

Lifestyle integration-gender based stereotypes: a study on Schein's career anchors within an ODeL HEI

Dr Marili Williams (UNISA)

Dr Sonja Grobler (UNISA)

*Prof Anton Grobler

*Unisa Graduate School of Business Leadership

Cnr Janadel and Alexandra Avenues

Midrand, 1686, Gauteng, South Africa

grobla@unisa.ac.za

011 6520299 (f)

*corresponding author

Abstract

This article is based on research that examined the differences between the aspirations of females and males in the workplace in terms of Schein's career anchors and enablers. The stereotype that females only work to ensure enhanced family lifestyles remains evident in the daily life of all (Hoobler, Lemmon & Wyane, 2014, p. 704; Mihail, 2006). Furthermore the stereotype that males' focus is much more ambitious in terms of reaching the highest managerial achievement/technical/ functional competence is regarded as a reality within society (Hoobler, Lemmon & Wyane, 2014, p. 704; Mihail, 2006). Insight into the question whether females work to live or live to work was investigated and this article reports on the differences between females and males regarding their work life ambitions. The data resulted from a quantitative research approach and the population consisted of 4 200 employees within an Open Distance electronic Learning (ODeL) Higher Education Institution (HEI) in South Africa. The focus was on the composition of a structured career conversation framework, using the original Schein career anchors (Schein, 1978; 1990; 1996) and the three-factor career-enabler model, developed by Grobler, Bezuidenhout and Rudolph (2014). Descriptive statistics, chi-square statistics as well as independent t-test analysis was used to identify the differences between genders with regard to career anchors and career enablers in different career stages.

The results of the analysis illustrated that females focus more on the *autonomy/independence-* and *lifestyle integration* career anchors than males in the first 3 years of employment, thereafter their focus remains more on the *lifestyle integration* career anchor than males. Males however focus more on the *general managerial* career anchor in the first 3 years of their careers than women; and after 3 years males' focus moves more to the *entrepreneurial creativity* career anchor. The reported differences between females and males bring forth further research questions worthwhile investigating – the difference between academic versus support female staff and the situation in other business environments.

Key words – lifestyle integration, gender, career anchors, career enablers, HEI ODeL.

INTRODUCTION

“Do females work to live or live to work?”

Even today the stereotype exists that females are more inclined to work to enhance their family lifestyle; therefore

prioritising the *lifestyle integration* as a career anchor and that males on the other hand aspire to reach optimal *managerial competence* as soon as possible (Hoobler, Lemmon & Wyane, 2014, p. 704; Mihail, 2006; Michailidis, Morphitou & Theophylatou, 2012, p. 4244).

Lately females are given more opportunities to become educated and to pursue high stake careers; however most females need to make adjustments to be able to manage dual or even multiple roles (Wattis & James, 2013, p. 268-269; Michailidis, Morphitou & Theophylatou, 2012, p. 4231). In recent years more females managed to move away from traditional female occupations to traditional male dominated professions such as managers, engineers, lawyers, academia (Kumra, 2012, p. 231; Michailidis, Morphitou & Theophylatou, 2012, p. 4231).

Research has shown that females aspire to reach managerial/technical- and/or functional competence however they never lose sight of the monetary value they are contributing to their respective households, thereby improving/sustaining the lifestyle conditions of their families, as it remains a priority for them (Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2011, p. 339; Rafnsdóttir & Heijstra, 2013, p. 287; Durante, Griskevicius, Simpson, Cantu & Tybur, 2012, p. 122). Literature elaborates on the reasons why females enter the labour market (ILO Report, 2010, p. 4), but does not indicate whether they want to excel on different levels (especially in terms of Schein's career anchors); therefore this article aims to address this gap, specifically within the context of an ODeL HEI in South Africa.

Gender differences regarding staff member's ambitions, career anchors and career enablers, within an ODeL HEI environment, have not yet been documented. Bezuidenhout, Rudolph and Grobler (2013) conducted a study within an ODeL HEI focussing on the development of a structured career conversation framework based on Schein's eight career anchors, followed by the development of a three-factor career-enabler framework (Grobler, Bezuidenhout & Rudolph, 2014). These studies reported on the different ambitions of staff in terms of their workplace aspirations without addressing demographic differences (Bezuidenhout, Rudolph & Grobler, 2013, p. 4; Grobler, Bezuidenhout & Rudolph, 2014, p. 25). This article will indicate the differences between genders with regard

to Schein's career anchors as well as career enablers within an ODeL HEI environment.

Determining and documenting gender differences based on Schein's career anchors will have a significant influence on the workplace practises in terms of gender sensitive and gender specific career development interventions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Career anchors

The manifestation and specific configuration of career anchors within the workplace influences management in general. It informs psychologists, occupational social workers, HR practitioners and managers in the process of managing different career stages and different demographic groups.

Career anchors as a concept can be approached from different perspectives. According to Du Toit and Coetzee (2012, p. 2) the career anchor theory provides a model that considers the complexity of career development. Kilimnik, De Oliveira, Sant'anna and Barros (2011, p. 148) suggests that career anchors serve to guide, stabilise and integrate a person's career whilst Peterson and Roger (2012, p. 2) are of the opinion that the alignment of career anchors with a person's work will portray their career success. Therefore, career anchors are a central element of an individual's internal sense of work life (Bezuidenhout, Rudolph & Grobler, 2013, p. 8).

Taking the above into consideration the premise of this article is based on Edgar Schein's career anchor model (1978; 1990; 1996) which identified eight career anchors that guide employees' when they make career choices: (1) *security, stability or organisational identity*; (2) *autonomy and independence*; (3) *creativity and entrepreneurship*; (4) *technical/functional competence*; (5) *managerial competence*; (6) *sense of service or dedication to a cause*; (7) *pure challenge*; and (8) *life-style integration* (Schein, 1978; 1990; 1996).

The following table provide a short description of each career anchor.

Table 1: Career anchors

Career anchor	Description
1. <i>Security, stability or organisational identity</i>	The need for job security (associated with benefit packages and long-term employment) in an organisation and stability in a geographical area.
2. <i>Autonomy and independence</i>	A person's need to be free of organisational constraints in order to pursue professional competence.
3. <i>Entrepreneurship and creativity</i>	The need to create or build (rather than manage) something that is entirely one's own project.
4. <i>Technical-/functional competence</i>	The motivation to develop one's technical or functional knowledge and expert skill.
5. <i>Managerial competence</i>	The desire to attain a position that requires the application of interpersonal, political, analytical and financial skills associated with management.
6. <i>Sense of service or dedication to a cause</i>	The need to align work activities with personal skills and values related to helping society and to improve the world in some fashion.
7. <i>Pure challenge</i>	The need to test one's abilities by single-mindedly focusing on competing with extremely tough opponents and solving a variety of challenging problems.
8. <i>Life style integration</i>	The need to integrate work, family, and self-concerns into a coherent lifestyle.

Schein (1978; 1990; 1996).

Career enablers

Career enablers, as developed by Bezuidenhout, Rudolph & Grobler (2014) are defined as practical actions by the individual/organisation to ensure that the preferred career anchor(s) are achieved. This definition also complements the stance of Ferreira and Coetzee (2010, p.

25) where they define it as "people's transferable skills (e.g. their practical or creative skills and self-management and relationship skills) that help them to succeed in their careers". The following table clarifies the different career enablers complementing the career anchors.

Table 2: Career enablers

Career enabler	Description
<i>Self-transcendence through technical self-affirmation</i>	The desire to improve or better oneself to go beyond one's current personal technical limitations. This can be achieved by participating in specialised projects, attending specialised training or conferences, remaining in specialised areas of work, etc.
<i>Self-enhancement through stretched goals</i>	Maintaining and enhancing one's self-esteem through setting personal challenging goals and objectives (stretched goals and objectives). This can be achieved through the attendance of relevant leadership development programmes and conferences (preparation for future roles), empowerment of oneself by performing a variety of tasks that do not form part of their current situation, and exposing oneself to stimulating challenges.
<i>Self-conservation through work motives and values</i>	Refers to work motives and needs (that encourage people to structure their work according to their basic personal desires and their personal lives) and comprise security, conformity and tradition. This can be achieved through adjustments to the job (job enlargement/enrichment, managing and monitoring own performance in terms of projects and by objectives) to ensure a better person-job fit; and, secondly, establishing a better work-life balance (flexible working arrangements, emphasis on lifestyle rather than career, and limited disruptions and uncertainty).

Bezuidenhout, Rudolph and Grobler (2014).

Gender and the workplace

The conventional belief that one partner is the breadwinner and the other the

caregiver has blurred over the years (Van der Boon, 2003, p. 132; Bezzina, Azzopadi & Vella, 2013, p. 3). Many people are

combining work and family roles (Van Veldhoven & Beijer, 2012, p. 665) and it is further argued by Chugh & Sahgal (2007, p. 353) that “the breakdown of traditional barriers, those between work and home, public and private, females and males, and employer and employee, which define organizational life, have considerable impact on females’ careers”. Females, who chose to be educated and pursue a career, had to learn how to balance and manage the two roles (or even more roles) that society awards them - roles of partner/mother/carer versus roles of staff member/supervisor/manager (Wattis & James, 2013, p. 265).

It is also evident that most females who opt for pursuing a career, re-directed their attention to pursue more male-dominated areas such as managers, engineers, lawyers, academia, but this move has its challenges as increased time and dedication leads to making it ever more difficult to maintain a balance between a demanding job and lifestyle integration (Michailidis, Morphitou, & Theophylatou, 2012, p. 4231; Kumra, 2012, p. 231; Durante, Griskevicius, Simpson, Cantu & Tybur, 2012, p. 122).

It is expressed by Kumra (2010, p. 230) and Wattis & James (2013, p. 265) that females tend to experience concerns when faced with balancing work, family and outside activities, although they are equally committed to their careers, they are often inundated with conflicting messages about how to manage/balance their careers and personal lives (Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2011, p. 339). It is still a reality that females and males spend their time differently due to the still existing gender division of work and family life (Rafnsdóttir & Heijstra, 2013, p. 283). Men still fill the highest paid jobs in Western society (Durante, Griskevicius, Simpson, Cantu & Tybur, 2012, p. 122) as their gendered societal role warrants them to dedicate most of their time, energy and effort towards upward career mobility. Research conducted on the reasons why females opted to stay in the workforce (Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2011, p. 339) referred to the fact that their income

ensured extra finances for education costs, family vacations and other expenses. However, the females interviewed also frequently mentioned that they work due to more fundamental reasons such as having a sense of self-identity, accomplishment, intellectual stimulation and the challenge that came with their positions (Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2011, p. 339).

Research conducted by Rajesh and Kalpana (2012, p. 42-50) concluded that addressing personal and family complexities (which can be related to self-management skills and relationship skills) significantly and positively improve a female’s career participation, longevity and growth. Addressing the flexibility of working hours (creative skills) is also prominent in enhancing female participation and upward mobility in the workplace (Maxwell, 2009, p. 561).

According to Shapiro, Ingols & Blake-Beard (2009, p. 310) and Hoobler, Lemmon & Wyane (2014, p. 704) females are inclined to decide at a certain stage in their work life to step away from the conventional workplace and its standards, to pursue alternative ways to balance the multiple roles they have to fulfil without compromising the quality lifestyle they want to maintain with their families. However, more than fifty percent employed females reported a desire to ascend to the executive level and many empirical studies have found that females and males have similar career aspirations (Chugh & Sahgal, 2007, p. 358; Hoobler, Lemmon & Wayne, 2014, p. 704).

Gender aspirations in higher education

It is clear that worklife issues such as childcare, eldercare, housework and external activities consumes the time of female academic staff. The lack of clear boundaries in academic lives between work and family have often been detrimental and pervasive to the progress intended to be made by females (Misra, Lundquist & Templer, 2012, p. 301-302).

Females in academia, who opted for a lifestyle where work and family coexist,

acknowledge the challenges of upward academic mobility associated with personal and family responsibilities (Suárez-Ortega & Riskey, 2014, p. 88). It tends to be difficult for them to ensure compatibility of work and family demands and personal roles, particularly during critical moments in their academic careers. Their academic career requires intensified research outputs as well as other important key responsibilities linked to their position (Suárez-Ortega & Riskey, 2014, p. 88; Misra, Lundquist & Templer, 2012, p. 301-302). These work demands often require augmented negotiation with family, effective time management, effort and travelling (Folbre & Nelson, 2000, p. 128).

Females holding high-ranking positions in academia, enjoying full recognition for their scientific achievements, probably paid a high price for their success (Editorial, 2009, p. 99). The combination of role division challenges, work demands, time management and self-confidence issues, to name but a few, negatively influences the opportunities and choices made by females during the upward mobility in academia (Editorial, 2009, p. 99). The career progress made by males still seems to be less complicated and faster, as it is more acceptable for them that work related activities overlaps between “the workplace and the home, between weekdays and weeknights, and between the working week and weekends, holidays, and vacations” (Drago & Colbeck, 2003, p.3). It is often easier for males to dedicate their time and effort towards work demands as the gendered role of females is still overwhelmingly focussed on the *lifestyle integration* role within the family environment (Misra, Lundquist & Templer, 2012, p. 302).

In light of the research discussed the question remains: “Do females work to live or live to work?” In terms of this study this question becomes part of a bigger research question focussing on the gender

differences in career anchors and enablers. In the next section the research process and results of the study on the differences in the career aspirations of females and males within an ODeL HEI will be discussed.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Research goal and questions

The goal of this study was to determine and analyse whether differences exist in the choice of career anchors and enablers within an ODeL HEI between males and females.

The research questions for this study are as follows:

- Is lifestyle integration as a career anchor more important to females than males?
- Are males significantly more inclined to have managerial/technical/functional competence as a career anchor than females?
- Do the male and female groups differ in terms of the career enablers?

Research approach

A quantitative survey research approach was applied to achieve the research objectives (Creswell, 2003, p. 14; Shaughnessy, Zechmeister & Zechmeister, 2008).

Population

The total staff complement of an ODeL HEI was the target population for this study. The staff were from different departments within the professional support as well as academic environment ($N=4\ 200$).

Purposive total population sampling was implemented with a sample of 1 392 interviews/career conversations being recorded on the HEI's electronic system – therefore a response rate of 33%.

Table 3: Race and gender distribution

		Race					
		Indian	African	Coloured	White	Total	
Gender	Male	Count	22	395	28	188	633
		% within Gender	3.5%	62.4%	4.4%	29.7%	100.0%
	% within Race	44.9%	52.9%	50.9%	34.7%	45.5%	
	Female	Count	27	351	27	354	759
		% within Gender	3.6%	46.2%	3.6%	46.6%	100.0%
	% within Race	55.1%	47.1%	49.1%	65.3%	54.5%	
Total	Count	49	746	55	542	1392	
	% within Gender	3.5%	53.6%	4.0%	38.9%	100.0%	
	% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

All race groups were represented with 53.6% African, 38.9% White, 4% Coloured and 3.5% Indian respondents. The sample

consisted of 54.5% female and 45.5% male respondents respectively.

Table 4: Age gender distribution

		Age						
		18–20 yrs	21–25 yrs	26–35 yrs	36–55 yrs	56–65 yrs	Total	
Gender	Male	Count	22	143	304	145	19	633
		% within Gender	3.5%	22.6%	48.0%	22.9%	3.0%	100.0%
	% within Age	44.0%	45.7%	47.3%	44.2%	32.8%	45.5%	
	Female	Count	28	170	339	183	39	759
		% within Gender	3.7%	22.4%	44.7%	24.1%	5.1%	100.0%
	% within Age	56.0%	54.3%	52.7%	55.8%	67.2%	54.5%	
Total	Count	50	313	643	328	58	1392	
	% within Gender	3.6%	22.5%	46.2%	23.6%	4.2%	100.0%	
	% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

The age group that are the best represented was the 26 to 35 years (46.2%).

Table 5: Category gender distribution

		Category			
		Professional and Support	Academic	Total	
Gender	Male	Count	483	150	633
		% within Gender	76.3%	23.7%	100.0%
	% within Category	43.6%	53.0%	45.5%	
	Female	Count	626	133	759
		% within Gender	82.5%	17.5%	100.0%
	% within Category	56.4%	47.0%	54.5%	
Total	Count	1109	283	1392	
	% within Gender	79.7%	20.3%	100.0%	
	% within Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

A significantly higher response rate (79.7%) was noted from the professional and support categories of the HEI, whilst 20.3% participants from the academic group participated in this study.

Measuring instruments

An instrument developed by Bezuidenhout, Rudolph and Grobler

(2013) were utilised for data collection by means of structured interviews (career conversations) with employees. Each line manager utilised a standard career planning conversation framework which comprised of the following:

- section one focused on the employee's current goals (to determine whether the individual would like to make a vertical or horizontal career move),
- section two included a "career preference" (based on Schein's career anchors). Line managers had to record the three top preferences expressed by each employee. The participants were requested to indicate their preferred career anchor (with a score allocated of 3), followed by the second option and third option, with an allocation of numeric values of 2 and 1 respectively (Bezuidenhout, Rudolph & Grobler, 2013).
- section three focused on the role of the line manager and included a "career preference" table, with "possible actions" and "agreed actions" captured in separate columns.

The career enabler model, as developed by Grobler, Bezuidenhout and Rudolph (2014) consist of three factors (*Self-transcendance*, *Self-enhancement* and *Self-conservation*) with the Cronbach alpha ranging from 0.84 to 0.91 reported on each of the constructs measured (Bezuidenhout, Rudolph & Grobler, 2013; Grobler, Bezuidenhout & Rudolph, 2014), which is acceptable according to De Vos, Strydom, Fouché and Delpont (2011, p. 177) and Tavakol and Dennick (2011, p. 54). A maximum score of 1 could be recorded, as the total factor score is divided by the number of items (6, 11 and 11 items for the three factors respectively).

The rationale behind the development of a career enabler model was not only to differentiate between the eight career anchors, but also to have a simple model with only three elements or factors to identify interventions or enablers that enhance the career anchors. These were categorised into three factors, which makes it easier for the human resource professionals to develop interventions and to formulate policy formulation. This also assists the line managers to manage individual career interventions (Grobler, Bezuidenhout & Rudolph, 2014).

Organisations should consider different ways to maintain support systems for females in the form of child care, job-sharing opportunities, part-time work, sabbaticals and other adaptive modifications of the traditional nine-to-five job (Grobler, Bezuidenhout & Rudolph, 2014).

Research procedure

Participation formed part of the ODeL HEI's performance management process. The line managers explained the objectives to the participants. The results were captured and consolidated with an electronic system, administered by the organisation's development directorate via personalised e-mail messages to all line managers. The line managers were requested to use a career conversation framework (structured interviews with clear guidelines) and to record and capture the responses on the electronic system. Confidentiality and anonymity was assured by not identifying individuals with captured results on the electronic system.

The demographic variables included in the instrument were age, race, gender, language and highest qualification as well as an indication of whether the respondent is currently studying, and the environment in which they work, *i.e.* academic or professional and support.

Statistical analysis

The statistical analysis was carried out by means of SPSS (version 22). Descriptive statistics include frequencies (the representation of the demographic groups), mean score and standard deviation of scores obtained by the respective gender groups.

RESULTS

The chi-square test was conducted to determine the differences between short term career aspirations (1 to 3 year) and long term (4 to 10 years) for female and male respondents. The participants had two options: (i) to stay in the same position with job enrichment or (ii) to be promoted to a higher position.

Table 6: Gender and career aspirations (options) – short term (1-3 years)

Career option		Gender		
		Male	Female	Total
Higher position - promotion	Count	354	376	730
	Expected Count	336	394	730
	%	48.5%	51.5%	100.0%
Same position with job enrichment	Count	249	331	580
	Expected Count	267	313	580
	%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	603	707	1310
	Expected Count	603	707	1310
	%	46.0%	54.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.03	1	.05		
Continuity Correction	3.80	1	.05		
Likelihood Ratio	4.03	1	.05		
Fisher's Exact Test				.05	.03
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.02	1	.05		
N of Valid Cases	1310				

Significantly more males (354) indicated that they aspire to be promoted to a higher position than what was expected (336) and significantly fewer females (376) indicated

that they aspire to be promoted to a higher position than what was expected (394) in the short term (1-3 years) (Pearson chi-square value of 0.05).

Table 7: Gender and career aspirations (options) - long term (4-10 years)

Career option		Gender		
		Male	Female	Total
Higher position - promotion	Count	455	503	958
	Expected Count	451	507	958
	%	47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
Same position with job enrichment	Count	100	122	222
	Expected Count	104	118	222
	%	45.0%	55.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	555	625	1180
	Expected Count	555	625	1180
	%	47.0%	53.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.43	1	.51		
Continuity Correction	.34	1	.56		
Likelihood Ratio	.44	1	.51		
Fisher's Exact Test				.55	.28
Linear-by-Linear Association	.43	1	.51		
N of Valid Cases	1180				

A non-significant Pearson chi-square value (0.51) was reported which is an indication that there is no difference between the males and females in terms of their aspirations to be promoted to a higher position in the long term (4–10 years).

Mean scores, standard deviation and standard error mean scores, as well as the

results of the t-tests are reported in Tables 8 and 9. The rationale of this analysis was to determine differences between the male and female group using the mean scores obtained on each of the career anchors (as indicated in the short term (1-3 years)). The means scores obtained by the groups on the career anchor constructs are out of

a maximum of 3, as discussed under the section on the measurement instrument.

Table 8: Gender mean scores on the career anchors (short term, 1-3 years)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TF	Male	633	1.57	1.37	.05
	Female	759	1.63	1.37	.05
GM	Male	633	1.24	1.29	.05
	Female	759	.89	1.2	.04
AU	Male	633	.49	.91	.04
	Female	759	.60	.98	.04
SE	Male	633	.53	.96	.04
	Female	759	.53	.93	.03
EC	Male	633	.31	.70	.03
	Female	759	.28	.72	.03
SV	Male	633	.57	.94	.04
	Female	759	.54	.93	.03
PC	Male	633	.38	.78	.03
	Female	759	.41	.80	.03
LS	Male	633	.17	.54	.02
	Female	759	.30	.70	.03

With: TF = technical/functional; GM = general managerial; AU = autonomy/ independence; SE = security/stability; EC = entrepreneurial creativity; SV = sense of service/dedication to a cause; PC = pure challenge; and LS = lifestyle

The highest mean scores were reported for the *technical and functional* career anchor (with 1.57 and 1.63 for males and females respectively), followed by the

general managerial career anchor. A mean score of 1.24 was reported for males and .89 for females for the *general managerial* career anchor.

Table 9: Significant t-tests results – comparison of gender mean scores on the career anchors (short term, 1 – 3 years)

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
GM	Equal variances assumed	17.50	.001	5.12	1390	.00	.35	.07	.21	.48
	Equal variances not assumed			5.10	1317.68	.00	.35	.07	.21	.48
AU	Equal variances assumed	11.34	.001	-2.05	1390	.04	-.10	.05	-.20	-.004
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.06	1374.85	.04	-.10	.05	-.20	-.005
LS	Equal variances assumed	54.30	.001	-3.93	1390	.000	-.13	.03	-.20	-.07
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.02	1381.79	.000	-.13	.03	-.20	-.07

With: GM = general managerial; AU = autonomy/ independence and LS = lifestyle

A statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in mean scores (.35) between males (1.24) and females (.89) on the *general managerial* career anchor was reported. However significantly higher mean scores were obtained by females on the *autonomy/ independence* career anchor (mean score difference = .10) and *lifestyle integration* (mean score difference = .13).

The results of the analysis on the differences between the female and male respondents on the career anchors in the long term (4-10 years) are reported in Tables 10 and 11. The maximum for each of the career anchors are 3, as discussed in the section on the measurement instrument.

Table 10: Mean scores of the gender groups on the career anchors (long term, 4- 10 years)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TF	Male	633	.84	1.23	.05
	Female	759	.81	1.23	.04
GM	Male	633	1.19	1.35	.05
	Female	759	1.03	1.34	.05
AU	Male	633	.52	.96	.04
	Female	759	.56	.98	.04
SE	Male	633	.65	1.06	.04
	Female	759	.67	1.03	.04
EC	Male	633	.46	.93	.04
	Female	759	.38	.85	.03
SV	Male	633	.45	.84	.03
	Female	759	.44	.87	.03
PC	Male	633	.39	.82	.03
	Female	759	.39	.81	.03
LS	Male	633	.33	.71	.03
	Female	759	.40	.78	.03

With: TF = technical/functional; GM = general managerial; AU = autonomy/ independence; SE = security/stability; EC = entrepreneurial creativity; SV = sense of service/dedication to a cause; PC = pure challenge; and LS = lifestyle

The highest mean scores were reported for the *general managerial* career anchor (with 1.19 and 1.03 for males and females respectively), followed by the *technical/functional* career anchor. A mean score of .84 was reported for males and .81 for females for the *technical/functional* career anchor.

Further independent t-tests were performed to determine the differences between the mean scores on the Schein career anchors between females and males in the long term (4 – 10 years). The significant results are reported in Table 11.

Table 11: Significant t-tests results – comparison of mean scores of the gender groups on the career anchors (long term, 4- 10 years)

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
EC	Equal variances assumed	9.70	.002	1.70	1390	.09	.08	.05	-.01	.17
	Equal variances not assumed			1.69	1301.48	.09	.08	.05	-.01	.18

LS	Equal variances assumed	9.51	.002	-1.73	1390	.08	-.07	.04	-.15	.01
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.75	1379.73	.08	-.07	.04	-.15	.01

With: EC = entrepreneurial creativity and LS = lifestyle

Significantly ($p < .05$) higher mean scores were obtained by males (.46) on the *entrepreneurial creativity* career anchor than females (.38). However, significantly higher mean scores were obtained by females (.40) compared to male respondents (.33) on the *lifestyle integration* career anchor.

The differences between the gender groups and the career enablers were also analysed, and are reported in Tables 12 and 13. The mean scores obtained by the groups on the career enabler constructs have a maximum value of 1, as discussed under the section on the measurement instrument.

Table 12: Mean scores of the gender groups on the career enablers

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Self-transcendence	Male	633	.72	.32	.02
	Female	759	.68	.34	.01
Self-enhancement	Male	633	.67	.33	.01
	Female	759	.58	.36	.01
Self-conservation	Male	633	.66	.33	.01
	Female	758	.65	.32	.01

The highest mean scores were reported on the *self-transcendence* career enabler (.72) followed by *self-enhancement* and

self-conservation career enablers with .67 and .66 respectively for males.

Table 13: Significant t-tests results – comparison of mean scores of the gender groups on the career enablers

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Self-transcendence	Equal variances assumed	6.24	.01	2.19	1390	.029	.039	.018	.004	.07
	Equal variances not assumed			2.20	1371.57	.028	.039	.018	.004	.07
Self-enhancement	Equal variances assumed	10.98	.01	4.70	1390	.000	.087	.019	.05	.12
	Equal variances not assumed			4.73	1375.55	.000	.087	.018	.05	.12

Significantly higher mean scores were reported for males on the *self-transcendence* career enabler than females, with $p < .05$. This was also the

case for the *self-enhancement* career enabler where males obtained a mean score of .67 and females .58 ($p < .05$).

DISCUSSION

This research project aimed to explore, determine and document the gender differences between employees' career anchors and enablers with specific reference to *lifestyle integration*. Literature indicated that a stereotype exists regarding female's reasons to work, apparently they work to live (financial reasons), while males work to reach the highest managerial level (Hoobler, Lemmon & Wyane, 2014, p. 704; Michailidis, Morphitou & Theophylatou, 2012, p. 4244; Mihail, 2006).

This research yielded that there are differences between females and males with regard to their career anchor/-enabler aspirations within an ODeL HEI environment.

The present study investigated whether females and males differ in terms of Schein's career anchors regarding their work life aspirations. Males indicated that they aspire to be promoted to a higher position much more than females in the short term (1-3 years), however there was no significant difference between the males and females in terms of their aspirations to be promoted to a higher position in the long term (4–10 years).

Overall the data indicated significant differences between *managerial competence*, *autonomy* and *lifestyle integration* career anchors and *self-transcendence* and *self-enhancement* career enablers. Within the first 3 years of employment in an ODeL HEI environment, significant differences were reported between females and males for *managerial competence*, *autonomy/independence* and *lifestyle integration*. In the long term (4-10 years) only *entrepreneurial creativity* and *lifestyle integration* indicated significant differences between females and males.

The reported results indicated that males have a higher desire to attain a position that requires the application skills associated with management (*managerial competence*) from the beginning of their

career than females. In the short term females' focus are more on being free of organisational constraints (*autonomy/independence*) and they have a higher need to integrate their work and family into a coherent lifestyle (*lifestyle integration*) than males.

Furthermore the results indicated that males have a higher need to create or build (rather than manage) something that is entirely their own project (*entrepreneurial creativity*) in contrast with females that still had a higher need to integrate their work and family into a coherent lifestyle than males after a longer term of employment (4-10 years).

In terms the significant differences in the career enablers, males succeed in their careers due to the technical and specialised affirmation of their skills and their ability to be motivated through the acquirement of wealth, authority, social power and recognition as an indication of their success and influence (*self-transcendence*), rather than females.

Males also maintain and enhance their self-esteem more through setting personal challenging goals and objectives (*self-enhancement*) than females.

The results confirm the stereotype that females are more inclined to work to enhance their family lifestyle; therefore prioritising *lifestyle integration* as a career anchor and that male respondents on the other hand aspire to reach optimal *managerial competence* as soon as possible (Hoobler, Lemmon & Wyane, 2014, p. 704).

The results further indicate that more than 50% females (53.18%) within the ODeL HEI aspire to be promoted in the short term (1-3 years) as was predicted in previous research (Chugh & Sahgal, 2007, p. 358; Hoobler, Lemmon & Wayne, 2014, p. 704).

It is interesting to observe that the *lifestyle integration* career anchor remains a priority for females throughout their career.

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions and implications

Lifestyle integration is a more important career anchor for females (compared to males) and they will aspire to remain in the same position with some work enrichment as long as they have the freedom to pursue their professional competence free from organisational constraints. Females, more than males, define their career as part of a larger “life system” and they may be impatient with the restrictions of organisations and may be looking for ways to break out.

Males are more inclined to improve or better themselves to go beyond their current personal technical limitations compared to females. *Self-transcendence* is solely focussed on the declaration of the individual that advanced technical knowledge and skills are of the utmost importance in terms of their career (advanced in this sense means superior, sophisticated and complex).

In terms of the *self-enhancement* career enabler the results indicated that males maintain and enhance their self-esteem (more compared to females) through setting personal challenging goals and objectives.

The findings of this study have significant influence on HEIs in practising and implementing sound, gender friendly career anchor and career enabler frameworks, free of stereotyping.

Recommendations

The research should be extended to differentiate between support- and academic staff within a HEI as well as other business environments to make a comprehensive scientific contribution towards eradicating gender stereotyping. Females have a need to integrate their family life with their work life throughout their career and therefore research with regard to the acknowledgement of this

career anchor needs to be established and accommodated.

Determining and documenting gender differences based on Schein’s career anchors will have a significant influence on the workplace practises in terms of gender sensitive and gender specific career development interventions.

References

Bezuidenhout, M. Grobler, A. & Rudolph, E. (2013). Development and institutionalisation of a career conversation framework based on Schein’s Career Anchors Model. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*. Vol. 11, No. 1.

Bezzina, F., Azzopardi, R.M. & Vella, G. (2013). Understanding and assessing the work motivations of employed females: insights into increasing female participation rates in the Maltese labor market. *SAGE Open* July-September 2013, pp. 1-14.

Chugh, S. & Sahgal, P. (2007). Why do few females advance to leadership positions? *Global Business Review* 2007 8:351, pp. 351-365.

Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Calif. Sage.

De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B. & Delpont, C.S.L. (2011). *Research at grass roots*. 4th edition. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Drago, R. & Colbeck, C. 2003. “The Mapping Project: Exploring the Terrain of U.S. Colleges and Universities for Faculty and Families.” Final Report to the Sloan Foundation. Retrieved June 2014 (<http://lser.la.psu.edu/workfam/mappingproject.htm>).

Du Toit, D. & Coetzee, M. (2012). Archetypal values of science and engineering staff in relation to their career

orientations. South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 38(1), 15 pages. doi:10.4102/sajip.v38i1.95.

Durante, K. M., Griskevicius, V., Simpson, J.A. & Cantú, S.M. (2012). Sex ratio and females' career choice: Does a scarcity of males lead Females to choose briefcase over baby? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 103, No. 1, pp. 121-134.

Editorial. (2010). Gender stereotypes prevent women from attaining full recognition of their research careers. Nature immunology, Vol. 11, No. 2, February 2009, p. 99.

Ferreira, N. & Coetzee, M. (2010). Psychological career resources and organisational commitment: exploring sociodemographic differences. South African Journal of Labour Relations: Vol. 34, No. 2, 2010, pp. 25-41.

Folbre, N. & Nelson, J.A. For love or money - or both? (2000). The Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Autumn, 2000), pp. 123-140.

Grant-Vallone, E.J. & Ensher, E.A. (2011). Opting In Between: strategies used by professional females with children to balance work and family. Journal of Career Development 38(4), pp. 331-348.

Grobler, A. Bezuidenhout, M. & Rudolph, E. (2014). Development and institutionalisation of a career enabler model for shaping career development systems within an ODeL environment. Journal of Management Psychology, Vol. 24 (3).

Hoobler, J.M., Lemmon, G. & Wayne, S.J. (2014). Females' managerial aspirations: an organizational development perspective. Journal of Management. 2014, 40: originally published online 2 December 2011, pp. 703-730.

International labour organization (ILO). (2010). Women in labour markets: measuring progress and identifying challenges. Geneva: ILO Publications.

Kilimnik, Z.M., De Oliveira, L.C.V., Sant'anna, A.D. & Barros, D.T.R. (2011). Career paths, images and anchors: a study with Brazilian professionals. The Qualitative Report, 16 (1), pp.147-161.

Kumra, S. (2010). Exploring career "choices" of work-centred females in a professional service firm. Gender in Management: An International Journal, Vol. 25 Iss: 3, pp. 227-243.

Maxwell, G.A., Ogden, S.M. & McTavish, D. 2007. Enabling the career development of female managers in finance and retail. Women in Management Review Vol. 22 No. 5, 2007, pp. 353-370.

Michailidis, M.P., Morphetoub, R.N. & Theophylatou, I. (2012). Females at work equality versus inequality: barriers for advancing. The International Journal of Human Resource Management Vol. 23, No. 20, November 2012, pp. 4231-4245.

Mihail, D. (2006). Gender-Based stereotypes in the workplace: the case of Greece. Equal Opportunities International, 25, 5, pp. 373-388, <http://proquest.umi.com> (accessed June 2014).

Misra, J., Lundquist, J.H. & Templer, A. (2012). Gender, work time, and care responsibilities among faculty. Sociological Forum, Vol. 27, No. 2, June 2012, pp. 300-323.

Peterson, J. & Roger, A. (2009). Career anchor profiles: an exploratory study of business school participants in France. Colloque international sur les indicateurs d'évaluation de la responsabilité sociale et environnementale des entreprises (pp. 1-13). France: Lyon, Université Jean Moulin Lyon 3.

Rafnsdóttir, G. & Heijstra, T.M. (2013). Balancing work-family life in academia: the power of time. Gender, work and organization. Vol. 20, No. 3, May 2013, pp. 283-296.

Rajesh, S. & Kalpana, B. (2012). Impact of career enablers and flexible working methods on workforce participation of women: an empirical study using path model. *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 3, Issue 3, September-December 2012, pp. 42-50.

Schein, E.H. (1978). Individual Careers. In J. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behaviour*, pp. 155-171, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Schein, E.H. (1990). *Career anchors: discovering your real values*. San Diego: Pfeiffer & Company.

Schein, E.H. (1996). Career anchors revisited: implications for career development in the 21st century, *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 80-88.

Schollosser, L.A. & Simonson, M. (2009). *Distance Education: definition and glossary of terms (3rd edn)*. United States of America: IAP-Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Shapiro, M., Ingols, C. & and Blake-Beard, S. (2008). Confronting career double binds: Implications for women, organizations, and career practitioners. *Journal of Career Development* 2008 34, pp. 309-333.

Shaughnessy, J.J., Zechmeister, E.B. & Zechmeister, J.S. (2008). *Research methods in Psychology (8th ed)*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education: Pennsylvania State University.

Suárez-Ortega, M. & Riquez, A. (2012). The impact of mobility on education. *Academic Mobility. International Perspectives on Higher Education Research*. Vol. 11, pp. 79-94.

Tavakol, M. & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, pp. 53-55.

Van der Boon, M. 2003. Women in International Management. *Women in Management Review*, 18 (3). pp. 132-146.

Van Veldhoven, M.J.P.M. & Beijer, S.E. (2012). Workload, work-to-family conflict, and health: gender differences and the influence of private life context. *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 68, No. 4, pp. 665-683.

Wattis, L. & James, L. (2013). Exploring order and disorder: Females' experiences balancing work and care. *European Journal of Females's Studies* 20(3), pp. 264-278.