is evident that there is significant relationship between career anchors and job satisfaction R=0.42. Furthermore, the R Square value is 0.17, it may be inferred that only 17% of the variance in career anchors can be accounted for as having some impact on job satisfaction. It is imperative to understand that the variance reported on for career anchors is quite small. There is a residual of 83%, of the variance that should be considered, as there are other factors, which may also bear relevance when attempting to understand job satisfaction. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, as there is a significant relationship between career anchors and job satisfaction.

4.4 SUMMARY OF THIS CHAPTER

This chapter dealt with the most salient findings of this research study. It highlights the empirical statistics that was used in analysing the various data collected.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the prominent results in Chapter 4, and makes use of relevant research to support the findings of this research study. The chapter also elucidates some of the limitations of this research study. The discussion includes demographic information about the sample, results obtained from the descriptive dimensions of career anchors and job satisfaction. In addition to this, the discussion will present the inferential statistics techniques utilised to analyse the findings. Conclusions are drawn based on the results obtained, and recommendations for future research will be addressed.

5.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE SAMPLE

The sample consists of 154 employees of the leading retail organisation within the Western Cape. There were more females (n=88 or 51%) than males (n=66 or 43%) that formed part of this research sample. The majority of respondents were in the 20 to 29 age group (n=89 or 58%), have an educational level of a Matric (n=53 or 34%), and are single (n=76 or 49%). The majority of the respondents were White (n=67 or 44%), followed by Coloured (n=64 or 41 %) and had > 5 years service (n= 58 or 38%) with the organisation. The sample is more representative of the respondents that occupied positions as clerks (n=56 or 36%). The majority of the respondents have a desire to be senior managers (n=39 or 25%), followed by specialists (n=37 or 24%).
5.2.1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE DIMENSIONS OF JOB SATISFACTION

The table 4.1 highlights the arithmetic means and standard deviations for the dimensions of job satisfaction namely that of work itself, pay, supervision, promotion, colleagues or co-workers. The results indicate that the means of the subscales of job satisfaction varies from 4.0 to 13.0.

The findings in table 4.1, signify that the sample of employees at the retail organisation in the Western Cape, where the research study was conducted, are most satisfied with the supervision they receive from their managers (mean=13.0 and sd = 3.8); thereafter with their colleagues or co-workers (mean =11.0 and sd = 4.9), as well as the nature of work itself (mean=10.6 and the sd=3.8). It is notable that this sample of employees are somewhat satisfied with the pay they receive (mean =4.4 and sd= 3.8), but less satisfied with promotion (mean =4.0 and sd=3.0).

5.2.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE DIMENSION OF THE CAREER ANCHORS

The results of table 4.2 indicate the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the following career anchors: Technical/Functional, General Managerial, Autonomy, Job Security, Geographic Security, Service/Dedication, Pure Challenge, Lifestyle, and Entrepreneurial Creativity. It is apparent that the means of the career anchors various from 2.9 to 3.9 whilst the standard deviations vary from 0.6 to 1.1. According to table 4.2, the Job Security career anchor has the highest mean of 3.9. On the other hand the Geographical Security and the Entrepreneurial Creativity career anchors share the same mean of 2.9, coupled with being the lowest too.
5.3 INFERENTIAL STATISTICS

The discussion of the findings concerning the inferential statistics mentioned in Chapter 4 will be described in detail in terms of the hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1:** A significant relationship exists between career anchors and job satisfaction amongst employees in a retail organisation.

The results from the research study indicate that there is a statistically significant correlation between career anchors and job satisfaction.

The results of the inter-correlations that were done between career anchors and job satisfaction, is supportive of this and indicates that there is a significant relationship between career anchors and job satisfaction. According to the Table 4.3 in Chapter 4, it is evident that there are significant relationships between the Service/Dedication career anchor and pay (r= 0.3037 and p =0.000), and between the Entrepreneurial Creativity career anchor and pay (r=0.3494 and p=0.000). There is also a significant relationship between Entrepreneurial Creativity and the nature of work itself (r= - 0.2850 and p =0.000). There is also a significant relationship between the General Managerial competence and promotion (r= 0.2949 and p=0.000). A significant relationship also exists between the Technical Functional Competence and promotion (r=0.2343 p= 0.03). Furthermore, there is a significant relationship between Career Anchors and Job Satisfaction (R= 0.42), which is significant at the 99% confidence level.
Thus, the results depicted in table 4.3 indicate that there is a significant statistical relationship between the employees’ career anchors and their level of job satisfaction within the retail organisation. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

The above findings are supported by Danziger and Valency (2006) who carried out a study on the relationship between career anchors and the impact it has on job satisfaction. The results of the study indicate that there is congruence between a person’s career anchor and job satisfaction. The results of that study indicate that 43.5% of the respondents of that study display congruence between the relationship between career anchors and job satisfaction. In conjunction to this the results reveal that the respondents career anchors that are congruent to their job have a significantly higher mean level of job satisfaction than those who have incongruent relationships between these two variables.

Additional support was provided by a research study carried out by Feldman and Bolino (1996) as they agree with the ideology that career anchors is significant in the consequences of job satisfaction and job stability. Thus, it is notable that employees who receive a high degree of fit or congruence between career anchors and the work environment will essentially be more effective with their work and satisfied with their work environment (Feldman & Bolino, 1996).

Ellison and Schreuder (2000) infer that those mid-employees with congruence between their career anchor and occupational type are likely to experience a higher level of general and intrinsic job satisfaction than midcareer employees who have incongruence between these variables. They also highlight the fact that the career anchors model is pivotal in terms of increasing job satisfaction in organisations. This study is consistent with the hypothesis that there is a statistically
significant relationship between the employees’ career anchors and their level of job satisfaction. Ellison and Schreuder (2000) stipulate that the fit between occupational types and career anchors does not necessarily lead to extrinsic job satisfaction. Coupled to this it is notable that the career anchors model in that study can serve as a guideline for improving job satisfaction.

According to a study by Igbaria and Greenhaus (1991), who carried out a study of the MIS professional and managers, it is apparent that employees whose career orientations fit their job environment or setting are more satisfied with their jobs and careers. Thus, they are more committed to the organisation and have fewer intentions to leave in comparison to those employees who do not have such a fit.

Nordvik (1991) also tested the hypothesis, and infer that a well-matched and compatible relationship between a person’s job and his career anchor is associated with higher positive job results. This serves to further support the hypothesis of this research study.

Mignonac and Herrbach (2003) stated that there is a strong correlation between mobility and structural changes, and career anchors, and that mobility is closely associated with the current occupation, which is manipulated by various job satisfaction variables.

According to Schein (1978), ideology of career anchors, it is imperative to understand individuals’ career anchors and workplace as it presumably leads to positive career by-products such as career effectiveness and job satisfaction and high retention levels, whilst on the other hand, incongruence leads to dissatisfaction and high turnover. This empirical evidence is supportive of the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between the employees’ career anchors and level of job satisfaction in the retail organisation within the Western Cape.
Therefore, the results of this research study as well as that of comparative studies on career anchors and job satisfaction identify that there is a significant relationship between the two variables.

**Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

**Hypothesis 2: There are significant differences in employees’ level of job satisfaction with regard to biographical factors (gender, age, race, tenure, education, current occupation and desired occupation) within a retail organisation.**

Table 4.4 indicates that a correlation analysis was done on the relationship between job satisfaction and the various biographical factors. The results of this research study indicates that there is significant difference between biographical factors and work itself, pay, supervision, promotion, and colleagues or co-workers.

**Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected**
5.3.1 Gender and Job Satisfaction

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ level of job satisfaction with regard to gender. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

There is an extensive amount of research on the relationship between gender and job satisfaction. It is evident that the literature on gender and job satisfaction differs tremendously. For instance, some studies indicate that there is a significant difference between males and females concerning job satisfaction, whilst other studies state that females experience greater levels of gratification and, some concur that there is no significant disparity between gender and job satisfaction.

According to a research study carried out by Sabharwal and Corley (2009) on the faculty job satisfaction across gender and various disciplines identified that female students experience lower levels of job satisfaction across all the disciplines in comparison to that of males.

A study carried out by Mora and Carbonell (2009) on job satisfaction and gender amongst university students in Catalonia, identifies that the young educated female students who took part in the study reported lower levels of job satisfaction with regards to the domains such as work content, promotion, pay, applicability of knowledge, and job security in comparison to males.

Unlike the above authors, Alavi and Askaripir’s (2003) study on the relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction of employees within the government, reveal that there is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and gender in terms of males and females experiences.
Hodson (1989) postulates that female employees are more satisfied with their work, in comparison to males because they are interested in different aspects of the job and able to make better adjustments in their workplace due to their so-called family responsibilities that they perform. Thus, it can be presumed that females are therefore able to adapt better to work–related scenarios than males.

5.3.2 Age and Job Satisfaction

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ level of job satisfaction with regard to age. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Empirical studies indicate that there are inconsistencies concerning age and job satisfaction. Bernal, Synder and McDaniel (1998) indicate that there are an array of relationships associated with age and job satisfaction be it a negative correlation, positive correlation or no significant relationship.

According to Spector (1996), Okpara (2004) and Robbins et al. (2003) are of the opinion that there is a significant relationship between age and job satisfaction amongst employees. Hence, this suggests that older employees are more satisfied with their work than younger employees are.

On the other hand some studies have identified a U–Shaped relationship between age and job satisfaction, this occurs when young employees experience escalated levels of job satisfaction, middle–age employees experience a decline in job satisfaction, whilst with age great amounts of
satisfaction is experienced (Kacmar & Ferris, 1989). Bohloko (1999) concurs with the above finds that job satisfaction is seemingly affected by age. Converse to the above findings, Green (2000) as well as Devaney and Chen (2003) found that there is no significant relationship between the various age groups and employees level of job satisfaction.

5.3.3 Marital Status and Job Satisfaction

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ level of job satisfaction with regard to Martial Status. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Chambers (1999) carried out a research study on managerial and executive females in organisations infer that women, who are married, tend to have higher levels of job satisfaction than those who are single provided additional support to the hypothesis of this research study.

In opposition to the above findings, Schreuder and Coetzee, (2006) deduce that marriage does not have a positive nor negative effect on female employees career success. Consequently, it is notable that children have a negative impact on both earnings and career satisfaction of females.
5.3.4 Race and Job Satisfaction

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ level of job satisfaction with regard to race. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

Diversity is prominent in the South African workplace, likewise in many other countries, as there are many different types of people working together to perform organisational tasks and goals. In relation to this, organisations have become more multicultural and are operating on a global scale. Hence, it is important to understand the fact that employees view the workplace, job, supervisors, and co-workers differently concerning job satisfaction. Thus, it is evident that in this study significant differences in job satisfaction exist due to racial groups or classification.

Wilson and Butler (1978) are of their opinion that there is a significant difference is White employees and Black employees perception of job satisfaction. According to the study, it is evident that White employees seem to be more satisfied with their occupations in comparison to Black employees. This could possibly be due to the higher rank of positions that they occupied, whereas Black employees were considered the minority or inferior racial group. Similarly Super (1996) further infers that there is a variation in Black employees viewpoint on job satisfaction and that White people seem to be happier.

In opposition to the above, authors Tuch and Martin(1991) are of the opinion that Black employees lower experiences of job satisfaction is not solely due to race but on other external factors as well, and infer that Black employees are generally more disadvantaged than their counterparts because they do not have the same career opportunities. Hence, Black employees would usually be considered as blue-collar workers, with lower pay and high levels of job
insecurity. According to Tuch and Maritn (1991) there is very little empirical evidence to substantiate that the processes that generates job satisfaction differs systematically by race.

Research studies in South Africa correlate to those abroad in terms of the relationship between race and job satisfaction, and concur that White employees seem to be more satisfied with their work and job settings in comparison to African employees who felt less secure. The main ideology for African employees’ dissatisfaction is due high level of job insecurity that is largely related to organisational restricting and downsizing (Robbins et al. (2003).

5.3.5 Tenure and Job Satisfaction

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ level of job satisfaction with regard to Tenure. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

Tenure refers to the length of service that a person has within an organisation. Spector (1996) is of the opinion that longer years of service within an organisation are correlated with higher levels of job satisfaction because of the feasible rewards associated with it.

Similarly, Dawis and Lofquist (1984) emphasize that both satisfaction and satisfactoriness are essential conditions if the employee is going to stay in the organisation. Coupled to this, they believe that tenure is the outcome associated with both conditions and largely related to work adjustment.
Benton and Halloran (1991) and Ronen (1978) believe that people undergo a U-shaped pattern as far as tenure is considered. This means that during the early stages of their career, people are generally more satisfied with the organisation, as times pass they begin to doubt the organisational policies in terms of fulfilling their career expectations and so does their level of job satisfaction. However, once they reach later stages in their careers, then so their levels of job satisfaction begin to increase as they hit retirement age.
5.3.6 Level of Education and Job Satisfaction

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ level of job satisfaction with regard to education. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

Eugenia and Cesar (2009) have done a study on the direct and indirect effects of education on job satisfaction. The results of their study indicate that individuals with higher levels of education are more satisfied. This is mainly because they have access to occupations that are better, attractive and appealing, as well as that is able to fulfil their needs of satisfaction.

Contrary to the above findings Ozel, Bayindir, Inan, and Ozel (2008) are of the opinion that there is no significant relationship between education and job satisfaction amongst police officers in central Kutahya. Hence, the study inferred that the police officers enjoyed their work despite the negative factors associated with it.

Hodson (1989) on the other hand postulates that higher education leads to lower levels of satisfaction amongst employees, this is because higher skilled people have greater expectations of their employer, job and overall careers.
5.3.7 Current Occupation and Job Satisfaction

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ level of job satisfaction with regard to current occupation. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

The sample of respondents of this research study consisted mainly of clerks (n=56 or 36 %), followed by junior managers (n=43 or 28%), then consultants (n=23 or 15%). Based on the above findings in Chapter 4 it is evident that there is a significant relationship between employees’ current occupation and their level of job satisfaction experienced. According to Corbin (1977), some researchers assume that job satisfaction increases as employees advance to higher positions.

Kline and Boyed (1994) state that managers’ generally have higher levels of job satisfaction in comparison to lower level employee in terms of pay. The study centralised around the relationship between organisational structures, climate and job satisfaction amongst three management spheres. It is apparent that the study identified that at each sphere of management, employees face different work related factors. Thus, it is important to consider other external factors as well when focusing on job satisfaction amongst different positions in the same organisation.

5.3.8 Desired Occupation and Job Satisfaction

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ level of job satisfaction with regard to desired occupation. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

According to the data in Chapter 4, it is noticeable that most employees desire better occupations than they currently occupy. This is human nature because generally people want to better themselves and seek more attractive career opportunities. There is evidence that there is a
difference amongst peoples’ perceptions about desired occupations and what they want out of a career and their levels of job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 3:** There are statistically significant differences in career anchors of employees within a retail organisation with regard to biographical factors (gender, age, race, tenure, education, current occupation and desired occupation) within a retail organisation.

The results indicate that there are significant differences in career anchors of employees with regard to biographical factors (gender, age, race, tenure, education, current occupation and desired occupation) within a retail organisation. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

### 5.3.9 Gender and Career Anchors

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ career anchors and gender. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

The results in table 4.5a highlights that there are significant differences between the General Managerial career anchor and gender, as it displays a significant level of 0.032 and F-value of 4.703. The table also emphasizes that there is a significant relationship between Entrepreneurial Creativity and gender as it displays a F-value of 4.092 and a significance level of p=0.044. Scheffe’s test is supportive of this and highlights that there is a positive relationship between gender and Entrepreneurial Creativity.

In support of the above hypothesis Schreuder and Coetzee (2006), agree that significant differences amongst males and females perceptions pertaining to career anchors. With regard to the Service/Dedication and Pure Challenge career anchors, males as well as females receive
highest scores in terms of these anchors. Whilst females receive higher scores in the Service/Dedication career anchor compared males. Schreuder and Coetzee (2006) infer that females also display higher scores for the Lifestyle career anchor than males. In conjunction to this, the study of Schreuder, Coetzee and Tladinyane (2005) highlighted that both males and females received lower scores on the General Managerial competence in contrast to the other career anchors.

Danziger and Valency (2005) provided additional support to the hypothesis in this current study, as the results of their study infer that there are significant differences amongst male and females perceptions of career anchors, however the study highlighted that there are no noteworthy difference between the Technical/Functional and Security career anchors.


Erwee (1990) carried out a study on Black managers’ career advancement in a multicultural society identified that female managers seem to have a strong preference for the General Managerial and Service/Dedication career anchors. In summary it is clear that, Schreuder and Coetzee (2006) as well as Erwee (1990) are of the opinion that women seem to prefer the Service/Dedication career anchor. Opposed to the above findings Kniveton (2003) propose that there are no significant differences between gender and carer anchors.

Therefore, the above authors, except for Knivetton (2003) present supplementary support to the hypothesis.
5.3.10 Age and Career Anchors

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ career anchors and age. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

The results of table 4.5b indicate that there are considerable differences between career anchors and age.

Additional support was provided by a research study carried out by Marshall and Bonner (2003) who centralised around career anchors and the effects of downsizing concerning the implications that it posits for generations and culture at work. Marshall and Bonner (2003) utilises Erickson’s stage like theory of career development to compare age differences concerning career anchors and downsizing. Results of their study indicate that there are significant differences between age, downsizing and career anchors. Coupled to this it important to understand that younger employees tend to seek lateral rather than upward progression and enhances the fact that career anchors hold these career paths together.

Slabbert (1987) study on management training and career anchors of graduates emphasizes the fact that certain career anchors were more prominent in particular age groups in the male candidates. According to Slabbert (1987), the results of the study revealed that, male candidates’ between the ages 30 to 39 had a strong preference for the Autonomy and Entrepreneurial Creativity anchors. Whilst those 40 to 45 were more inclined toward the General Managerial competence, those 50 to 59 were inclined to value the Technical/Functional and the Service/Dedication career anchors, the older employers aged 60 to 64 on the other had preferred
the job security career anchor which is largely associated with their years of service with the company.

The above studies concur with the results of this study; hence, there is a difference between career anchors and age.

5.3.11 Race and Career Anchors

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ career anchors and race. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

Table 4.5c identify that there are significant differences between employees’ career anchors with regard to race. Specifically between the Service/Dedication career anchor and race (p=0.021996), and the F-value is that of 3.304.

Schreuder and Coetzee (2006) conducted a study on university students at UNISA and identified that there are significant differences between White students and African students’ career anchor preference. The results of the study indicated that African students received higher scores on the Service/Dedication to a cause anchor and the Pure Challenge career anchor, while on the other hand White students’ received higher scores on the Lifestyle and Technical/Functional career anchors. Therefore, the study by Schreuder and Coetzee (2006) notably provides feasible support to the hypothesis.
Coetzee and Schreuder (2008) carried out a research study on a multi-cultural examination of students’ career anchors at a South African higher education institution. The study highlighted the fact that there are significant differences between race and career anchors. The sample of the study comprised predominantly of Black single and married females, and identified that they had a strong preference for the Service or Dedication to a Cause career anchor, followed by the Lifestyle and General Managerial competence. Coetzee, Schreuder and Tladinyane (2007), Schein (1978) as well Suutari (2004) concur that there are significant different between race and career anchors.

5.3.12 Marital Status and Career Anchors

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ career anchors and marital status. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

Table 4.5d depicts that ANOVA was done and confirm that there is a significant relationship between Entrepreneurial Creativity and marital status. According to Scheffe’s post of comparison of the means it is evident that the mean for married employees (2.729) is significantly lower in comparison to those employee who are single (3.134), with a significance level of 0.035.

The Entrepreneurial Creativity career anchor centralises around the need to start ones own business and have a certain degree of autonomy (Schreuder and Coetzee, 2006). One could possibly suggest that the reason that there is a strong correlation between the two variable is that married people have dual incomes, and therefore more likely to take risks as far as starting up a business.
Coetzee and Schreuder (2008) were support of hypothesis in this research study and concur that there is a significant differences between employees’ marital status and career anchors. Thus, the results unveil that single respondents have a strong preference to work in job environments whereby they would be able to use their skills and abilities appropriately, as well as occupy positions in a challenging workplace, and have some degree of freedom and power, and some value create new products and services. This infers that these people have the Technical/Functional, Pure Challenge, Autonomy, and Entrepreneurial Creativity career anchors. Married respondents on the other hand had a strong preference to work in a stable and secure workplace; hence, they prefer the Job Security career anchor (Coetzee and Schreuder, 2008).

5.3.13 Tenure and Career Anchors

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ career anchors and tenure. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

According to Table 4.5e it is evident that significant differences between career anchors and tenure or years of service. The results reveal that there is a highly significant relationship (p=0.002) between the Autonomy career anchor and tenure or years of service. According to Scheffe’s post of comparison it is evident that are no real differences between the years of service within the organisation and Geographic Security.

In support of the above findings Schein(1992) emphasizes the fact that individuals do not necessarily have a career anchor during the early stages of their career, hence individuals only become aware of career anchors once they have worked for number of years and have been exposed to relevant and constructive feedback about their career experiences. In conjunction to
this Schein (1992) also postulates that a career anchor only develops after five to ten years after the individual has started working.

According to the results of this study, on the significance between tenure and the Autonomy career anchor, this could possibly be as a result that people who have worked longer than 5 years for the organisation perceive that they should receive higher degrees of autonomy, as opposed to new entrants into the organisation.

5.3.14 Level of Education and Career Anchors

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ career anchors and education. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

Table 4.5f indicates that there is a significant relationship \(p=0.003\) between the employees level of education and the Technical/Functional career anchor, with an F-value of 4.231. According to Scheffe’s post of comparison it is evident that there is no real significant difference between the means of Matric (3.201), Diploma (3.563), Bachelors Degree (3.834), Honours Degree (3.836), and Masters Degree (3.560) and the Technical/Functional competence.

In support of the above findings, Coetzee and Schreuder (2008), states that there are significant differences between educational levels and individual’s career anchors. According to that study it is evident that respondents with a diploma or first–year level degree qualification display to be more achievement oriented. These respondents value positions whereby they would be able to utilise their skills and abilities effectively (Technical/Functional career anchor), to work in a challenging environment (Pure Challenge career anchor), as well as be able to develop new products or services (Entrepreneurial Creativity career anchor). Comparison to this the results of
that study identified that respondents with degrees or postgraduate qualifications preferred the Lifestyle and the Service/Dedication career anchors (Coetzee and Schreuder, 2008).

5.3.15 Current Occupation and Career Anchors

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ career anchors and current occupation. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

The results in table 4.5g indicate that there are significant difference between occupational positions and career anchors. The table 4.5g highlights the fact that there are more clerks (n=56 or 36%), followed by (n=43 or 28%), consultants (n=23 or 15%), senior managers (n=17 or 11%), and specialists (n=12 or 8%). Thus, only 2% of the sample forms part of top management.

It is evident that there are different types of ranks of positions in this research study, and thus people at different level in the hierarchy seem to have different perceptions on career anchors. Slabbert (1987) provided additional support to this research study and postulates that employees who formed part of top management had a stronger preference for the Autonomy career anchor, followed by senior managers who valued the Service/Dedication and the Security career anchors. In Conjunction to the above findings of this research study Schreuder (1989) infer that middle managers (which are referred to as junior managers in this study) have a strong tendency towards the Technical/Functional career anchors and the non-managerial staff (which are clerks in this study) are more prone to valuing the Security career anchors.
5.3.16 Desired Occupation and Career Anchors

The results of this research study indicate that there are significant differences in employees’ career anchors and desired occupation. **Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

Table 4.5h highlights the fact that ANOVA was done on the relationship between the desired occupation and career anchors. It is visible that there is a highly significant relationship between the Technical/Functional competence and career anchors as it displays a significance level of $p=0.0002$. This means that most of the employees’ in this research sample, desire occupations whereby they will be able to utilise their skills and abilities effectively, in terms of occupy positions in their specialist area or field. For instance, if they were in the finance field then they would most probably like to be an account, and they would want to be paid according to their skills level (Schreuder and Coetzee, 2006).
5.4 LIMITATIONS

A primary limitation of this research is that since the data were obtained via self-report responses, common method variance could have inflated the findings. Research relying more upon archival and longitudinal data would allow greater confidence in the conclusions. The sample also comprised of only White South African employees; hence the degree to which the findings can be extrapolated from the sample to the other population groups is limited. Van den Heuvel and Wooden (1997) point out, employees should not be treated as a homogeneous group. It is possible, then, that individuals' career anchors may also directly influence whether individuals pursue careers as professional consultants, small family business owners, farmers, artists, independent tradespersons, and so forth.

Generalisations might not be able to be made about the population as a whole due to the fact that the sample is too small and not representative of the population (Babbie & Mouton, 2001).

The number of respondents in this study is suitable for statistical testing; however, display a low response rate is prominent, thus external validity can be enhanced by selecting a larger sample size.

There were a very few studies on career anchors and job satisfaction researched in the retail industry.

The sample of this study on focused on respondents in the retail industry in the Western Cape, thus generalisations cannot be made about other retail organisations.
This study was cross-sectional and thus, only focused on respondents’ perceptions about career anchors and job satisfaction at a particular time.

5.5 CONCLUSION

Career anchor literature emphasizes the importance of understanding non-monetary motivators of career satisfaction, depending on the individuals’ motives, values and talents. It is also suggested (Barth, 1993; Derr, 1986) that a greater understanding of career anchors can help organisations to tailor and focus career initiatives more successfully. Moreover, the significant effect between the biographical variables and career anchors identified suggests the need for further research into whether the eight career anchors identified by Schein (1978) are in fact discrete categories.

The importance for organisational career management is the recognition that there are strong non-monetary factors, which affect work and career satisfaction, and career orientations provide a way of understanding these motivators of career decisions. Many organisational career programmes assume that employees are motivated by the prospect of promotion, but while there is evidence to suggest that employees promotion aspirations are often underestimated (Herriot, Gibbons, Pemberton and Jackson, 1994) there is also considerable evidence for differences in motivation (Holland, 1973).

Barth (1993) postulates that the organisational benefits of recognising other motivators as firstly, being a greater understanding of why quality staff choose to leave the organisation and secondly, the ability to target career management systems more effectively and increase job satisfaction through more constructive discussions with employees who might be dissatisfied. If employees
remain in a job that is not congruent with their career anchor and repress their motivations, they seek to achieve the missing elements of their anchor through outside work interests or by withdrawing commitment, which has obvious implications for organisations.

Derr (1986) also suggests that organisations should analyse career orientations in order to determine which career interventions are most appropriate for each career orientation. In accordance with this, Schein (1990) promotes the case for flexible reward systems, promotion systems and recognition systems to address the differing needs of individuals. For example, people with a lifestyle anchor are likely to place a high value on flexible benefits, where people with a security/stability anchor will be more biased towards pension schemes and steady incremental pay scales.

The organisational benefits in understanding career orientations are:

1. the ability to tailor career interventions appropriately;
2. the ability to offer opportunities congruent with an individual’s orientation;
3. the design of appropriate reward systems;
4. the design of appropriate promotion systems;
5. targeted recognition systems;
6. an increased understanding by managers of what drives internal career satisfaction;
7. a means of understanding the overriding career culture in the organisation;
8. a way of structuring career discussions and particularly exit interviews (Schein, 1990).
Schein operationalised career anchors as a pattern of self-perceived talents and abilities; self-perceived motives and needs and self-perceived values and attitudes, which guide and direct their career related decisions (Schein 1975; 1978; 1987, cited in Danziger, Rachman-Moore & Valency, 2008). Schein further postulated that a career anchor is the one component in an individual’s self-concept that they will not sacrifice when faced with difficult decisions (Danziger & Valency, 2006). If individuals are not aware of their career anchors, then they could find themselves in a work environment that is not satisfactory. This definition will be utilised as the core definition in this research study.

Even though Schein (1978) hypothesized that by definition, an individual can maintain just one dominant career anchor, his own empirical evidence advocated that in fact individuals could nevertheless have strong inclinations for more than one career anchor.

Delong (1982) and Feldman (1996) built on the ideology of Schein’s career anchor theory. They were supportive of the fact that career anchors are subjective and form part of the internal career construct. Subsequently they were of the opinion that individuals not only have one dominant career preference, instead two or three career preferences seem to be the norm. This might be as result of the situation that individuals find themselves in currently. No empirical data has eradicated the possibility that multiple career anchors might become constant over time, consequently resulting in numerous amounts of stable career anchors. Conversely, the dominant career anchor or anchors do represent a constant and secure belief and value system of the individual. Delong (1982) defined the career anchor as a permutation being the combination of peoples career orientation and self-perceived talent. Knivetom (2004) and Norvik (1996) highlight the fact that career anchors do not classify the individual per se; alternatively, it accentuates the individuals’ orientation to that of their work environment. It is essential to understand the fact that
the career anchor theory suggests that individuals have long term and enduring tendencies towards their job as well as to the workplace as a whole.

The distribution of the career anchors in this sample indicated that job security/stability and technical/professional values were less important to the majority of employees’ careers, which would suggest that these groups would relate better to a more independently, as opposed to organizationally managed, career process. In this instance, which appears to have individuals with high levels of autonomy/independence, employees are more likely to have a greater interest in self-development interventions. Recent research (Giles and West, 1995) supports this and showed that people with a security/stability anchor were less likely to be proactive in career planning than employees with a general managerial anchor. Consequently, there may be an argument for tailoring activities to reach different groups.

The rapid pace of change occurring in South African organizations suggests that career anchors will play a more significant role in human resource planning and development especially in the case of Black managers. The importance of tailoring career development programmes to the culture of an organisation is well-documented (Hirsh & Jackson, 1996; Mayo, 1991; Walters, 1992). By analysing career anchor data in this way, it is possible for an organisation to build up a picture of the key drivers of career satisfaction in the organisation, by providing a valuable insight into the career culture in existence.

The effect of biographical variables on career anchors is important and it is evident that there is a relative paucity of empirical research among South African employees in general. This information can prove invaluable for selection purposes by determining what groups of people are, according to their biographical variables and career anchor choices, more suitable for different
types of work. It is also possible that this information can be used for evaluating biographical profiles of current employees in order to strengthen the utilisation, development and effective maintenance of the working force, while contributing to the upliftment of low productivity levels among South African employees. To ensure quality some of the critical success factors are for example education and training, teamwork and employee involvement.

The results of this study provide a basis for comparison of individual career anchors as well as to investigate the opportunities for organisations to capitalise on cumulative career anchor data. In discussing the future of career development, it can be noted that as organisations are undergoing rapid transformations, new paradigms regarding career development will have to evolve. Career anchors will become a more important concept and career development will be more akin to self development and the burden of the organisation will be to identify these anchors, relate them to biographical data, and to describe work to be done better so that individuals can better select themselves into the appropriate job roles and take personal responsibility for how their careers evolve. This may lead to continuous employee development, job satisfaction, job involvement and positive consequences for both employee and organisation.

The implications of the results of this study confirm that individual and organisational needs must be carefully matched. Individuals need to discover their career anchors and plan their future career strategies. They should negotiate with their employing organisation regarding future assignments. The organisation can utilise information about career anchor hierarchies in connection with biographical variables to plan future developmental opportunities for employees.

Information on the effect of certain biographical information on the career anchors of employees could help psychologists/employers in identifying subgroups preferences for specific kind of jobs.
(career anchors) which can be used for selection purposes as well as on how to improve the utilisation of current employees. Better selection of applicant employees and the improved utilisation of current employees can make an important contribution in increasing productivity levels amongst employees (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006).

In conclusion, to this it is necessary to identify the limitations that are associated with this research study as well as infer possible recommendations for future research that should be considered in this field of study.

5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

Stratified sampling methods could be utilised to generalise about the population as well as reduce sampling error (Sekaran, 2001).

Organisations should try to introduce employees to the phenomenon of career anchors in order to improve job satisfaction and overall productivity.

According to Danziger and Valency (2006), studies show focus on adding objective measures of job effectiveness, as this will enhance the validity of Schein’s compatibility hypothesis.

Research should strive towards looking at ways to improve people’s career anchors in organisation by means of Employee Assistance Programmes (EAP) and reduce job satisfaction.
The results from this research study substantiated the relationship that exists between career anchors and job satisfaction as depicted by the various authors. It once again proves that as much as things are constantly changing, some things remain constant and human beings display strong tendencies to be happy and appreciated.

Several studies report a significant relationship between job satisfaction and an individual’s internal career anchors (Kniveton, 2004). Organisations that attempt to retain valuable employees should hence endeavour to provide incentives and career paths that are consistent with the underlying career values, expectations and aspirations of their employees. It is hence feasible that enhancing fit between the individual and environment may culminate in lower stress and job dissatisfaction and consequently turnover may not occur (Coetzee, Schreuder & Tladinyane, 2009).
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Dear Colleague

I am currently enrolled for the Masters Programme in Industrial Psychology at UWC. The aim of my research study is to ascertain whether or not career anchors have an impact on employees' job satisfaction.

While permission has been granted for doing the research at company X, I am dependent on your input and participation to complete the research study effectively.

It is imperative to understand that any data obtained in this research study will remain confidential, and anonymity will be enhanced to ensure that your responses to any of the questions are also anonymous.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank you for your co-operation.

Yours faithfully

Zaida Fakir
Introduction:

The purpose of this questionnaire is mainly to obtain data for my research report which focuses on whether or not career anchors presumably affect employees’ level of job satisfaction.

Please answer the questions as honestly as possible and your responses will be kept confidential and anonymous.

Please put a tick in the appropriate boxes when responding to the questions or statements.

Please make sure you respond to all the questions. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions or statements.

Biographical Data:

Please put a tick in the appropriate box:

1. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Age Category

| 20-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50+ |

3. Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Widow/er</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4. Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>African</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please specify if you have chosen other: ____________________

5. Years of service within this organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 1 year</th>
<th>1 -2 years</th>
<th>2 -3 years</th>
<th>More than 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matric</th>
<th>National Diploma</th>
<th>Bachelor's Degree</th>
<th>Honours Degree/Btech</th>
<th>Masters Degree</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Current Occupation Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerk</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Junior Manager</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Top Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Desired Occupation Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerk</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Junior Manager</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Top Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that you may have about your present job. There are no right or wrong answers.

Your responses will be treated as strictly confidential.

A. Think of your present work. What is it like most of the time? How well do the words below describe your work? Please circle the most appropriate response next to each word.

- Y for YES if it describes your work
- N for NO if it does not describe your work
- ? if you cannot decide

WORK IN PRESENT JOB

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fascinating</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Satisfying</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Respected</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hot (Temperature)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tiresome</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Healthful</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>On your Feet</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Frustrating</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Endless</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gives a sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Think of the pay you are receiving now. How well does each of the following words describe your present pay? Please circle the most appropriate response next to each word.

- Y for YES if it describes your work
- N for NO if it does not describe your work
- ? if you cannot decide

**PRESENT PAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income adequate for normal expenses</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfactory Profit sharing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barely live on income</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Income provides luxuries</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Less than I deserve</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Highly Paid</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Underpaid</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Think of the supervision you are receiving now. How well does each of the following words describe your present supervision? Please circle the most appropriate response next to each word.

- Y for YES if it describes your work
- N for NO if it does not describe your work
- ? if you cannot decide

**SUPERVISION ON PRESENT JOB**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asks my advice</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hard to please</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Impolite</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Praises good work</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tactful</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Up-to-date</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does not supervise enough</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quick-tempered</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tells me where I stand</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Annoying</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stubborn</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Knows job well</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Leaves me on my own</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Around when needed</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Think of the **opportunities for promotion** that you have now. How well does each of the following words describe your present opportunities for promotion? Please **circle** the most appropriate response next to each word.

- Y for YES if it describes your work
- N for NO if it does not describe your work
- ? if you cannot decide

### PRESENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good opportunities for advancement</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Opportunities somewhat limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promotion on ability</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dead-end-job</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good chance for promotion</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unfair promotion policy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Infrequent promotions</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regular promotions</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fairly good chance for promotion</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Think of the majority of the people with whom you are working at the moment. How well does each of the following words describe these people? Please circle the most appropriate response next to each word.

- Y for YES if it describes your work
- N for NO if it does not describe your work
- ? if you cannot decide

PEOPLE IN YOUR PRESENT JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stimulating</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Easy to make enemies</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Talk too much</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>No privacy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Narrow interests</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hard to meet</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CAREER ANCHORS QUESTIONNAIRE**

This questionnaire will help you determine in general terms what you value most in a job, what motivates you and what your unique talents are.

- There are no right or wrong answers.
- For each statement, circle the number that best describes how important or how true it is for you. This scale ranges from 1 (of absolutely no importance) to 5 (very important).
- Answer quickly – your first response is always best.

How important is each of the following statements for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To build my career around some specific functional or technical area is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The process of supervising, influencing, leading and controlling people at all levels is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The chance to do things my own way and not be constrained by the rules of an organisation is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>An employer who will provide security through guaranteed work, benefits, a good retirement programme etc, is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The use of my interpersonal skills in the service of others is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Working on problems that are almost insolvable is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Developing a lifestyle that balances my career and family needs is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To be able to create or build something that is entirely my own product or idea is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Remaining in my specialised area as opposed to being promoted outside my area of expertise is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>To be in charge of a whole organisation is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A career that is free from organisation is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>An organisation that will give me long run stability is...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Using my skills to make the world a better place to live and work in is…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Competing with and winning out over others is…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Developing a career that permits me to continue to pursue my own lifestyle is…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Building a new business enterprise is…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>To rise to a high position in general management is…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Remaining in my area of expertise throughout my career is…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A career that permits a maximum amount of freedom and autonomy to choose my own hours, work, etc, is…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Remaining in one geographical area rather than moving because of a promotion is…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Being able to use my skills and talents in the service of an important cause is…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now use the scale 1 (not true) to 5(completely true)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The only real challenge in my career has been confronting and solving tough problems no matter what area they were in.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I have always tried to give equal weight to my family and to my career</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I am always on the lookout for ideas that would permit me to start and build my own enterprise.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I will accept a management position only if it is in my area of expertise.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I would like to reach a level of responsibility in an organisation whereby I would supervise others in various business functions and my role would primarily be to integrate their efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>During my career I have been mainly concerned with my own sense of freedom and autonomy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>It is more important for me to remain in my present geographical location than to receive a promotion or new job assignment in another location.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>I have always sought a career in which I could be of service to others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Competition and winning are the most important and exciting parts of my career</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>A career is worthwhile only if it enables me to lead my life in my own way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial activities are the central part of my career</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>I would rather leave my company than be promoted out of my area of expertise.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>I will feel successful in my career only if I become a high level general manager in some organisation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>I do not want to be constrained by either organisation or the business world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>I prefer to work for an organisation that provides for tenure (lifetime employment)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>I want a career in which I can be committed and devoted to an important cause.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>I feel successful only if I am constantly challenged by a tough problem or a competitive situation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Choosing and maintaining a certain lifestyle is more important than career success.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>I have always wanted to start and build up a business of my own.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>I prefer to work for an organisation that will permit me to remain in one geographical area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>