

# **An Empirical Study on Career Anchor Congruence of Various Professionals of North Karnataka**

A.H.Chachadi, Tazeentaj Mahat, Tejashwini Patil & Chaitra

## **Abstract**

The fast changing organizational contexts have forced career management as essential ingredient for success. Today career are the whole responsibility of the individuals and not the organizations. The present study aims at understanding the congruence between career anchors and present job held by individual. Edgar schiens Career orientation Inventory (COI) is used as the research instrument. This study investigates the career anchors held by teachers, managers, engineers, entrepreneurs and government employees. Entrepreneurial creativity and sense of service are the dominant anchors across gender, age groups and professions. Life style and general management are the lowest scoring anchors. Thus employers or the organizations have to give room for creative ideas to flow in, rather than routine jobs. To enhance job satisfaction the organizations have to include creativity as one of the performance parameter. In the Indian context it is more necessary to view career options more seriously. Career should not be a bunch of accidents as it is perceived now. Career should be based on ones aspirations goals and anchors. Organizations or employers, on the other hand, can use career anchors as one of the tools to identify employee potential leading to greater goal congruence and satisfaction.

*Keywords : Career Anchor, Role Congruence, Technical skill*

## **Introduction**

India suffers from multifarious crisis such as socioeconomic crisis, political crisis, and as well as financial crisis which is greatly affected by global economic crisis. Despite of all these crises, Indians are imaginative, creative, and courageous to surpass these obstacles in everyday life. Even though there are some companies affected by these crises which they are force to decrease their employees called as "recession", some of them have job openings that offer new career opportunities to graduated college students. In India Career means fulfilling aspirations of the parents, friends and society at large, career means supporting the family members by sacrificing their interest and aspirations.

Till 90's many favored climbing the hierarchical ladder within the same organization to make careers. During the last decade, life time employment within the same organization has come under pressure as a result of globalisation. Many change professions not only the companies. With all the differences these definitions bring one common point that careers have become less predictable as a result of increasingly

fragmented and discontinuous nature of careers. Also they point that individuals can no longer rely on their employer to offer them a life time career (Hall, 2004).

The success of career depends on more than one characteristic. Earlier empirical research on Career success reveal gender, personality, education, mentoring relationships, and career tactics are precursors of career success. This research proposes that career anchors are a helpful model of careers that can help individuals and organizations navigate the new career realities that exist. It provides empirical support for the use of a 40 item version of the career orientations inventory (COI) as a measure of career anchors and that enables career anchors to be matched to job roles.

## **Career Anchors**

The career anchor model developed by Edgar Schein, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has received considerable attention. Schein (1978) coined the term career anchor to describe a constellation of self-perceived attitudes, values, needs and talents that develops over time, and which when developed, shapes and guides career choices and directions. It can be thought of as a central component of the self-concept that executives are unwilling to

relinquish, even when forced to make a difficult choice. The career anchor is significant because it influences career choices, affects decisions to move from one job to another, shapes what individuals are looking for in life, determines their views of the future, influences the selection of specific occupations and work settings, and affects their reactions to work experiences (Schein, 1988). He postulated that individuals' career anchors gradually come to be their own definition of career success (Schein, 1974, 1978). Schein (1993) pointed out that all people develop

some kind of picture of their work life and their own role in it. Derr (1986a) and Igarria & Baroudi (1993) asserted that this work role focuses on the individuals' self-concept and career values - the internal career. Career anchors are important element of individuals' internal careers. This is the result of their conscious educational, work and career decisions (Schein, 1990). In this context, the career anchor theory signifies nonmonetary or psychological factors (Barth, 1993).

### ***Anchor Definition***

**Definitions in Table 3.2 taken from Schein (1993)**

Functional Expertise	Primarily excited by the content of the work itself; prefers advancement only in his/her technical or functional area of competence; generally disdains and fears general management as too political.
General Management	Primarily excited by the opportunity to analyse and solve problems under conditions of incomplete information and uncertainty; likes harnessing people together to achieve common goals; stimulated (rather than exhausted) by crisis situations.
Entrepreneurial Creativity	Primarily motivated by the need to build or create something that is entirely their own project; easily bored and likes to move from project to project; more interested in initiating new enterprises than in managing established ones.
Autonomy	Primarily motivated to seek work situations which are maximally free of organisational constraints; wants to set own schedule and pace of work; is willing to trade off opportunities for promotion to have more freedom.

Security	Primarily motivated by job security and long term attachment to an organisation; willing to conform and to be fully socialized into an organisation's values and norms; tends to dislike travel and relocation.
Sense of Service	Primarily motivated to improve the world in some fashion; wants to align work activities with personal values about helping society; more concerned with finding jobs which meet their values than their skills.
Pure Challenge	Primarily motivated to overcome major obstacles, solve almost unsolvable problems, or win out over extremely tough opponents; define their careers in terms of daily combat or competition in which winning is everything; very single minded and intolerant of those without comparable success
Lifestyle	Primarily motivated to balance career with lifestyle; highly concerned with such issues as paternity/maternity leave, day care options etc. Looks for organizations that have strong pro family values and programs.

DeLong (1982a, 1982b) attempted to validate the career anchor model empirically. Beyond the five anchors identified by Schein, he investigated three additional career anchors. These are:

1. Identity - the desire for status and prestige from belonging to certain companies or organizations;
2. Sense of Service - concern with helping others and seeing changes that result from efforts; and
3. Variety - the desire for several different challenges.

Operationalizing Schein's model through research questionnaires, DeLong's (1982a, 1982b, 1982c) studies validated Schein's conclusions by clearly identifying the five anchors and, moreover, distinguishing these additional three career anchors.

He also found that the security/stability anchor emerged as two independent anchors. One, stability, represents individuals who will accept an organizational definition of their careers. The other, security, is demonstrated by individuals who will move from company to company to ensure permanence in a geographical area (DeLong, 1982a, 1982b, 1982c).

Schein's (1985, 1987a, 1993) subsequent career history interviews of several hundred people in various career stages found that the identity anchor can be viewed as an extension of the security/stability anchor. Recent studies (Applin, 1982; Igbaria & Baroudi, 1993; Igbaria, Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1991), however, have identified a type of career

anchor defined by the belief that it should somehow be possible to integrate work, family, and self-concerns into a coherent lifestyle - the lifestyle integration anchor. Similarly, recent studies (Applin, 1982; Igbaria & Barroudi, 1993; Igbaria et al, 1991; Schein, 1985, 1987a, 1993) have reported that the variety anchor is favored by individuals who defined all work situations as self-tests that are won or lost against either an absolute standard or an actual competitor. Thus the label pure challenge was adopted as the essence of the variety anchor.

### **Job Congruence**

The notion of congruence forms the basis of vocational counselling where counselors try to establish the individual's needs and skills and match these to an occupation. Congruence is the term used in research into Holland's vocational preferences (Tinsley, 2000). It is also referred to as fit particularly in the theory of work adjustment (Lofquist and Dawis, 1991) and in writings on methodology (e.g. Kristof-Brown, 2007). Schein believed that congruence between career anchors and work environment would lead to greater job satisfaction and increased organisational commitment. Feldman and Bolino (1996) added to this list of outcomes by including increased work effectiveness, job stability, work role adjustment, psychological well-being and reduced role conflict. Two main forms of fit are discussed; person job (PJ) defined as "the fit between the abilities of a person and the demands of the job or the desires of a person and the attributes of the job" Kristof (1996 p.2) and person organisation (PO) fit defined as "the compatibility between individuals and organisations".

### **Statement of the Problem**

This study was designed to investigate career anchors of executives from different occupations of Hubli-Dharwad. Review of similar research studies conducted in different fields provided insights in undertaking this study. These studies found that their subjects were oriented to most of these career anchors, although some of these were identified as more dominant than others. Although the security and stability anchors did not surface as more dominant

than the career anchors in any of the studies reviewed, such anchors were part of the wide variety of career orientation of the subjects.

There is a dearth of research studies on career anchors of Indian executives. Given the dearth of previous research in the Indian context, this study examined whether these career anchors are operative for those in the various occupations like managerial, teaching, entrepreneurial and public sector employees. The study aims to examine the prevalence of each of the career anchors in the current sample and investigate the existence of demographic differences in the career anchors held by individuals. Thus six research propositions were investigated.

**Proposition 1:** There is no significant difference between men and women in their scores on each of the career anchors as measured by the COI.

**Proposition 2:** There is no significant difference between age groups in scores on each of the career anchors as measured by the COI.

**Proposition 3:** The public sector employees are not oriented towards sense of stability and security of job as an anchor.

**Proposition 4:** Sense of technical skill and general management is not the dominant anchors for Engineers

**Proposition 5:** Managerial executives do not possess a wide variety of career anchors.

**Proposition 6:** The dominant career anchors exhibited by teachers and lecturers are not sense of service and managerial competence.

**Proposition 7:** The dominant career anchors exhibited by entrepreneur are not sense of autonomy and pure challenge.

### **Research Methodology**

The Career Orientation Inventory (COI) survey developed by Schein in collaboration with DeLong was used for data collection. Subjects in this research were Managers, Entrepreneurs, Lecturers, Public sector employees and Engineers. Totally 220 executives in these four categories from Hubli-Dharwad were administered the COI questionnaire.

Data was gathered in the months of March and April in 2012. Usable responses were received from 216 persons, corresponding to a response rate of 98.28 per cent. Of the respondents, 190 were males and 26 were females. Table 3 shows the demographic profile. SPSS and MS excel are used for analysis.

### ***Rationale for the Career Orientation Inventory***

The COI of Schein (1990a) was used to measure each respondent's dominant career anchor. In this study, the COI is discussed with reference to the development, rationale, description of sub-scales, administration, interpretation, validity and reliability and motivation for choice.

The COI is a self-diagnosing questionnaire developed by Schein (1974) and later revised by Schein (1990a). The aim of the instrument is to measure the eight career anchors of individuals which are primarily grouped into three dimensions, being talent-based (technical/functional, managerial, and entrepreneurial creativity competence), need-based (security and stability, autonomy and independence, and lifestyle competence) and value-based (dedication to a cause and pure challenge competence) (Felman & Bolino, 1996; Schein, 1990a).

It should be pointed out that the COI does not purport to measure career anchors as such, but rather career orientations. In an attempt to validate and refine Schein's (1978) career anchor model, DeLong (1982) found that the COI measured career attitudes, values and needs of individuals, but did not reflect individuals' perception of their talents. According to DeLong (1982), the COI measures a central part of the concept of career anchors, namely career orientation. Schein (1990a) agrees with the view that the construct career anchors can be measured by means of a combination of the COI and a structured in-depth interview exercise. Moreover, applying the COI as a measurement of career anchors for research purposes is regarded as an acceptable and reliable practice by researchers in the field (Burke, 1983; Erdem, 2003; Marshall & Bonner, 2003;)

The COI (Schein, 1990a) consists of a set of 40 items, all of which are considered to be of equal value and to which respondents respond in terms of how true the statement is. The sub-scale used is a summated rating in the form of a six-point Likert type scale. The purpose of this questionnaire is to stimulate the respondent's thoughts about their own areas of talents, needs and values that anchor them in their careers.

**Table 1 : Eight Sub-Scales of the COI and Allocated items**

<b>Sub - Scale Contents Of COI (Schein, 1990 A) COI Sub - Scales</b>	<b>Allocated items</b>
<b><i>Talent - based anchors</i></b>	
Technical/ functional	1,9,17,25,33
General management	2,10,18,26,34
Entrepreneurial creativity	5,13,21,29,37
<b><i>Need - based anchors</i></b>	
Autonomy/ Independence	3,11,19,27,35
Security/ stability	4,12,20,28,36
Lifestyle	8,16,23,32,40
<b><i>Value - based anchors</i></b>	
Service / dedication to a cause	6,14,22,30,38
Pure challenge	7,15,23,31,39

The COI instrument is a self-diagnosis questionnaire, which can be administered individually or in group and takes approximately 10 minutes to answer, although there is no time limit. The COI is administered according to the rating and scoring instructions provided by Schein (1990a). Respondents are required to answer each statement as honestly and quickly as they can, choosing their best alternative on a seven-point Likert scale. Respondents are to avoid extreme ratings, except in areas where the respondent has very strong feelings in one direction or the other.

For each of the 40 items, respondents are required to rate how true that item is for them in general by assigning a number 1 to 7. The higher the number, the more that item is true to the respondent. The rating scale is as follows:

- a. "1" if the statement is never true to the respondent
- b. "2" or "3" if the statement is occasionally true to the respondent
- c. "4" or "5" if the statement is often true to the respondent
- d. "6" or "7" if the statement is always true to the respondent.

The allocated item scores for each of the eight categories of career orientation are summed up and multiplied by 2.86 to yield the respondents average score for each career orientation sub-scale. The sub-scale that yields the highest score is regarded as the respondent's dominant career orientation (Schein, 1990a). Each of the eight sub-scales can produce a separate score which can range from 20.02 to 99.05.

Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each factor to establish reliability and determine internal consistency (Churchill, 1979). As reported in Table 2 Cronbach's Alpha is 0.764, ranges of 0.5-0.8 surpass acceptable reliability coefficient levels (Nunally, 1967). Internal consistency (coefficient alpha) ranges from 0.59 to 0.78 in a sample of 216. Scores for

technical/functional competence (0.59), general management (0.71), autonomy (0.75), security (0.78), entrepreneurship (0.75), service (0.73), pure challenge (0.70) and lifestyle (0.64) are considered to be moderately high, with the exception of the technical/functional competence and Lifestyle.

**Table 2 : Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients**

#### Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Cases Valid	215	100.0
Excluded <sup>a</sup>	0	.0
Total	215	100.0

a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

#### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.764	8

#### Statistical Methodology

The analysis identified the following factors: (1) lifestyle integration, (2) sense of service, (3) managerial competence, (4) autonomy, (5) geographical security, (6) entrepreneurship creativity, (7) technical competence, and (8) organizational stability.

#### Discussion

As Schein (1972) noted that individual career anchors are developed over a period of time and one's experience would have some effects over their development. In this case, therefore, it could be assumed that the majority study respondents are at ease with their administrative work and that they have already passed the test of time. Challenges to them may be viewed as a natural thing in their academic administrative work.

**Table 3 : Demographic Profile of Respondents**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Managers	50	23.1481481
Entrepreneurs	27	12.5
Lecturers and teachers	35	16.2037037
Public sector employees	52	24.0740741
Engineer	52	24.0740741
<b>Total</b>	216	
<b>AGE</b>		
21-30	15	6.94444444
31-35	14	6.48148148
36-40	17	7.87037037
41-45	16	7.40740741
46-50	36	16.6666667
50-above	42	19.4444444
Unknown	76	35.1851852
<b>Total</b>	216	
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	190	87.962963
Female	26	12.037037

Source : Field Survey

### ***Dominant Anchors***

Based on the sum total of the scores of each anchor the dominant anchor is determined. The dominant anchor overall among all the respondents is found to be entrepreneurial quality and sense of service. The technical skill and stability and security closely follow next. The life style anchor and general management scores lowest in the whole population. This is a clear indication that being creative and enterprising is a part of every job and the population is very much congruent with this anchor.

As discussed earlier, entrepreneurial creativity means these respondent are Primarily motivated by the need to build or create something that is entirely their own project; easily bored and likes to move from project to project; more interested in initiating new enterprises than in managing established ones. It does not mean that they are entrepreneurs in the real sense, but enjoy being entrepreneurial in their work.

### ***Gender and Anchor Differences***

When gender is considered there is no distinction between dominant career anchors for men and women. Contrary to literature available the women show equal importance to entrepreneurial creativity and sense of service. While lifestyle and general management continue to be the lowest preferred anchors. This indicates women in Hubli Dharwad are equally competitive in their careers. While the literature asserts that lifestyle as dominant anchor for women a trend reversal has been noticed in this study.

**Table 4 : Dominant Anchors of Different Professionals**

	Tech	Mangr	Auto	Sta & Sec	Entre	Serv	Pure Chal	L Style
<b>Public Sector Employees</b>	3696.9	3696.22	3728.78	3906.8	3992.6	4019.7	3761.9	3761.9
<b>Engineer</b>	3735.3	3653.91	3676.08	3844.8	3810.5	3895.8	3661.2	3545.9
<b>Lecturers and Teachers</b>	2639	2452.39	2411.46	2560.9	2695.5	2624.3	2485.5	2553.5
<b>Managers</b>	3615.3	3535.78	3494.84	3572.2	3710.6	3658.4	3619.1	3498.7
<b>Entrepreneurs</b>	2016.9	1875.64	2461.12	1918.8	2085	2031	1892.9	2036.5
<b>Overall</b>	15703	15213.9	15772.3	15803	16294	16229	15421	15397

**Table 5 : Gender**

	Tech	Mangr	Auto	Sta & Sec	Entre	Serv	Pure Chal	L Style
<b>Males</b>	13707	13348.7	13896.1	13835	14314	14143	13518	13450
<b>Females</b>	61290	59065.1	61127.2	61171	63127	62739	59700	59551

**Proposition 1:** There will be no significant difference between men and women in their scores on each of the career anchors as measured by the COI.

difference between genders w.r.t career anchors. So the Proposition is accepted since significance level higher than 0.05.

A One Way Anova indicates that here is no significant

**Table 6 : Gender \* Career Anchor**

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean	F	Sig.
Technical	Between Groups	414.574	1	414.574	2.575	0.11
	Within Groups	34294.291	213	161.006		
	Total	34708.864	214			
Managerial	Between Groups	28.227	1	28.227	0.133	0.715
	Within Groups	45054.419	213	211.523		
	Total	45082.646	214			
Autonomy	Between Groups	42.607	1	42.607	0.033	0.857
	Within Groups	277324.746	213	1301.994		
	Total	277367.353	214			
Stability & Security	Between Groups	142.751	1	142.751	0.703	0.403
	Within Groups	43267.161	213	203.132		
	Total	43409.912	214			
Entrepreneurial	Between Groups	4.456	1	4.456	0.02	0.887
	Within Groups	46562.359	213	218.603		
	Total	46566.814	214			
Service	Between Groups	669.981	1	669.981	3.209	0.075
	Within Groups	44473.132	213	208.794		
	Total	45143.113	214			
Pure Challenge	Between Groups	61.2	1	61.2	0.352	0.554
	Within Groups	37057.376	213	173.978		
	Total	37118.576	214			
Life Style	Between Groups	314.49	1	314.49	1.484	0.225
	Within Groups	45139.759	213	211.924		
	Total	45454.249	214			

#### **Anchor Differentiation According to Age**

Life style career anchor is the lowest scorer among all age groups as depicted in Table 7. General management is also a low scorer across age groups. The common dominant anchor is entrepreneurial creativity. The population with anchor exhibits the

need to build or create something that is entirely their own project; easily bored and likes to move from project to project; more interested in initiating new enterprises than in managing established ones. (Schein 1978).



**Table 7 : Anchors According to Age**

Age	Tech	Mangr	Auto	STA&SEC	Entre	Serv	Pure Chal	L Style
21-30	1069.6	1129.7	1121.12	1144	1156.9	1106.8	1030.2	1032.5
31-35	1129.8	1127.12	1069.64	1095.4	1141.1	1174	1084	1055.8
36-40	1245	1133.68	1145.96	1304.2	1321.3	1327	1246	1260.6
41-45	1155.4	1204.2	1152.54	1233.5	1238.4	1229.8	1152.3	1202.6
46-50	2682.9	2606.56	2685.54	2771.3	2828.5	2822.8	2673.6	2666.9
50-above	2974.6	2772.85	2810.26	2955.7	3018.2	3045.2	2891.3	2806.1
Unknown	5369.1	5159.74	5701.42	5225	5521	5432	5263.1	5283.5

**Proposition 2:** There will be no significant differences between age groups in scores on each of the career anchors as measured by the COI.

Age does not influence the career anchor. Thus the Preposition is accepted since significance level is greater than 0.05.

**Table 8 : AGE\* Career Anchor**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>Technical</b>	Between Groups	6370.797	32	199.087	1.191	0.251
	Within Groups	17885.01	107	167.15		
	Total	24255.81	139			
<b>Managerial</b>	Between Groups	9949.472	32	310.921	1.511	0.061
	Within Groups	22020	107	205.794		
	Total	31969.47	139			
<b>Autonomy</b>	Between Groups	7572.207	32	236.631	1.367	0.12
	Within Groups	18524.79	107	173.129		
	Total	26097	139			
<b>Stability &amp; Security</b>	Between Groups	7041.853	32	220.058	1.249	0.2
	Within Groups	18856.51	107	176.229		
	Total	25898.36	139			
<b>Entrepreneurial</b>	Between Groups	5992.728	32	187.273	0.847	0.698
	Within Groups	23653.44	107	221.06		
	Total	29646.17	139			
<b>Service</b>	Between Groups	6872.363	32	214.761	1.224	0.221
	Within Groups	18776.46	107	175.481		
	Total	25648.83	139			
<b>Pure challenge</b>	Between Groups	5037.313	32	157.416	0.921	0.593
	Within Groups	18297.38	107	171.004		
	Total	23334.7	139			
<b>Life style</b>	Between Groups	8174.528	32	255.454	1.215	0.229
	Within Groups	22500.81	107	210.288		
	Total	30675.34	139			

**Proposition 3:** The public sector employees are not oriented towards sense of stability and security of job as an anchor.

The public sector employees (ref table 4) have service as their dominant anchor followed by entrepreneurial

nature. Stability and security is the third dominant anchor for these professionals the technical and managerial anchors are the low scorers for public sector employees. Contrary to our assumption that stability and security will be the dominate anchor we

find that these employees are oriented towards being enterprising and service. These employees who belong to KSRTC, PWD, HDMC, BSNL and Postal Department have shown more concern for service which is a positive sign. The congruence between job and anchors is high. The preposition is rejected as it is relevant that entrepreneurial creativity and sense of service are the dominant anchors.

**Proposition 4 :** Sense of technical skill and general management is not the dominant anchors for Engineers

**Table 9 : One Way Anova**

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	1851.774	7	264.5391	1.186794	0.309082	2.03248
Within Groups	89160.91	400	222.9023			
Total	91012.68	407				

**Proposition 5:** Managerial executives do not possess a wide variety of career anchors.

The managers of this population show more inclination towards creativity and sense of service. Though technical and general management closely follow. Again life style is least important with autonomy.

Engineers also score high on sense of service and security and stability closely followed by entrepreneurial and technical skills. Low scoring anchors are general management. The single factor ANOVA of the anchors indicates no significance hence the preposition is accepted. The study touched upon those engineers who are in the public sector and service sector like PWD.

**Proposition 6 :** The dominant career anchors exhibited by teachers and lecturers is not sense of service and technical competence

Creativity and technical skill are the high scorers for teachers and lecturers. Service and life style are the next high scorers. General management and autonomy are the low scorers for this group.

**Table 10 : One Way Anova**

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	1930.025	7	275.7179	1.812266	0.084926	2.043329
Within Groups	41382.05	272	152.1399			
Total	43312.07	279				

In order to reject the null hypothesis at 95% confidence, the P-value to be less than or equal to 0.05. Hence Proposition is accepted.

**Proposition 7 :** The dominant career anchors exhibited by entrepreneur is not sense of autonomy

and pure challenge.

The entrepreneurs have autonomy and creativity as their dominant anchor. Life style and service are next highly scoring anchors for this group of professionals.

**Table 11 : Anova for Entrepreneurs**

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	9012.474	7	1287.496	0.980854	0.446177	2.053808
Within Groups	273026.6	208	1312.628			
Total	282039.1	215				

In order to reject the null hypothesis at 95% confidence, the P-value to be less than or equal to 0.05. p-value is greater than 0.05 Proposition is accepted.

There are no significant differences between men and women in their scores on each of the career anchors as measured by the COI. There is no significant differences between age groups in scores on each of the career anchors as measured by the COI. The public sector employees are not oriented towards sense of stability and security of job as an anchor. Sense of technical skill and general management is not the dominant anchors for Engineers. Managerial executives do not possess a wide variety of career anchors. The dominant career anchors exhibited by teachers and lecturers are not sense of service and managerial competence. This indicates that the differentiation between jobs is narrowing down. There is no specific anchor for a particular job or occupation. All want to be creative and want to serve in their respective fields.

### ***Anchor Congruence and Job***

Only entrepreneurs, lecturers and teachers are found to have congruent anchors with their job requirements. Entrepreneurs by definition should enjoy and seek autonomy and creativity which has emerged as a dominant anchor. Lecturers and teachers are expected to be technically sound and should use creativity in accordance with the level of the class. Their anchors are congruent with job requirement. Non congruence is found for engineers and managers who are not very eager on technical and general management anchor, and show more inclination towards sense of service, creativity and security and stability which may be a cause of concern, since the security and stability in jobs is reducing considerably.

The expected anchor for public sector employees is security and stability with lifestyle but their creativity needs to be channelized in the right direction to avoid dissatisfaction.

### ***Managerial Implications***

Entrepreneurial creativity has emerged as the most

frequently occurring dominant anchor, across occupations and across age groups. Thus employers or the organizations have to give room for creative ideas to flow in, rather than routine jobs. To enhance job satisfaction the organizations have to include creativity as one of the performance parameter.

The dominance of sense of service is a positive sign for the customers and society at large. It indicates that given a chance everyone would like to pay back in their own way to the organization.

The public sector employees would not be satisfied with the security and stability embedded in the job. Their satisfaction is derived from entrepreneurial creativity and sense of service which has to be recognized. Similarly teachers and lecturers could be given the roles that enhance and satisfy their anchor, which is technical skill and creativity. Entrepreneurs are the one who find congruence with their job and anchor. Entrepreneurship gives them the autonomy and creativity which is their anchor.

All professionals need to identify their anchor and achieve satisfaction. Therefore, both organizations and individuals concerned are responsible in shaping the kind of career that they want. This responsibility, per se, is inevitable since they know exactly what they want from their careers that will satisfy their needs and expectations. They know the kind of career that will suit their competence. This means that individuals should identify their needs, motives, and goals, so they can work out how to align them with the needs of the organization.

Further, all the propositions stand rejected in the context of Hubli- Dharwad since there seems to be a multi skilling approach. As previous studies have shown there are cluster of anchors rather than a single dominant anchor (Ramakrishna, H. V. and Pofosky, D. (2003)). Further research in career anchor clustering is recommended. The propositions were based on literature review and understanding of anchors as suggested by Schien. A new trend has been observed in this region of North Karnataka.

In the Indian context it is more necessary to view career options more seriously. Career should not be a bunch of accidents as it is perceived now. Career should be based on one's aspirations, goals and anchors. Organizations or employers, on the other hand, must find a way to inspire, motivate, and appropriately reward employees. These organizational concerns about the careers of employees could be realized through the cooperation of those concerned. This means that employees must relate their career needs and motives to their organizations. Hence for organizations to achieve an effective human resource planning and development, they should match their needs for human resources with individuals' needs for personal growth and development (Morin, 1992; Schein, 1982, 1987b).

### Directions for Future Research

Future studies are required to determine the extent to which the internal career orientations (career anchors) of lawyers, doctors, or any professions separately. This research constitutes an initial step toward exploring this important area.

While the career anchors identified by this study are representative of a small occupational group, difference among career anchors across job functions (i.e., presidents and vice-presidents, deans, department chairpersons) may yield perspectives enabling organizations/institutions to establish more effective personnel management. It is hoped that this study will catalyze further research in career management in the Indian context.

### References

- Alka Singh Bhatt, A career anchor perspective of employees in a large company, <http://www.ipcsit.com/vol20/49-icait2011-g3039.pdf>
- Barth, TJ (1993), Career Anchor Theory: A Useful Framework for Federal Managers, *Review of Public Administration*, 13(4) 27-42.
- Burke, RJ (1983), Career Orientations of Type A Individuals, *Psychological Reports*, 53, 979-989, [http://www.careeranchoronline.com/SCA/media/images/common/report\\_sample.pdf](http://www.careeranchoronline.com/SCA/media/images/common/report_sample.pdf).
- Catherine Ann Steele, *Measuring career anchors and investigating the role of career anchor congruence* [http://eprints.worc.ac.uk/705/1/measuring\\_career\\_anchor\\_s\\_csteele.pdf](http://eprints.worc.ac.uk/705/1/measuring_career_anchor_s_csteele.pdf)
- Clawson, James G And Wilson, Brendt, Steven Taylor's Career-Development paper, Darden case no. Uva-pacs-0025. Available at ssrn: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1584490>
- Chang, B. L. P. (2002), Career goals and career management strategy among information technology professionals. *Career development international*, 7(1), 6-13.
- Counsell, D., & Popova, J. (2000), Career perceptions and strategies in the new market-oriented Bulgaria: An exploratory study. *Career Development International*, 5(7), 360-368.
- Crepeau, RG, Crook, CW, Goslar, MD & McMurtrey, ME (1992), Career Anchors of Information Systems Personnel, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 9(2), 145-160.
- Dalton, M. (1951), Informal factors in career advancement. *American Journal of Sociology*, 56, 407-415.
- DeLong, TJ (1981), Career Anchors: A New Concept in Career Development for the Professional Educator, Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, April.
- DeLong, TJ (1982a), The Career orientations of MBA Alumni: A Multidimensional Model, in Katz, R. (Ed) (1982) *Career Issues in Human Resource Management*, Engle-Wood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- DeLong, TJ (1982b), Reexamining the Career Anchor Model, *Personnel*, 59(3), 50-61.
- DeLong, TJ (1982c), Career Orientations of Rural Educators: An Investigation, *The Rural Educator*, 4(2), 12-16.
- DeLong, TJ (1983), Dentists and Career Satisfaction: An Empirical View, *Journal of Dentistry for Children*, May-June 179-185.
- Donnellan, m.b., oswald, f.l., baird, b.m., & lucas, r.e. (2006), The mini-ipp scales: tiny-yet-effective measures of the big five factors of personality. *Psychological assessment*, 18, 192-203
- Eddleston, K. A., Baldridge, D. C., & Veiga, J. F. (2004). Toward modeling the predictors of managerial career success: Does gender matter. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(4), 360-385.
- Edgar H. Schein, Career anchors - Participant workbook, third edition
- Elizabeth Jean Lumley , Exploring the relationship between career anchors, job satisfaction and organisational commitment.
- Garcia, LG (1986), Job Satisfaction of College Instructors in Seven State Colleges in Region III in Relation to

Selected Individual Variables EdD Dissertation, Baguio Central University Graduate School.

Giuseppina Palermo, gender and organisational culture: Relationships between marginality and Women's career success, <http://wallaby.vu.edu.au/adt-vvut/uploads/approved/adt-vvut20070821.141101/public/01front.pdf>

Gattiker, U. E. (1985), Organisational careers: Testing a model of career success. *Unpublished PhD Dissertation*, Claremont Graduate School.

Gould, S., & Penley, L. E. (1984), Career strategies and salary progression: A study of their relationships in a municipal bureaucracy. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 34, 244-265.

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990), Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 64-86.

Hair, JF Jr., Anderson, RE & Tatham, RL (1987), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, New York: Macmillan.

Igbaria, M & Baroudi, JJ (1993) A Short-Form Measure of Career Orientations: A Psychometric Evaluation, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 10(2), 131-154.

Igbaria, M, Greenhaus, JH & Parasuraman, S (1991) Career Orientations of MIS Employees: An Empirical Analysis, *MIS Quarterly*, 15(2), 151-169.

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

Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick, M. R. (1999), The Big Five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 621-652.

Jean Miles, the impact of a career development programme on career maturity and academic motivation, <http://ufh.netd.ac.za/bitstream/10353/143/1/the%20impact%20of%20a%20career%20development%20programme.pdf>

Lau, A., & Pang, M. (2000), Career strategies to strengthen graduate employees' employment position in the Hong Kong labour market. *MCB University Press*, 42(3), 135-149.

Lau, V. P., & Shaffer, M. A. (1999), Career success: The effects of personality. *Career Development International*, 4(4), 225-231.

Nabi, G. R. (1999), An investigation into the differential profile of predictors of objective and subjective career success. *Career Development International*, 4(4), 212-225.

Nabi, G. R. (2001), The relationship between HRM, social support and subjective career success among men and women. *International Journal of Manpower*, 22(5), 457-474.

Nabi, G. R. (2003), Situational characteristics and subjective career success: The mediating role of career-enhancing strategies. *International Journal of Manpower*, 24(6), 653-672.

Pawan S. Budhwar, Yehuda Baruch, (2003), "Career Management practices in india: an empirical study", *international journal of manpower*, vol. 24 iss: 6, pp.699 - 719,

Ramakrishna, H. V. and Potosky, D. (2003), Conceptualization and exploration of composite career anchors: An analysis of information systems personnel. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 14: 199-214. doi: 10.1002/hrdq.1060

Susan Abraham, individual career management and career satisfaction among employees in indian banks <http://www.trikal.org/ictbm11/pdf/hrm/d1141-done.pdf>

Sunil Maheshwari T.N.Krishnan, Determinants of employee career effectiveness – an empirical study, [http://jgxy.usx.edu.cn/daom/042\\_sunilmaheshwari.pdf](http://jgxy.usx.edu.cn/daom/042_sunilmaheshwari.pdf)

William J. Rothwell, Career planning and succession management: developing your organization's business & economics

Tanuja Agarwala, (2008), factors influencing career choice of management students in India, *career development international*, vol. 13 iss: 4, pp.362 – 376

<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=1737957&show=abstract>

Schein, EH (1971), The Individual, the Organization, and the Career: A Conceptual Scheme, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 7(4), 401-426.

Schein, EH (1974), *Career Anchors and Career Paths: A Panel Study of Management School Graduates, Technical Report No.1*, Cambridge, MA: MIT, Alfred Sloan School of Management.

Schein, EH (1978), *Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational Needs*, Philippines: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Schein EH (1985), *Career Anchors: Discovering Your Real Values* San Diego, Ca: University Associates.

Schein, EH (1987a), Individuals and Careers, in Lorsch, JW (ed) (1987), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Schein, EH (1987b), Increasing Organizational Effectiveness through Better Human Resource Planning and Development, in Science, EH (ed) (1987) *The Art of Managing Human Resources*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Schein, EH (1988), How "Career Anchors" Hold Executives to Their Career Paths, in Katz, R. (Ed) (1988) *Managing Professional in Innovative Organizations: A Collection of Readings*, Cambridge, MA: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.

Schein, EH (1990), *Career Anchors: Trainer's Manual* revised edition, Cambridge, MA; Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, MIT.

Schein, EH (1993), *Career Anchors: Discovering Your Real Values*, revised edition, Sydney: Pfeiffer and Company.

Tazeentaj, Cheatan P, *Role of Career Anchors in Job selection, Change and Satisfaction: An Empirical Study*, Employees first, customer Next, HR conclave, Rani Channamma University, Belgaum.

Zerdavis, AZ (1982), *The Career Orientations of Pima Community College Faculty*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Brigham Young University.

[http://testets.com/samples/career%20anchors/sample%20career%20anchors%20workbooklet\\_15\\_pgs\\_of\\_72.pdf](http://testets.com/samples/career%20anchors/sample%20career%20anchors%20workbooklet_15_pgs_of_72.pdf)

<http://www.wit.org.au/images/linked%20documents/career%20anchor.pdf>

[http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/3455/dissertation\\_lumley\\_e.pdf?sequence=1](http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/3455/dissertation_lumley_e.pdf?sequence=1)

<http://www.cek.ef.uni-lj.si/magister/tadic2755.pdf>

### **About the Authors :**

A.H. Chachadi is a Dean at KUD. The author can be reached at [dr\\_ahc@rediffmail.com](mailto:dr_ahc@rediffmail.com)

Tazeentaj Mahat is an Assistant Professor at Global Business School, Hubli. The author can be reached at [tazeentaj@gmail.com](mailto:tazeentaj@gmail.com)

Tejashwini Patil is a Faculty at Global Business School, Hubli. The author can be reached at [teju@globalschool.in](mailto:teju@globalschool.in)