

CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF DATA

- 4.1. Preview of the Chapter
- 4.2. Introduction
- 4.3. Descriptive analysis
 - 4.3.1. Descriptive analysis - Quarter Life Crisis
 - 4.3.2. Descriptive analysis - Career Decision Self Efficacy
 - 4.3.3. Descriptive analysis - Career Anchors
 - 4.3.4. Descriptive analysis - Career Satisfaction
- 4.4. Factor Analysis
 - 4.4.1. Factor Analysis – Quarter Life Crisis
 - 4.4.2. Factor Analysis – Career Decision Self Efficacy
 - 4.4.3. Factor Analysis – Career Anchors
 - 4.4.4. Factor Analysis – Career Satisfaction
- 4.5. Review of Chapter

4.1. Preview of Chapter

The previous chapter gave an overview of the methodology involved in the study. In this chapter, the focus would be on descriptive analysis, correlation and factor analysis. The discussion of the findings of the study have been structured in the

following manner – descriptive analysis, followed by correlation analysis and finally, followed by factor analysis.

4.2. Introduction

For the purpose of present study, all data collected from the employees of the four sectors i.e. BPO/ Call Centre, Retail, Telecom and Software had been scored and compiled in various tables to facilitate statistical analysis. The data arranged in a systematic manner had been used to calculate measure of central tendency and correlation and factor analysis. The computation of descriptive analysis data was done using SPSS Software.

The present study aims at studying quarter life crisis, and what are its effects on career decision self efficacy and career anchors. The researcher also wanted to see, if it results in career satisfaction amongst employees. The major variables of the study were as follows:

- Quarter Life Crisis
- Career Decision Self Efficacy
- Career Anchors
- Career Satisfaction

4.3. Descriptive Analysis

4.3.1. Descriptive Statistics - Quarter Life Crisis

Findings of Descriptive Statistics - Quarter Life Crisis

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
QLC Career	1630	24.22	4.754
QLC Job	1630	23.83	4.529
QLC Stress	1630	23.59	4.997
QLC Health	1630	23.08	4.835
QLC Lifestyle	1630	21.97	5.032
Valid N (listwise)	1630		

Table No. 4.1.

Analysis: The mean range was from 21.97 to 24.22. The standard deviation (SD) range was from 4.52 to 5.03, this indicates a desirable level of standard deviation

Discussion: Amongst the broad five items in the in this variable, the first one was career crisis followed by job crisis. There is a very thin line between the two - career is the entire working span of an individual, irrespective the number of jobs the employee changes, where as job basically reflects in one's current assignment. The standard deviation is relative to sample size and mean. The value indicates that "the responses on the particular variable deviated from the mean. Higher the sample size higher the chances of deviation. Very less deviation will imply the

homogeneity of sample which is not desirable and too high will indicate incorrect sampling. SD within a range of 4.52 to 5.03 is adequate and this is desirable for any research given this sample size.

4.3.2. Descriptive Statistics - Career Decision Self Efficacy

Findings of Descriptive Statistics - Career Decision Self Efficacy

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
CDSE Occupation Information	1630	16.66	4.174
CDSE Goal Selection	1630	17.03	4.211
CDSE Planning	1630	15.26	3.900
CDSE Problem Solving	1630	15.48	4.151
CDSE Self Appraisal	1630	15.14	4.852
Valid N (list wise)	1630		

Table No. 4.2.

Analysis: The mean range was from 15.14 to 17.03. The standard deviation range was from 3.90 to 4.85, this indicates a desirable level of standard deviation.

Discussion: The five items in the in this variable, the first one was goal selection, followed by occupation information. All across the four industries, the employees felt that goal selection and finding information about occupations were crucial

.The standard deviation is relative to sample size and mean. The value indicates that "the responses on the particular variable deviated from the mean. Higher the sample size higher the chances of deviation. Very less deviation will imply the homogeneity of sample which is not desirable and too high will indicate incorrect sampling. Hence, a SD within a range of 3.90 to 4.85 is adequate and this is desirable for any research given this sample size.

4.3.3. *Descriptive Statistics – Career Anchors*

Findings of Descriptive Statistics – Career Anchors

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
CA Technical Functional	1630	9.48	4.421
CA General Mgt	1630	9.34	4.555
CA Autonomy	1630	10.70	4.019
CA Security	1630	12.69	4.511
CA Entrepreneurial Creativity	1630	9.73	3.820
CA Service Dedication To A Cause	1630	8.56	3.396
CA Pure Challenge	1630	8.93	3.441
CA Lifestyle	1630	11.72	4.628
Valid N (listwise)	1630		

Table No. 4.3.

Analysis: The mean range was from 8.56 to 12.69. The standard deviation range was from 3.39 to 4.62, this indicates a desirable level of standard deviation.

Discussion: Professionals have a wide variety of career anchors. Career anchors represented in the sample the highest mean was obtained in organisational stability/security, followed by lifestyle and then autonomy. Professionals possess a wide sense of security / stability, life style and autonomy career orientations respectively than other career orientations. The standard deviation is relative to sample size and mean. The value indicates that the responses on the particular variable deviated from the mean. Higher the sample size higher the chances of deviation. Very less deviation will imply the homogeneity of sample which is not desirable and too high will indicate incorrect sampling. Hence, a SD within a range of 3.39 to 4.62 is adequate and this is desirable for any research given this sample size and hence at a desirable level.

4.3.4. Descriptive Statistics- Career Satisfaction

Findings of Descriptive Statistics – Career Satisfaction

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
CS Career Goal Satisfaction	1630	19.27	5.127
CS Job Satisfaction	1630	19.86	4.544
CS Mentor Satisfaction	1630	20.85	4.618
CS Organisation Satisfaction	1630	19.53	4.675
CS Self Satisfaction	1630	19.91	4.456

CS Superior Satisfaction	1630	22.44	3.805
CS Team Satisfaction	1630	20.24	4.374
Valid N (listwise)	1630		

Table No. 4.4.

Analysis: The mean was between 19.27to 22.44. The standard deviation range was from 3.80 to 5.12, this indicates a desirable level of standard deviation

Discussion: Amongst the seven items in the in this variable, Superior Satisfaction had the highest mean and then followed by Mentor Satisfaction. The standard deviation is relative to sample size and mean. The value indicates that "the responses on the particular variable deviated from the mean. Higher the sample size higher the chances of deviation. Very less deviation will imply the homogeneity of sample which is not desirable and too high will indicate incorrect sampling. Hence, a SD within a range of 3.80 to 5.12 is adequate and this is desirable for any research given this sample size.

4.4. Factor Analysis

This section illustrates the application of factor analysis for the identification of core factors that affect the variables under consideration. This analysis technique was considered appropriate as it required no pre – existing theory of functional relationships and can handle masses of diverse data relating to a large number of social and economic characteristics and communities (Adleman & Dalton, 2001).

Factor analysis does not allow one to attribute cause and effect. It does, however permit one to delineate the underlying regularities in a complex mass of data by extracting from a larger set of variables the mutual interdependence among subsets of characteristics comprising of each factor (Adelman & Dalton, 2001).

Factor Analysis provides the tools for analyzing the structure of the interrelationships (correlations) among a large number of variables by defining sets of variables that are highly interrelated , known as ‘factors’. It helps in testing the validity of the instrument. The decisions made at each choice point can have a substantial impact on the results of the factor analysis and on subsequent interpretation of those results (Armstrong & Soelberg, 1968; Comrey 1978; Mac Callum, 1983; Weiss (1976). Researchers must carefully review choice points provide a rationale for each decision and interpret results in accordance with those decisions (Weiss, 1976).

The first decision the researcher faces when employing factor analysis is the choice of factor model. Most modern applications of factor analysis can be divided into two different approaches: common factor analysis and components analysis. Both approaches allow researchers to examine how variance for a given variable is distributed relative to other variables in the data set. The major assumption that distinguishes the two approaches concerns the nature of the variance in the variables. The results by Tucker et al. (1969) suggest that researchers should give serious thought to the appropriate factor model during the design phase of the research.

KMO Bartlett’s Test was used as a measure for sampling adequacy. If this is high, inter correlations among different items are also high. This is also a pre requisite

for factor analysis, as it tests the overall significance of all correlations within a correlation matrix.

The sum of squared factor loadings i.e. Eigen values, it indicates the relative importance of each factor in accounting for the variance associated with the set of variables. As expected, the factor solution extracts the factors in the order of their importance, with factor 1 accounting for the most variance, factor 2 slightly less, and so on through all the factors. For components analysis, it has been argued that the Kaiser criterion of retaining factors with Eigen values greater than one appears to be most appropriate (Kim & Mueller, 1978b; Weiss, 1976).

The cumulative percentage of the total variance which is based on achieving a specified cumulative percentage of total variance extracted by successive factors . The purpose is to ensure practical significance of the derived factors by ensuring that they explain at least a specified range of variance. In social science, where information is often less precise, it is common to consider a solution that accounts for 60 % of the total variance (and in some instances even less) as satisfactory (Hair, Black et al , 2005)

For Factor loadings .40 was the threshold that was considered. Extraction method was Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation. Rotating the matrix does improve the structure of the factor matrix. The cutoff point for interpretation purposes is all loadings $\pm .40$ or above. The cutoff point was set somewhat low to illustrate the factor interpretation process with as many significant loadings as possible. If nothing beyond this is done, the value of the analysis is limited (Comrey, 1978). Substantive interpretations are based on the significant loadings. For loadings below .40 have not been printed. The factors are sorted by their

loadings on each factor. A marked pattern of factors with high loadings for each factor is evident. Each factor was named based on the items with significant loadings.

Factor labels are more meaningful when they reflect what is as well as what is not involved in a factor (Rummel, 1970). The process of naming factors is based primarily on the subjective opinion of the researcher. Different researchers in many instances will no doubt assign different names to the same results because of differences in their backgrounds and training.

Factor rotation was used to improve the psychological meaningfulness, reliability and reproducibility of factors (Weiss, 1976). Because the number of different positions for the axis is unlimited, a unique solution to the rotation problem is not possible (Comrey, 1978).

The size of the communality is a useful index for assessing how much variance is accounted for by the factor solution. Higher the communality values, it indicates that a large amount of the variance in a factor has been extracted by the factor solution. Small communalities show that a substantial portion of the variables variance is not accounted for by the factor. Although no statistical guidelines indicate exactly what is 'large or small', practical consideration dictates a lower level of .50 from communality in this analysis. All factors that have communality more than .50 must be retained in the analysis.

Factor analysis tests were run on the data to determine the validity and see whether the respondents' ratings on the various items on the 4 scales. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Hair, Anderson & Tatham, 1987) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin

(KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy (Kaiser, 1974) were used. Both tests were conducted due to the sensitivity associated with the large sample size. Principal components analysis confirmed the existence of quarter life crisis, career anchors, career decision self efficacy and career satisfaction among the executives. Factor analysis applying varimax rotation identified various factors.

4.4.1. Factor Analysis – Quarter Life Crisis

Testing the adequacy of sample

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.768
Bartlett's Test of Approx. Chi-Square		12511.120
Sphericity	df	595
	Sig.	.000

Generally, $0 < \text{KMO} < 1$

If $\text{KMO} > 0.5$, sample is adequate.

Here $\text{KMO} = .768$. This indicates that the sample is adequate and one may proceed with factor analysis.

The cumulative percentage of the total variance was found to be 55.264 which is based on achieving a specified cumulative percentage of total variance extracted by successive factors

KMO Bartlett's Test was used as a measure for sampling adequacy. It was found to be .768. As it is high, the, inter correlations among different items are also high. This test helps in testing the overall significance of all correlations within a correlation matrix.

Taking a 99% Level Of Significance ($\alpha = 0.01$)

Since p-value (sig.) of 0.001 < 0.01, the factor analysis is valid

The cumulative percentage of the total variance was found to be which is based on achieving a specified cumulative percentage of total variance extracted by successive factors

The data shows the correlation of all original items with each of the extracted factors. Usually each item will be highly loaded on one factor and have a low loading on the other factors. To identify which factors are highly loaded with each factor, maximum value in each row was selected.

Based on factor analysis, ten core factors have been named.

Naming of core factors of Quarter Life Crisis based on factor analysis.

Factor	Factors Included in the factor	Name of the Factor
1	Maintain a balanced diet , am regular at work, have a	Health

	loss of appetite, regularly exercise, always late for work , have fixed meals at regular intervals	
2	Having a mentor in the few years of joining would have helped me in my career. Did not plan my career, took up the first job. Have chalked out my career goals for next five years. Could have planned my career better. This is the career that has dreamt of.	Career
3	Love the money that this job pays and took it up. Love coming to work every day. Have erratic work schedules. Work for more than eight hours a day. Prefer working in shifts.	Lifestyle
4	Get mentally exhausted every day. Have become forgetful. Am under stress whenever I come to work. Get physically exhausted every day. Lose my temper at home and work. Have good sleeping habits.	Stress
5	Am not cut out for this job. Am very passionate about my work. I Dislike my work. Can't stand doing my job anymore.	Job
6	Think I am in a wrong career and feel like quitting. Have regularly felt overworked.	Overwork
7	Could have planned my career a little better. Work is distributed in my department.	Planning
8	During my free time, I think of relaxing, watching a movie or going out.	Leisure
9	Love a 9 - 5 kind of job.	Fixed hours
10	Hate my job.	Dislike job

Table no.4.6.

Factor Analysis Conclusion

The factor analysis exercise identified that there are 10 core factors that influence quarter life crisis. These are:

1. Health
2. Career
3. Lifestyle
4. Stress
5. Job
6. Overwork
7. Planning
8. Leisure
9. Fixed hours
10. Dislike job

The first factor explained 11.190 % of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 3.917. The loadings ranged from .539 to 0.789. The composition of this factor suggests that .789= I maintain a balanced diet and have good eating habits, .651= I am regular at work, .716= I have a loss of appetite, .539= I regularly exercise, .612= I am always late for work, .755= I have fixed meals at regular intervals. This was in consistent with the original scale developed by the researcher with one item being dropped. This factor was labeled as Health.

The second factor explained 8.688 % of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 3.041. The loadings ranged from .448 to 0.785. The composition of this factor suggests that .744= Having a mentor in the few years of joining an organisation would have helped me in my career, .661= I did not plan my career. Just took up the first job that came my way, .735= I have already chalked out my career goals for the next five years, .448= I could have planned my career a little better, .699= I have planned my career very well, .785= This is the career that I have always dreamt of. This was in consistent with the original scale developed by the researcher. This factor was labeled as Career.

The third factor explained 7.103 % of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 2.486. The loadings ranged from .584 to 0.827. The composition of this factor suggests that .827= I love the money that this job pays and hence I took it up, .584= I love coming to work every day, .779= I have erratic work schedules, .717= I work for more than eight hours a day, .708= I prefer working in shifts than normal hours). This factor was labeled as Lifestyle.

The fourth factor explained 6.651 % of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 2.328. The loadings ranged from .482 to .776. The composition of this factor suggest that .776= I get mentally exhausted every day, .716= I have become forgetful, .72=I am under stress whenever I come to work .578=I get physically exhausted every day. .482=I lose my temper at home and at work. .528= I have very good sleeping habits. This factor was labeled as Stress.

The fifth factor explained 5.844 % of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 2.046. The loadings ranged from .668 to 0.827. The composition of this factor suggest that .712= I am not cut out for this job, .746=I am very passionate about

my work, .668= I dislike my work, .827=I can't stand doing my job anymore. This factor was labeled as Job.

The sixth factor explained 3.478 % of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 1.217. The loadings ranged from .503 to 0.657. .503=I think I am in a wrong career and regularly feel like quitting. .657= In the last six months, I have regularly felt overworked. .This factor was labeled as Overwork.

The seventh factor explained 3.216 % of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 1.125. The loadings ranged from .400 to 0.755. .400=I could have planned my career a little better.755=Work is equally distributed to my colleagues in my department. This factor was labeled as Planning.

The eighth factor explained 3.126 % of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 1.094. The factor loading was .741= During my free time, I think of relaxing, watching a movie or going out. This factor was labeled as Leisure.

The ninth factor explained 3.032% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 1.061. The loadings ranged from .575 to 0.664. There were two items that got grouped in this factor -.664=I love a 9 - 5 kind of job. .575=I feel great when I awake in the mornings. This factor was labeled as Fixed Hours.

The tenth factor explained 2.936% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 1.028. The loading was .799 on only one factor. .799=I hate my job. This factor was labeled as Dislike job.

Discussion: In the study done on Quarter Life Crisis, as the scale was self developed, there were only five factors initially, but, as the above analysis indicates that there are a total of ten factors that were considered important. They were Quitting due to overwork, planning, leisure, fixed hours and dislike job. The difference could be linked to the odd hours of work and the levels of frustration the employees faced at the BPO and the Retail sectors, though it could not be applicable to the other two industries too. Work today is done in a crisis situation, so most employees felt that ‘planning’ should be an important factor in the scale. The highest loading was in Health crisis and Career Crisis. In all the four industries, it was commonly felt that odd and late hours of work was probably detrimental to one’s well being. In these four industries, they either have odd hours or late hours i.e. extended office hours. Career crisis is a common thread that again runs across all four industries. Most fresher’s are hired from engineering and management institutes and are assigned any kind of project, most organisations rarely review and see what the employees interest are at the nascent stage of one’s career, hence , they are saddled with a job content that they do not have too much of interest in. They normally face this for at least two years of their work experience, but, then even as they gather years of experience and take up new assignments, many a time – what the company commits during the interview process and what the employee finally gets assigned to when joining the company, also differs to a great extent.

4.4.2. Factor Analysis – Career Decision Self Efficacy

Testing adequacy of sample

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.695
Bartlett's Test of Approx. Chi-Square	8429.668
Sphericity df	300
Sig.	.000

Generally, $0 < KMO < 1$

If $KMO > 0.5$, sample is adequate.

Here $KMO = 0.695$. This indicates that the sample is adequate and one may proceed with factor analysis.

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

Taking a 99% Level Of Significance ($\alpha = 0.01$)

Since p-value (sig.) of $0.001 < 0.01$, the factor analysis is valid

As it is high, the, inter correlations among different items are also high. This test helps in testing the overall significance of all correlations within a correlation matrix.

8 core factors can be extracted from the 25 items used in this career decision making self efficacy. These extracted factors will explain the cumulative percentage of the total variance which was found to be 60 % (almost two thirds) of the variability in the career decision making self efficacy.

The data shows the correlation of all original items with each of the extracted factors. Usually each item will be highly loaded on one factor and have a low loading on the other factors. To identify which items are highly loaded with each factor, maximum value in each row is to be selected.

The items included in each factor are set out below and based on this the eight core factors have been named.

Naming of core factors of Career Decision Self Efficacy based on factor analysis

Factor	Items Included in the factor	Name of the Factor
1	Assessing abilities ,determining one’s ideal job, value most in an occupation, figure out what you are, lifestyle one would like to live	Self Appraisal
2	Involved in work experience, select one occupation ,choose a career , make a career decision , chose a career that fits ones interest	Goal Selection
3	Usage of internet for occupations, employment trends ,average yearly earnings, talk with someone employed in the filed	Occupation Information
4	Determine steps if faced with trouble in occupation, persistently working on career goals, change the occupation , career strategy	Problem Solving
5	Plan your goals for 5 yrs, determine steps for your	Planning

	occupation, prepare a good C.V.	
6	Identify employers, firms, and institutions, Manager job interviews.	Preparation
7	Information on further studies.	Academic Information
8	Identify some reasonable major or career alternatives if you are unable to get your first choice.	Career Alternatives

Table No. 4.7.

Factor Analysis Conclusion

The factor analysis exercise identified that there are 8 core factors that influence career decision self efficacy. These are:

1. Self appraisal
2. Goal selection
3. Occupation Information
4. Problem Solving
5. Planning
6. Career Initiatives
7. Academic Information
8. Career Alternatives

The First factor explained 11.497% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 2.874. The loadings ranged from 0.584 to 0.826. The composition of this factor suggests that .826 - Accurately assess your abilities, .584=Determine what your

ideal job would be, .782= Decide what you value most in an occupation, .728= Figure out what you are and are not ready to sacrifice to achieve your career goals,.719= Define the type of lifestyle you would like to live. The five items loading on the factor were same as per the original factor on self appraisal. This factor was labeled as self appraisal as it was in Taylor and Betz (2001).

The Second factor explained 9.832% of variance, with an Eigen-value of 2.458. The loadings ranged from 0.504 to 0.754. The composition of this factor suggests that (.699= Get involved in a work experience relevant to your future goals, .754= Select one occupation from a list of potential occupations you are considering, .663= Choose a career that will fit your preferred lifestyle, .745= Make a career decision and then not worry whether it was right or wrong, .504= Choose a career that will fit your interests. The five items loading on the factor were same as per the original factor on goal selection .This factor was labeled as goal selection as it was in Taylor and Betz Scale (2001).

The Third factor, explained 9.365% of variance, with an Eigen-value 2.341. The loadings ranged from 0.659 to 0.837. The composition of this factor suggests that .659=Use the internet to find information about occupations that interest you, .803 = Find out the employment trends for an occupation over the next ten years, .655 = Find out about the average yearly earnings of people in an occupation, .837 =Talk with a person already employed in a field you are interested in. Four items were loaded on the factor were almost same as per the original factor. Though the original factor had five items on this factor. This factor was labeled as occupation information as it was in Taylor and Betz Scale (2001).

The Fourth factor, explained 8.183 % of variance, with an Eigen-value 2.046. The loadings of each item ranged from 0.592 to 0.817. The composition of this factor suggests that .592= Determine the steps to take if you are having trouble with an aspect of your chosen occupation, .817= Persistently work at your career goal even when you get frustrated, .645= Change occupation if you did not like your first choice, .734 = Come up with a strategy to deal if your career fails. Four items were loaded on the factor were almost same as per the original factor. Though the original factor had five items on this factor. This factor was labeled as problem solving as it was in Taylor and Betz Scale (2001).

The Fifth factor, explained 7.632 % of variance, with an Eigen-value 1.908. The loading of each item ranged from 0.742 to 0.840. The composition of this factor suggests that .760 =Make a plan of your goals for the next five years, .840 =Determine the steps to take if you are having trouble with an aspect of your chosen occupation, .742=Prepare a good resume. Three items were loaded on the factor as per the original factor. Though the original factor had five items on this factor. This factor was labeled as Planning as it was in Taylor and Betz Scale (2001).

The Sixth factor, explained 4.698 % of variance, with an Eigen-value 1.174. The loadings of each item ranged from 0.687 to 0.786. The composition of this factor suggests that, .687= Identify employers, firms, and institutions relevant to your career possibilities, .786= Successfully manage the job interview process. The factor was called career initiatives. This factor matched both one from the preparation factor and it was called .

The Seventh factor, explained 4.329 % per cent of variance, with an Eigen-value 1.082. The factor loading was .816. The composition of this factor suggests that .816= Find information about further studies in my line of occupation from graduate or professional schools. Only one item was loaded on this factor and it was called academic information. This was originally a part of the occupation information factor.

The Eighth factor, explained 4.017% of variance, with an Eigen-value 1.004. The factor loading was .934. The composition of this factor suggests that, .934= Identify some reasonable major or career alternatives if you are unable to get your first choice. Only one item was loaded on this factor and it was called Career Alternatives. This was originally a part of the problem solving factor..

Eight factors in general corresponded to five of CDSE - SF Taylor and Betz Scale (2001).of Career Decision Self Efficacy - SF. There are some partial differences between the factors found in this research and Taylor and Betz Scale (2001). The responses associated with the planning construct loaded on two factors i.e. numbers five and six and seventh and eight factors had one item each loaded from occupation information and problem solving factor. Responses clearly distinguished three other dimensions one which was a part of the original planning factor called preparation and the others were academic information and career alternatives.

Discussion: Career Initiatives, Academic Information and Career Alternatives, were three items that featured over and above the existing factors. The respondents must have felt that for career decision self efficacy, it is important to take interest and initiation in finding out the various alternative career choices

first, rather than taking hasty decisions .It was also felt that it was necessary to obtain data in line with the career interest of employees that one is pursuing .

4.4.3. Factor Analysis – Career Anchors

Testing adequacy of sample

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.794
Bartlett's Test of Approx. Chi-Square		41310.483
Sphericity	df	780
	Sig.	.000

Generally, $0 < KMO < 1$

If $KMO > 0.5$, sample is adequate.

Here $KMO = .794$. This indicates that the sample is adequate and one may proceed with factor analysis.

The cumulative percentage of the total variance was found to be 69.082 which is based on achieving a specified cumulative percentage of total variance extracted by successive factors

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

Taking a 99% Level Of Significance ($\alpha = 0.01$)

Since p-value (sig.) of 0.001 < 0.01, the factor analysis is valid

As it is high, the, inter correlations among different items are also high. This test helps in testing the overall significance of all correlations within a correlation matrix.

9 core factors can be extracted from a 40 items used in the career anchor scale. These extracted factors will explain the cumulative percentage of the total variance which was found to be 69.082% (almost two thirds) of the variability in the career anchor scale.

The above matrix shows the correlation of all original variables with each of the extracted factors. Usually each factor will be highly loaded on one factor and have a low loading on the other factors. To identify which factors are highly loaded with each factor, the maximum value in each row is selected.

The items included in each factor are set out below and based on this the nine core factors have been named.

Naming of core factors of Career Anchors based on factor analysis.

Factor	Items Included in the factor	Name of the Factor
1	Fulfilled in my work, Dream of being in charge ,Successful at a high level ,Becoming a general manager is more attractive, Leave my organisation than accept any other job.	General Management
2	Comprise my ability to pursue personal and family concerns ,leave my organisation than compromise my personal and family concerns ,Career that helps integrate my personal family and work needs, Feel successful only if I balance my personal , family and career requirements, Managerial position is not important, Work that would not interfere with personal or family concerns.	Life style
3	Security and stability are important, Not stay in an organisation that jeopardises my job security, Seek jobs that will give me a sense of stability and security, Dream of a career that allows me security and stability ,Most fulfilled when I have financial and employment security.	Security/ Stability
4	Building a business is important, Feel fulfilled when I build something of my skill and effort, Feel successful creating an enterprise on my own skills and ideas ,Dream of building my own business.	Entrepreneurial Creativity
5	Feel successful only if I have made a contribution to	Service

	the welfare of society, Feel fulfilled when I use my talents in service of others, Using my talents to make the world a better place, dream of a career that makes al contribution to humanity and society ,Would leave my organisation than accept a job that takes me away from general managerial track.	Dedication to a Cause
6	I want to be good so others will seek my expert advice, Will feel successful only if I can develop my technical or functional skills, Becoming a senior functional manager is more attractive than becoming a general manager, Would leave my organisation than accept a rotational assignment, I am most fulfilled when I have been able to use my special skills and talents.	Technical /Functional Competence
7	Dream of a career in which will always have the challenge of solving difficult problems, Will feel successful only if I have overcome difficult challenges, Most fulfilled when I have been able to solve unsolvable problems , Prefer work opportunities that challenge my problem solving and competitive skills, Working on problems is more important than achieving a high-level managerial position.	Pure Challenge
8	Dream of a career that will allow me to do a job my own way and schedule, Am most fulfilled in my work when I am free to define my own tasks and	Autonomy

	procedures, Will feel successful in my career only if I achieve complete autonomy and freedom.	
9	Chance to do a job in my own way, free of rules and constraints, Would leave my organisation than accept a job that would reduce my autonomy, Prefer opportunities that challenge my problem solving skills.	Work Independence

9 factors emerged

Table no.4.8.

Factor Analysis Conclusion

The factor analysis exercise identified that there are 9 core factors that influence career anchors. These are:

1. General Management
2. Lifestyle
3. Security/ Stability
4. Entrepreneurial Creativity
5. Service Dedication to a cause
6. Technical /Functional Competence
7. Pure Challenge
8. Autonomy
9. Work Independence

A total of 9 factors emerged

The First factor explained 17.145% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 6.858. The loadings ranged from 0.743 to 0.880. The composition of this factor suggests that (.819= I am most fulfilled in my work when I have been able to integrate and manage the effort of others, .798= I dream of being in charge of a whole organization, .880= I will feel successful only if I become a high level general manager in some organization, .765= Becoming a general manager is more attractive to me than becoming a senior functional manager in my area of expertise, .743= I would rather leave my organization than accept a job that would take me away from the path to general management). The five items loading on the factor were the same as Schein (1990). This factor was labeled as General Management as it was in Schein (1990).

The Second factor explained 9.438% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 3.775. The loadings ranged from 0.748 to 0.924. The composition of this factor suggests that .817= I would rather leave my organisation than to be put into a job that would compromise my ability to pursue personal and family concerns, .748= I dream of a career that will permit me to integrate my personal, family and work needs, .924= I feel successful in life only if I have been able to balance my personal, family and career requirements, .763= Balancing the demands of my personal and professional life is more important to me than a high level managerial position, .881= I have always sought out work opportunities that would minimize interference with personal or family concerns. The five items loading on the factor were the same as Schein (1990). This factor was labeled as Lifestyle as it was in Schein (1990).

The Third factor explained 8.558% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 3.423. The loadings ranged from 0.889 to 0.769. The composition of this factor suggests that .817= Security and stability are more important to me than freedom and autonomy, .884= I would not stay in an organisation that would give me assignments that would jeopardise my job security, .889= I usually seek jobs in organisations that will give me a sense of stability and security, .803= I dream of a career that will allow me to feel a sense of stability and security, .769= I am most fulfilled in my work life when I feel that I have complete financial and employment security. The five items loading on the factor were the same as Schein (1990). This factor was labeled as Security/ Stability as it was in Schein (1990).

The Fourth factor explained 8.176% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 3.270. The loadings ranged from 0.889 to 0.769. The composition of this factor suggests that .764= I am always on the lookout for ideas that would permit me to start my own enterprise, .814= Building a business of my own is more important to me than being a high-level manager someone else's organization, .867= I feel most fulfilled when I have been able to build something that is primarily the result of my own skill and effort, .834= I will feel successful in my career only if I have created an enterprise of my own based on my own ideas and skills, .679= I dream of starting up and building my own business. The five items loading on the factor were the same as Schein (1990). This factor was labeled as Entrepreneurial Creativity as it was in Schein (1990).

The fifth factor explained 7.311% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 2.924. The loadings ranged from .719 to 0.910. The composition of this factor suggests that .719= I will feel successful in my career only if I have a feeling of

having made a real contribution to the welfare of society, .856= I have felt most fulfilled in my career when I have been able to use my talents in the service of others, .910= Using my talents to make the world a better place to live and work is what drives my career decisions, .791= I dream of having a career that makes a real contribution to humanity and society, .732= I would rather leave my organisation than accept a job that would take me away from the general managerial track. The five items loading on the factor were the same as Schein (1990). This factor was labeled as Service Dedication to a cause as it was in Schein (1990).

The Sixth factor explained 5.972% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 2.389. The loadings ranged from .602 to 0.857. The composition of this factor suggests that .709= I want to be so good at what I do that others will always seek my expert advice, .767= I will feel successful in my career only if I can develop my technical or functional skills to a very high level of competence, .857= Becoming a senior functional manager in my area of expertise is more attractive to me than becoming a general manager, .705= I would rather leave my organisation than accept a rotational assignment that would take me out of my area of expertise, .602= I am most fulfilled in my work when I have been able to use my special skills and talents. The five items loading on the factor were the same as Schein (1990). This factor was labeled as Technical / Functional Competence as it was in Schein (1990).

The Seventh factor explained 5.710% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 2.389. The loadings ranged from .529 to 0.899. The composition of this factor suggests that .855= I dream of a career in which I will always have the challenge of solving ever more difficult problems, .750= I will feel successful in my career

only if I have met and overcome increasingly difficult challenges, .899= I have been most fulfilled in my career when I have been able to solve seemingly unsolvable problems or won out over seemingly impossible odds, .529= I prefer work opportunities that strongly challenge my problem solving and competitive skills, .679= Working on problems that are almost unsolvable is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position. The five items loading on the factor were the same as Schein (1990). This factor was labeled as Pure Challenge as it was in Schein (1990).

The Eighth factor explained 3.948% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 1.579. The loadings ranged from .780 to 0.879. The composition of this factor suggests that .854= I dream of having a career that will allow me the freedom to do a job my own way and on my own schedule, .879= I am most fulfilled in my work when I am completely free to define my own tasks, schedules and procedures, .780= I will feel successful in my career only if I achieve complete autonomy and freedom to define my work. Three items were loaded on this factor and were the same as Schein (1990). This factor was labeled as Autonomy as it was in Schein (1990).

The Ninth factor explained 2.823% of the variance and had an Eigen-value of 1.129. The loadings ranged from .400 to 0.675. The composition of this factor suggest that .673= The chance to do a job in my own way, free of rules and constraints, is very important to me, .675= I would rather leave my organisation than accept a job that would reduce my autonomy and freedom, .400= I prefer work opportunities that strongly challenge my problem solving and competitive skills. This factor was labeled as 'Work Independence'. The items included in the ninth factor were a subset of factor 8 i.e. Autonomy, the researcher decided to

label it as ‘Work Independence’, though the meaning of the factor ‘Autonomy’, is similar to the meaning of ‘Work Independence’.

Discussion: There is one factor which featured over and above the existing 8 Career Anchors by Edgar Schien (1970). There were nine anchors that featured in the study i.e. ‘Work Independence’. This also supports the research done by Igarria and Baroudi (1993) they adapted and revised the model to include nine anchors which was ‘geographical security’ Subject responses clearly as per the dimensions of Schein's Career Orientation Inventory These results are consistent with prior research (DeLong, 1982). Hence, General Management was the career anchor which had the highest loading, followed by Lifestyle and then Security.

4.4.4. Factor Analysis – Career Satisfaction

Testing adequacy of sample

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.778
Bartlett's Test of Approx. Chi-Square		18481.844
Sphericity	df	861
	Sig.	.000

Generally, $0 < KMO < 1$

If $KMO > 0.5$, sample is adequate.

Here KMO = .778. This indicates that the sample is adequate and one may proceed with factor analysis.

Step 2: Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

Taking a 99% Level Of Significance ($\alpha = 0.01$)

Since p-value (sig.) of 0.001 < 0.01, the factor analysis is valid

As it is high, the, inter correlations among different items are also high. This test helps in testing the overall significance of all correlations within a correlation matrix.

11 core factors can be extracted from the 42 items used in this career satisfaction .These extracted factors will explain the cumulative percentage of the total variance which was found to be 57.268% (almost two thirds) of the variability in the career decision making self efficacy.

The data shows the correlation of all original items with each of the extracted factors. Usually each item will be highly loaded on one factor and have a low loading on the other factors. To identify which items are highly loaded with each factor, the maximum value in each row is selected.

The items included in each factor are set out below and based on this the eight core factors have been named.

Naming of core factors of Career Satisfaction based on factor analysis

Factor	Items Included in the factor	Name of the Factor
1	Met my career goals, Clear career path, Career control, Satisfied with my career progress, Career Planned for next three years, Quitting as in wrong career.	Career – Goal Satisfaction
2	Mentor guides me, Role model instrumental in my career, Has helped me in my goals, Mentor takes time to learn about my goals. Discuss my career, It is important to have a mentor.	Mentor Satisfaction
3	Organisation takes interest to upgrade my skills, Contended with my benefits, has access to company sponsored programs, Happy with the position I am in. Growth opportunities are available, Satisfied with my company.	Organisation Satisfaction
4	Personal sense of accomplishment, Am contended with my pay packet, Enjoy coming to work every day, Totally stressed out at work, Am interested in my job, Cannot stand doing my job.	Self Satisfaction
5	Workload is evenly distributed ,Satisfied with my priorities ,Get along with my team ,Get good cooperation from my team , able to influence my team.	Team satisfaction
6	Satisfied with the additional training, Enough freedom in my position, Opportunity to work on projects, Sense of completion in my job. Have adequate information to do my job.	Job Satisfaction

7	Happy with the guidance, Get along with supervisor, Position to Influence my supervisor.	Superior Satisfaction
8	Supervisor identifies my strengths and weaknesses, Supervisor is happy with my performance, Happy with the guidance.	Supervisor Assistance
9	I am satisfied with the progress I have made in this company.	Job Progress Satisfaction
10	My supervisor is actively involved in my career development.	Supervisor Involvement
11	The team meetings held are fruitful and I have a role to play, my mentor takes the time to learn about my goals and aspirations.	Role and Goal Satisfaction

11 factors emerged

Table no.4.9.

Factor Analysis Conclusion

The factor analysis exercise identified that there are 11 core factors that influence career satisfaction. These are:

1. Career Goal Satisfaction
2. Mentor Satisfaction
3. Organisation Satisfaction
4. Self Satisfaction
5. Team Satisfaction
6. Job Satisfaction

7. Superior Satisfaction
8. Supervisor Assistance
9. Job Progress Satisfaction
10. Supervisor Involvement
11. Role and Goal Satisfaction

The First factor explained 11.998% of variance, with an Eigen-value 5.039. The loadings ranged from 0.433 to 0.763. The composition of this factor suggests that .696= My career goals have been met since the time I started my career, .693= I have a clear path for career advancement, .763= I have total control of my career, .433= I am satisfied with the progress I have made in this company, .699= My career has been planned for the next three years, .711= I am in a wrong career and regularly feel like quitting. Six items were loaded on the factor were the same as per the original factor developed by the researcher. This factor was labeled as Career Goal Satisfaction.

The Second factor explained 7.740 % of variance, with an Eigen-value 3.251. The loadings ranged from 0.461 to 0.779. The composition of this factor suggests that .749= I have a mentor who guides me at my work., .683= My role model has been very instrumental in helping me to decide on my career, .728= My role model / mentor has helped me in achieving my goals, .461= My mentor takes the time to learn about my goals and aspirations, .685 I have taken pains to discuss my career with couple of folks already employed in the similar field, .779= I think it is important to have a mentor at an early stage of one's career. Six items were loaded on the factor were the same as per the original factor developed by the researcher. This factor was labeled as Mentor Satisfaction.

The Third factor explained 6.919% of variance, with an Eigen-value 2.906. The loadings ranged from 0.550 to 0.771. The composition of this factor suggests that .757= My organisation takes keen interest at regular intervals to help me upgrade my skill set, .589= I am contented with the benefits that I receive out here, .665= I have the access to company-sponsored training and seminars, .550= I am very happy with the position that I am in this company, .677= There are growth opportunities for me in this organization, .771= In short, I am satisfied with my company. Six items were loaded on the factor were the same as per the original factor developed by the researcher. This factor was labeled as Organisation Satisfaction.

The Fourth factor explained 5.872 % of variance, with an Eigen-value 2.466. The loadings ranged from 0.667 to 0.765. The composition of this factor suggests that .765= I have a personal sense of accomplishment in my career working here, .715= I am contented with my pay packet out here, .673= I enjoy coming to work every day, .689= I am interested in my job, .667= I cannot stand doing my job anymore. Five items were loaded on the factor were the same as per the original factor developed by the researcher. This factor was labeled as Self Satisfaction.

The Fifth factor explained 5.096 % of variance, with an Eigen-value 2.140. The loadings ranged from 0.582 to 0.744. The composition of this factor suggests that .739=The workload is evenly distributed with my team members, .582= I am satisfied with the priorities and direction of my department, .744= I get along with almost all my team members, .697= I get good cooperation from most of my colleagues, .735= I am able to influence my team, if I have a valuable suggestions to make in a team meeting. Four items were loaded on the factor were the same as

per the original factor developed by the researcher. This factor was labeled as Team Satisfaction.

The Sixth factor explained 4.882 % of variance, with an Eigen-value 2.051. The loadings ranged from 0.597 to 0.742. The composition of this factor suggests that .714= I am satisfied with the additional training my company gives me to fulfill my current role, .624= I have enough freedom in my position to do what is right for the customer/client, .742= I get the opportunity to work on interesting projects, .597= I feel a sense of completion with my job, .677= I have adequate information available which enables me to do my job well. Five items were loaded on the factor were the same as per the original factor developed by the researcher. This factor was labeled as Job Satisfaction.

The Seventh factor explained 4.192 % of variance, with an Eigen-value 1.760. The loadings ranged from 0.597 to 0.742. The composition of this factor suggest that .598= I am happy with the guidance I receive from my superiors, .879= I get along with my supervisor, .778= I am in a position to influence my superior if I have a valuable contribution Satisfaction. Three items were loaded on the factor were the same as per the original factor developed by the researcher. This factor was labeled as Superior Satisfaction.

The Eighth factor explained for 2.859% of variance, with an Eigen-value 1.201. The loadings ranged from 0.543 to 0.847. The composition of this factor suggest that .608= My Supervisor puts in efforts to identify my strengths and weaknesses, .847= My supervisor is happy with my performance, .543= I am happy with the guidance I receive from my superiors.. Three items were loaded on the factor

were the same as per the original factor developed by the researcher. This factor was labeled as Supervisor Assistance

The Ninth factor explained for 2.689% of variance, with an Eigen-value 1.130. The loadings ranged from 0.487 to 0.583. The composition of this factor suggests that .583= I am totally stressed out at work, .487= I am satisfied with the progress I have made in this company. Three items were loaded on the factor were the same as per the original factor developed by the researcher. This factor was labeled as Job Progress Satisfaction.

The Tenth factor explained for 2.545% of variance, with an Eigen-value 1.069. The loading was on one factor .770= My supervisor is actively involved in my career development. One item was loaded on the factor. This factor was labeled as Supervisor Involvement.

The Eleventh factor explained for 2.475% of variance, with an Eigen-value 1.040. The loadings ranged from 0.490 to 0.581. The composition of this factor suggests that -.490 = My mentor takes the time to learn about my goals and aspirations, .581= The team meetings held are fruitful and I have a role to play. Two items were loaded on the factor. This factor was labeled as Role and Goal Satisfaction.

Discussion: Four factors were loaded over and above the existing ones i.e. Supervisor Assistance, Job Progress Satisfaction, Supervisor Involvement and Role and Goal Satisfaction. For an employee to feel career satisfied, the involvement of the superior was found to be crucial, the respondents also felt that the company needs to check on their progress at regular intervals, this would probably help them perform better at the work place. The respondents also felt that the kind of

role and the set targets are crucial to achieve career satisfaction. The highest loading was on Role and Goal Satisfaction.

4.5. Review of the Chapter

The chapter covered descriptive analysis and factor analysis and a discussion on the same.