



T.C. YEDITEPE UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

MASTER'S PROGRAM IN GUIDANCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL COUNSELING

**EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMPLOYEES' CAREER
SATISFACTION, SELF EFFICACY LEVELS AND CAREER ANCHORS**

AŞKIN KUTLU

SUPERVISOR: Asst. Prof. Berke KIRIKKANAT

İSTANBUL,2021



**YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES DIRECTORATE**

THESIS SUBMISSION and APPROVAL FORM

TITLE: Examining the Relationship Between Employees' Career Satisfaction, Self Efficacy Levels and Career Anchors

APPROVAL:

Asst. Prof. Berke KIRIKKANAT
(Advisor)

(Signature)

Asst.Prof.Adem Semai TUZCUOĞLU
(Member)

(Signature)

Assoc.Prof. Yelkin Diker COŞKUN
(Member)

(Signature)

SUBMITTED BY : Aşkın Kutlu
DATE OF THESIS DEFENSE : 02.07.2021
DATE OF THESIS APPROVAL : 04.08.2021

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all materials and results that are not original to this work.

Name – Last Name: Aşkın Kutlu

Signature:

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my esteemed thesis advisor, Asst. Prof. Berke Kırıkkanat, who shared her knowledge and experience with me with great compassion not only during the thesis writing process, but also at every moment of my academic and professional adventure. She helped me with all her energy in solving the problems I was experiencing, and made it possible for me to expand my world of thought.

Second, I would like to thank my teachers who took part in my thesis jury.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to all the participants who contributed to my research.

I am grateful to my fiancé Batuhan Şar; who always makes me feel valued, makes life meaningful with his love and support, and gives me moral support when I am unhappy, for all his help.

Gözde Cengiz, my lifelong friend who motivates me, supports me with her ideas and touches my heart... I'm so glad to have her.

I cannot pass without thanking my colleagues Aylin Yırtıcı, Burcu Dok and Simay Vapurlu. I felt their support and positive energies since i met them.

Lastly, I dedicate this thesis to my mother and father, who are the gifts of life to me, who always hold my hands. I felt their endless support and love throughout this process, as always happens...

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to examine whether there is a significant relationship between career satisfaction, self-efficacy levels and career anchors of employees. Exploratory relational correlational research model was used to examine the relationship between study variables and the relationship between each variable and demographic variables. The sample of the study consisted of 306 people working in an automotive company operating in Bursa. Personal Information Form, Career Satisfaction Scale, General Self-Efficacy Scale and Career Anchors Scale were applied to the participants. In order to answer the research questions, one-way ANOVA, independent sample t-test, Kruskal Wallis test, Tukey HSD and Pearson correlation analyzes were performed with SPSS 25.0 program.

The results showed low positive and significant relationships between self-efficacy and career satisfaction, and between self-efficacy and career anchors. It was observed that the relationship between career satisfaction and career anchors was weakly positive, but not at a significant level. It was observed that the scores obtained from the career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scales did not differ significantly according to gender and the graduated field. Career satisfaction scores showed a significant difference according to age; however, self-efficacy and career anchor scores did not differ significantly according to age. Only career satisfaction scores differed significantly according to task focus. On the other hand, self-efficacy and career anchor scores did not differ significantly according to years of experience in the relevant organization, while career satisfaction differed significantly by years of experience in the relevant organization. It was observed that career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchor scores did not differ significantly according to monthly income. The findings and limitations of the study were discussed according to the relevant literature and suggestions for future studies were presented.

Keywords: *Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy, Career Anchors*

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, çalışanların kariyer tatmini, öz-yeterlik düzeyleri ve kariyer çapaları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olup olmadığını incelemektir. Çalışma değişkenlerinin birbiriyle olan ilişkileri ile her bir değişkenin demografik değişkenlerle arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek için keşfedici ilişkisel korelasyonel araştırma modeli kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın örneklemini Bursa ilinde faaliyet gösteren bir otomotiv şirketinde çalışmakta olan 306 kişi oluşturmaktadır. Katılımcılara Kişisel Bilgi Formu, Kariyer Doyumu Ölçeği, Genel Öz Yeterlilik Ölçeği ve Kariyer Çapaları Ölçeği uygulanmıştır. Araştırma sorularını yanıtlamak amacıyla tek yönlü ANOVA,bağımsız örneklem t-testi, Kruskal Wallis testi, Tukey HSD testi ve Pearson korelasyon analizleri SPSS 25.0 programı ile yapılmıştır.

Sonuçlar, öz yeterlik ile kariyer tatmini arasında ve öz yeterlik ile kariyer çapaları arasında düşük düzeyde pozitif ve anlamlı ilişkiler olduğunu göstermiştir. Kariyer tatmini ile kariyer çapaları arasındaki ilişkinin zayıf düzeyde pozitif olduğu, ancak anlamlı düzeyde olmadığı görülmüştür. Kariyer tatmini, öz yeterlik ve kariyer çapaları ölçeklerinden elde edilen puanların cinsiyete ve mezun olunan alana göre anlamlı düzeyde farklılık göstermediği gözlemlenmiştir. Kariyer tatmini puanlarının yaşa göre anlamlı bir farklılık gösterdiği; ancak öz yeterlik ve kariyer çapaları puanlarının yaşa göre anlamlı düzeyde farklılaşmadığı görülmüştür. Yalnızca kariyer tatmini puanları görev odağına göre anlamlı farklılık göstermiştir. Diğer yandan kariyer tatmini puanları ilgili kurumda deneyim yılına göre anlamlı farklılık göstermekte iken, öz yeterlik ve kariyer çapaları puanları ilgili kurumda deneyim yılına göre anlamlı düzeyde farklılaşmamıştır. Ek olarak kariyer tatmini, öz yeterlik ve kariyer çapaları puanlarının aylık gelire göre anlamlı farklılık göstermediği gözlemlenmiştir. Araştırmanın bulguları ve sınırlılıkları ilgili literatüre göre tartışılmış ve gelecek çalışmalar için öneriler sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Kariyer Tatmini, Öz-Yeterlilik, Kariyer Çapaları*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Thesis Submission Form.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Özet.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Tables.....	ix
1.INTRODUCTION	
1.1. Research Problem.....	1
1.2. Purpose of the Study.....	10
1.3. Significance of the Study.....	11
1.4. Assumptions.....	14
1.5. Limitations.....	14
1.6. Definitions.....	14
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1. Career Satisfaction.....	15
2.1.1. The Importance of Career Satisfaction and Its Role in Business Life...	20
2.1.2. Related Studies.....	21
2.2. Self-Efficacy.....	24
2.2.1. Sources of Self Efficacy	25
2.2.2. The Importance of Self-Efficacy and Its Role in Business Life.....	27
2.2.3. Related Studies.....	30
2.3. Career Anchors.....	34
2.3.1. Types of Career Anchors.....	36

2.3.2. The Importance of Career Anchor and Its Role in Business Life.....	41
2.3.3. Related Studies.....	42
3.METHODOLOGY	
3.1. Research Model.....	47
3.2. Study Group.....	47
3.3. Data Collection Tools.....	48
3.3.1. Personal Information Form (PIF).....	48
3.3.2. Career Satisfaction Scale (CSS).....	48
3.3.3. General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES).....	49
3.3.4. Career Anchors Scale (CAS).....	52
3.4. Data Collection Process.....	53
3.5. Data Analysis.....	53
3.5.1.Preliminary Analyses.....	53
4. FINDINGS	
4.1. Findings Regarding the Demographic and Occupational Characteristics of the Participants	55
4.2 Descriptive Findings of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchors Scores.....	56
4.3. Relationships Between Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy, and Career Anchors Scores.....	57
4.4. Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Demographic and Occupational Characteristics.....	58
5. CONCLUSION.....	65
6. DISCUSSION.....	70
7. SUGGESTIONS.....	79

REFERENCES.....	81
APPENDICES.....	103
Appendix 1: Personal Information Form.....	103
Appendix 2: Career Satisfaction Scale	104
Appendix 3: General Self-Efficacy Scale.....	105
Appendix 4: Career Anchors Scale.....	107
Appendix 5: Permit Documents of Scales.....	110
Appendix 6: Ethics Committee Permit Documents.....	113



LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. <i>Skewness and Kurtosis Values of Variables</i>	54
Table 4.1. <i>Distribution of Participants by Demographic and Occupational Characteristics</i> ..	55
Table 4.2. <i>Descriptive Findings of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchors Scores</i>	56
Table 4.3. <i>Relationships Between Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy, and Career Anchors Scores</i>	57
Table 4.4. <i>Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchors Scores by Gender</i>	58
Table 4.5. <i>Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchors Scores by Age</i>	59
Table 4.6. <i>Multiple Comparison (Post-hoc) Findings on the Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchors Scores by Age</i>	60
Table 4.7. <i>Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Graduated Field</i>	61
Table 4.8. <i>Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Task Focus</i>	61
Table 4.9. <i>Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Years of Experience in the Relevant Organization</i>	62
Table 4.10. <i>Multiple Comparison (Post-hoc) Findings on the Comparison of Career Satisfaction Scores by Years of Experience in the Relevant Organization</i>	63
Table 4.11. <i>Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Monthly Income</i>	64

1.INTRODUCTION

1.1.Research Problem

Throughout their lives, people are interested in actions that match their interests and abilities, where they can realize and develop their potential. Human behavior is related to objects that meet physiological and psychological needs (Kuzgun, Sevim & Hamamcı, 1999). One of the most important areas where individuals can fulfill their various needs and desires is working life. Considering why people choose to work, many influential factors can be mentioned. One of the most important outputs of working life for an individual is the opportunity to meet financial needs. Besides, the professional fields of individuals appear as a tool by which they can reveal their self and potential and thus develop their self-esteem and self-confidence. As a social entity, human beings shape their social status by interacting with others in the workplace. Therefore; an individual's job affects all roles and positions in his/her life. Hence, it is conceivable that having a job / profession meets not only physiological needs but also psychological needs, social needs and life roles of people (Yeşilyaprak, 2015, 2017).

Although the needs of employees vary according to the place, time and organization, one of their basic needs is to pursue a career (Tunçer, 2012). In the literature, it is obvious that the term ‘career’ is defined in many different ways. In the dictionary of the Turkish Language Association (TDK), career is defined as "The stage, success and expertise achieved in a profession with time and work" (TDK, 2019). According to Hall (2002), career connotes the attitudes and behaviors related to work-related activities and experiences throughout the life of the individual (as cited in Mavisu, 2010). Moreover; Greenhaus, Callanan and Godshalk (2010;10) describe the concept of career as “the pattern of work-related experiences that span the course of a person’s life”. Yeşilyaprak (2015) indicates that the concept of career

generally includes the combination of activities required by all life roles including individual roles in working life.

Along with the transformations in organizational structures, changes in education levels and expectations of employees have changed the meaning of career. Today, career is characterized as a meaningful process that provides psychological satisfaction to people through restructuring of the work. In this regard, career is a process that enables to reveal themselves in the workplace environment in which people realizes their knowledge, abilities, experiences and to shape work life and social life (Gökdeniz & Merdan, 2011). Many people devote a significant portion of time in daily life to their job and they desire to move up the career ladder. Thus, when the individuals' physical and emotional needs are satisfied, they aim to progress in their career with the motive of self-actualization (Kozak, 2001; as cited in Taşlıyan, Arı & Duzman, 2011).

When people have a profession, over time, they want to achieve success by blending their professional knowledge and experience with their roles in life. A general standpoint in society towards a good career is that people who have higher status and income have a successful career (Ng, Eby, Sorensen & Feldman, 2005). In a broader sense, career turns into a fact including elements such as sense of achievement, money, prestige, promotion, rewards, opportunities, better lifestyle and lifelong development (Gürüz & Yaylacı, 2009; as cited in Tunçer, 2012).

Career is a phenomenon with individual and organizational dimensions; as it is a process that includes the relations between the individual, employer, organization and the change of these relations (Arthur, Hall & Lawrence; 1989). Today, many perspectives are put forward in career studies. For example, traditional career approaches point to a structure based on hierarchical progress in organizations (Seçer & Çınar, 2011). Yet, developments and changes in areas such as technology, economy, society, and politics had a significant impact

on working and career life (Baruch, 2004). By this way, career transitions have begun to change into horizontal movements rather than vertical movements that involve advancement in predetermined hierarchical steps in an organization. It is stated that nowadays objective factors are not sufficient to satisfy employees and new career approaches are followed (Arthur, Khapova & Wilderom, 2005). Hall (1976) indicates that contemporary career approaches emphasize certain concepts such as employability, development and subjective success. In these approaches, a person's career is not limited to being connected to an organization or to hierarchical progress, but mainly the responsibility of the individual in managing his/her career comes to the forefront. By this way, career management is the process of which career owners develop, apply and evaluate career strategies and goals (Greenhaus, Callanan & Godshalk, 2018). Employees who take responsibility for career planning within the framework of new career approaches have turned to jobs that satisfy them psychologically. In this manner, the concept of "career satisfaction" gained importance, so organizations and individuals began to prefer this way of enhancing satisfaction (Gerçek, Atay & Dündar, 2015).

Although there are various current career approaches, boundaryless career and protean career can be given as examples to the conceptual approaches that became prominent in the literature (Baruch, 2004). Boundaryless career does not refer to a commitment to a single organization in the career process. Indeed, it includes psychological and physical mobility and multiple job changes. In another words, boundaryless career is defined as the management of career independently from an organization, profession and social mechanisms. Working in different organizations in this way enables people to acquire a wide variety of knowledge and skills (DeFillippi & Arthur, 1994). Protean career is a career orientation that focuses on psychological success rather than objective success, it is based on one's own direction and individual goals (Seçer & Çınar, 2011). Accordingly, it is important for individuals to have a

career life that will meet their needs, support them to feel productive, successful and happy, and give the opportunity to manage their careers. In another aspect, the concept of career reflects how individuals experience jobs and tasks in working life (Noe, 2009; as cited in Kendir & Özkoç, 2018).

People bring various needs and values to their career lives (Baruch, 2004). Yüksel (2005) states that working people intend to meet their basic needs in the early stages of their career. Over time, they make an effort for the satisfaction of their different needs and expectations. Each person evaluate his/her career from different aspects. For example, employees attribute different values to some factors in work life, such as income, status, security, location, access to learning, progress in different jobs, work- life balance in their career (Arthur et al., 2005). Fulfilling the various needs of the individual and the expectation of getting a return for labor is important for providing satisfaction in work life (Kendir & Özkoç, 2018). An individual changes his/her job or makes amendments in his/her expectations during career management process (Özdemir & Mazgal, 2012). Today, organizations place more emphasis on successful experiences and subjective comments as a way of predicting employees' motivation, performance, satisfaction and commitment to their careers (Visagie & Koekemoer, 2014). It is important to emphasize that employees' extent of satisfaction with their careers contributes to the achievement of personal and organizational goals (Demirdelen & Ulama, 2013).

Career satisfaction is seen as a subjective criterion that reflects the satisfaction levels of the employees regarding their career goals, income, advancement and skill development goals (Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Wormley, 1990). It is a structure that includes both the satisfaction and success individuals gain from their careers and the perceived hope for the career advances they desire to achieve in the future (Nauta, van Vianen, van Heijden, van Dam & Willemsen, 2009). In other words, as a whole, career satisfaction is a broad

expression of individuals' level of satisfaction with their past, present and future working life. The concept of career satisfaction has different dimensions when evaluated from objective and subjective perspectives. The external dimension of career satisfaction refers to the perception of elements such as income and promotion, which are measurable and concrete aspects. On the other hand, the internal dimension includes perceptions and interpretations of individuals about their achievements and career development (Avcı & Turunç, 2012).

Career satisfaction, defined as an individual's internal evaluation of his/her career in significant aspects for himself/herself, is also regarded as an important indicator of subjective career success (Van Maanen, 1977). It is indicated that people who have positive evaluations of their career success have higher self-confidence, motivation and goal-oriented effort levels (Abele & Spurk, 2009a). On the other hand, low career satisfaction may result in leaving the job or organization, as dissatisfied employees may put in weak performance and less engage in work than satisfied employees (Korman, Wittig-Berman & Lang, 1981). Dissatisfied employees tend to seek other career development options (Nauta et al., 2009).

In the literature, the relationship of career satisfaction with many variables has been studied. For example, there are studies regarding to person - job fit, person - organization fit, supervisor support, mentoring, accessibility to resources, leader-member interaction, education, learning-oriented organizational climate and developmental feedback, that indicates the relationship between career satisfaction and factors relating to job and organizations (Wayne, Liden, Kraimer & Graf, 1999; Seibert, Kraimer & Liden, 2001; Cable & De Rue, 2002; Eby, Butts & Lockwood, 2003; Ballout, 2007; Joo & Park, 2010; Rehfuß, Gambrell & Meyer, 2012). The literature also indicates the relationship between career satisfaction and personality variables such as extraversion, adaptability, openness to experience, conscientiousness, emotional stability, proactivity; as well as individual variables such as individual career management and protean career attitude (Orpen, 1994; Seibert &

Kraimer, 2001; Ng et al. 2005; Volmer & Spurk, 2010; Takawira, 2018). Furthermore, it is claimed that variables such as career capital, career values, perceived organizational support, career identity, work commitment, career commitment, emotional commitment, locus of control, goal orientation, goal setting, self-efficacy and career competence are also related to career satisfaction (Aryee, Wyatt & Stone, 1996; Joo & Park, 2010; Yu, 2011; Kong, Cheung & Song, 2012; Otluoğlu, 2014; Aytekin, Erdil, Erdoğan & Akgün, 2016; Park, 2018; Çetin & Mavisu, 2018; Kendir & Özkoç, 2018; Anafarta & Yılmaz, 2019; Kale, 2019).

In addition to career satisfaction, another factor that determines the career success of individuals and enables them to have a good career life is self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Some studies point to the concept of self-efficacy as a social cognitive and motivational predictor of career success (e.g. Ballout, 2009; Pan, Sun & Chow, 2011). The concept of self-efficacy was coined by Lent, Brown and Hackett (1994) and its foundations were based on the Social Learning Theory of Albert Bandura (1977). It is a significant variable that has received a lot of attention in Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT). According to the SCCT, human is an organism that behaves proactively, determines his/her own future, and has self-control. In this respect, human is both the creator and the product of the environment and social systems he/she lives in (Bandura, 1999). Considering the reciprocal causality model which the theory benefits; the individual, behavior and environment interact mutually. Hence, personal characteristics such as cognitive and affective situations, external environmental factors and explicit behaviors work together and affect each other (Bandura, 1986). The theory argues that three main variables influence career development: self-efficacy, a belief in a person's ability to successfully perform a behavior; outcome expectations, personal beliefs about the possible consequences of certain behaviors; and personal goals, desire to engage in a specific activity or achieve a certain level of performance (Bandura, 1977, 1986).

Self-efficacy refers to individuals' beliefs about their ability to organize and execute the action plans needed to achieve certain types of performance (Bandura, 1986). Perceived self-efficacy determines what to do with the abilities and skills and thus influences performance (Lent, Brown & Hackett, 1994). In addition, self-efficacy affects the way individuals feel, think and act (Bandura, 1994). Individuals with higher self-efficacy are more confident in their own abilities to complete work tasks and achieve positive results in a task, goal or an activity (Bandura, 1986). Bandura (1997) suggests that individuals' goal-oriented behavioral choices, emotional reactions, level of effort and steadiness against obstacles and failures are affected by their self-efficacy perceptions. According to Stajkovic and Luthans (1998), self-efficacy is one of the most effective psychological processes for producing desired outcomes related to working life. Also, self-efficacy is seen as one of the basic structures of positive organizational behavior (Luthans, Youssef & Avolio, 2007). An individual who has high self-efficacy for a task continues to work despite difficulties and experiences less negative emotions (Zimmerman, 2000). Judge and Bono (2001) state that there is a relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and job performance. Therefore, the importance of the dimensions of self-efficacy related to job and career can be underlined.

In the career dimension, self-efficacy represents personal belief in pursuing career goals successfully (Rigotti, Korek & Otto, 2018). Dealing with stress, problem solving, positive emotions, high motivation and positive social relationships are associated with higher self-efficacy beliefs (Ünsal, 2014; as cited in Durmuş, Fikret & Özkan, 2019). People having low self-efficacy may experience negative outcomes such as stress, anxiety and depression (Pajares, 1997).

Self-efficacy is a concept that shapes individuals' professional interest development, goals, expected activity selection, implementation and performance gains (Lent, Brown & Hackett, 1994). Individuals who have high self-efficacy beliefs have superordinate goals,

make more effort to achieve their goals and follow their career strategies. Employees with higher career self-efficacy are more determined to achieve career success than those with lower career self-efficacy (Ballout, 2009). Career-oriented self-control behaviors allow achievement of goals and acquirement of career success (King, 2004). In the literature, some studies (Valcour & Ladage, 2008; Abele & Spurk, 2009b; Yalalova & Zhang, 2017; Rigotti, Korek & Otto, 2018) revealed a positive relationship between career satisfaction and self-efficacy. In related studies, it was stated that individuals' self-efficacy levels had a positive effect on career satisfaction.

Along with the concepts of career satisfaction and self-efficacy; career values also appear as an important notion for being effective for an individual to have a successful career life. SCCT states that self-efficacy plays an important role on career attitudes with career values and career goals that depict outcome expectations. Schein (1974) indicates that a person's abilities, motives, and values are mutually interactive and inseparable. The criteria for individuals' success in their career are generally guided by their need for meaningful work that matches their personal motivations, interests, abilities, motives, and values (Schein, 1990a). With the increasing responsibility for career planning, psychological success has become important for the individual. In this respect, it has gained importance for individuals to structure their careers within the framework of their work values (Elmas-Atay, 2017).

Career values, which represent the expectations of individuals about their career, has different names in the literature. For example, career values are defined as ‘‘career anchors’’ by Edgar H. Schein. According to Schein (1996), a career anchor reflects all of the elements such as motives, needs, basic values, skills and predispositions of individuals in their careers, thus constitutes the individual's career self. Barutçugil (2004) states that career anchors occur when a person is aware of his / her motives, abilities and values.

Schein (1978) states that career anchors are inside the person, they affect professional decisions and choices. If the individual enters a situation where his/her needs are not met, he/she is unable to use his/her abilities and incompatible with his/her values, he/she may feel turning back to a more harmonious environment, thus an anchor metaphor. This anchor metaphor emphasizes aspects of career values such as stability and constancy (Otluoğlu, 2014). Schein (1996; 80) explains the individual's process of discovering his/her dominant career anchor with the statement ‘‘Most of us are not aware of our career anchors until we are forced to make choices pertaining to self-development, family, or career’. Individuals are confronted with career values in situations such as promotion, dismissal or relocation. In these situations, employees become more aware of their career values (Erdoğmuş, 2003). According to Schein (1990a), a fair amount of work experience is required in order to develop stable values or motives for work.

In the literature, there are also studies that examined the relationship of career satisfaction with various career anchors (Sakal & Yıldız, 2015; Jiang, Klein & Balloun, 2001; Igbaria, Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1991; Igbaria, Kassicieh & Silver, 1999). In these studies, it is revealed that career anchors are related to career satisfaction and that individuals with high career satisfaction meet their career expectations in their current institutions, in a sense, their career anchors are met.

Today, the concept of career is expressed as a meaningful satisfying psychological process going beyond just a hierarchical progress (Türkmen & Yıldız, 2012). When people enter a work environment where they can meet their basic, social and psychological needs, they act with the awareness of the requirements and self-efficacy level towards their job/career throughout following the career path. Then, they strive to achieve positive results by shaping their career upon this awareness (Uzunbacak, Zengin & Çelik, 2019). On the other hand, satisfaction with one's career is a standard for evaluating the quality of overall career

experiences (Yu, 2011). In this regard; there is a need to investigate the relationship between judgments about what a person has achieved in his/her career, the perception of competence regarding his/her success in completing a task, and the symbol of his/her professional identity intertwined with needs, values, and expectations. There was no study examining the relationship between career satisfaction, self-efficacy levels and career anchors of employees together in the literature. For this reason, the problem statement of the research is summarized as follows: "Is there a significant relationship between employees' career satisfaction, self-efficacy levels and career anchors?"

1.2. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine whether there is a significant relationship between employees' career satisfaction, self-efficacy levels and career anchors. The sub-goals created in line with the main purpose were as follows:

1. What are the career satisfaction, self-efficacy levels and career anchors of the employees?
2. Is there a significant relationship between employees' career satisfaction, self-efficacy levels and career anchors?
3. Do the career satisfaction of employees differ significantly by gender?
4. Do the self-efficacy levels of employees differ significantly by gender?
5. Do the career anchors of employees differ significantly by gender?
6. Do the career satisfaction of employees differ significantly by age?
7. Do the self-efficacy levels of employees differ significantly by age?
8. Do the career anchors of employees differ significantly by age?
9. Do the career satisfaction of the employees differ significantly by graduated field (physical sciences / social sciences)?

10. Do employees' self-efficacy levels differ significantly by graduated field (physical sciences / social sciences)?
11. Do the career anchors of the employees differ significantly by graduated field (physical sciences / social sciences)?
12. Do the career satisfaction of the employees differ significantly by task focus (human oriented / non-human oriented)?
13. Do the self-efficacy levels of the employees differ significantly by task focus (human oriented / non-human oriented)?
14. Do the career anchors of employees differ significantly by task focus (human oriented / non-human oriented)?
15. Do the career satisfaction of the employees differ significantly by years of experience in the relevant institution?
16. Do the self-efficacy levels of the employees differ significantly by years of experience in the relevant institution?
17. Do the career anchors of the employees differ significantly by years of experience in the relevant institution?
18. Do the career satisfaction of employees differ significantly by their monthly income (socioeconomic status)?
19. Do employees' self-efficacy levels differ significantly by their monthly income (socioeconomic status)?
20. Do the career anchors of employees differ significantly by their monthly income (socioeconomic status)?

1.3. Significance of the Study

Career satisfaction, defined as one of the important indicators showing that individuals have a good career life, is directly proportional to the expectations met in the current business

environment. It emerges as a result of employees' evaluations of whether their expectations are met in the environment they work in (Heslin, 2005). Providing individual satisfaction is important in terms of developing their careers in line with their plans. In this context, experiencing career satisfaction is possible by successes, awards, achieving goals concerning salary and skill development and advancing in line with the goals set. Such a situation is seen as a result that working individuals expect and desire in their career lives (Demirdelen & Ulama, 2013). From this point of view, career satisfaction expresses an individual's career choices and how much individuals' work experiences confirm that career (Shaver & Lacey, 2003). Lounsbury, Steel, Gibson, and Drost (2008) state that career satisfaction points to employees' feelings about work and attitudes towards their career. On the organizational side, it is necessary to give importance to the satisfaction of the employees with their careers in order to achieve more effective and efficient work (Kumudha & Abraham, 2008). Based on all these expressions, self-evaluation of a person's career life is a factor that determines career satisfaction.

Apart from career satisfaction, self-efficacy, which is effective in individuals to experience a successful career life, is defined as the belief of a person in achieving success in a professional environment. This belief enables people to progress with hope in their careers. Bandura (1997) asserts that working individuals' sense of ability affects their perception, motivation and performance. Lent et al. (1994) states that people generally believe that they may achieve positive results while performing activities that they feel competent. Employees with low self-efficacy generally have a weak level of desire and commitment to their goals (Bandura, 1997). Some studies concluded that the level of self-efficacy people have is a factor that can help explain, predict, and shape motivation, performance and career success (Day & Allen, 2004; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). It is indicated that in order for employees with low self-efficacy to get rid of the unsuccessful results of their current situation, organizations

should exert an effort to enhance the self-efficacy levels of their employees (Schaubroeck & Meritt, 1997).

In addition to career satisfaction and self-efficacy, career values of individuals also play an important role in achieving career success. The extent to which individuals have reached their career goals in the work environment they work or plan to work affects their opinions about whether they will be satisfied with the relevant environment, feel competent and have a healthy career at a noteworthy level. Schein (1978) states that career anchors, depicting the dimensions of abilities, values and needs perceived by the individual, play an important role in directing, limiting and balancing his/her career. Career anchors represent a synthesis of the self-perceived images, values, career motivations and work experiences (Nowak & Bonner, 2013). Accordingly, it is thought that individual's career anchors will give an idea about many aspects of the individual. At the same time, understanding the individual's career anchors provides information about effective career development (Evans, 1996).

According to the information given above, a study investigating the relationship between career satisfaction, self-efficacy levels and career anchors of employees will play an important role in the preparation of career counseling practices and programs for increasing career satisfaction of working individuals. Today, with the increasing importance of modern career management approaches and the decrease in the influence of traditional approaches, career planning responsibility falls on individuals. Individuals' level of satisfaction with their careers also increases because more employees direct themselves to psychologically satisfying jobs (Gerçek, Atay & Dünder, 2015). Perceptions of competence, satisfaction, interpretations, feelings, thoughts, goals and expectations of a person are important building blocks in all stages of the career journey. The harmony of the career values of individuals with the characteristics and the environment of the work is an important element of working life for those people to feel happy and productive. Therefore, in order to employees to

continue their careers in a positive development line and for organizations to use their workforce resources efficiently, career counselors and experts should prepare career structuring programs. These programs will aim to increase career satisfaction, competence beliefs of employees in relevant organizations and how much they can reflect their career orientations to working life due to the increasing importance of this issue.

1.4. Assumptions

1. It was assumed that the participants answered the items in the Personal Information Form, Career Satisfaction Scale, General Self-Efficacy Scale and Career Anchors Scale sincerely and honestly.
2. It was assumed that the measurement tools used in this study was suitable for their purpose and that they measured the desired properties.

1.5. Limitations

1. The working group of the research were limited to the employees of a company operating in various fields of expertise in the automotive sector in Bursa, due to pandemic, cost and time factors.
2. The results obtained were valid for the group in which the research was conducted.

1.6. Definitions

- Career satisfaction: It is the perception of satisfaction of an individual with the degree of achieving career goals (Yüksel, 2005).
- Self-efficacy: It is the judgment of individuals about their ability to organize and carry out the necessary actions to reach certain types of performance (Bandura, 1986).

- Career anchor: It is a personality concept consisting of perceived abilities, basic values, career-related motives and needs of an individual (Schein, 1996).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Career Satisfaction

Various definitions of the term career have been made. Although career is generally considered as all of the jobs and positions undertaken by the individual throughout his working life, it is a process that will provide psychological satisfaction beyond vertical progress in the organizational structure (Erdoğan, 2002). Hall (1976) conceptualizes career as a process that is directly linked to personal and organizational goals, linked to work experience and activities that a person will experience throughout his life and partially control it. In this respect, Hall (1976) points to two aspects of career: internal elements (needs, values, attitudes, experiences) and external elements (title, salary, level, activities). When looked at the common points of definitions for career in the literature, career emerges as a concept based on the advancement in job-related positions that symbolize the degree of success, promotion in the organizational ladder, and attitudes and behaviors related to individual's position (Aytaç, 1997). In summary, career is a series of jobs that continue throughout life, equipped with behavioral patterns (Tüz, 2003).

With the changes in the career context, it is seen that working individuals take more responsibility in managing their own careers regardless of the direction of their organizations (Hall & Chandler, 2005), make plans in line with their goals and expectations, and strive to protect both individual and organizational interests and goals (Sturges, Conway & Liefvooghe, 2008). In the information age, career is based on developing, learning to learn, adapting to the environment, researching information and continuous learning (Koçel, 2013). Career

satisfaction emerges as a reflection of the positive evaluations that a person makes as a result of progressing in well-defined goals regarding his/her career. These evaluations made by the individual are based on career achievements such as income, development and well-being (Joo & Ready, 2012). The overall level of happiness experienced with career choice reflects career satisfaction (Fu, 2010). Career satisfaction is a concept that includes the activities in one's life more comprehensively than job satisfaction, which reflects the satisfaction of the individual from various aspects of the job (Yüksel, 2005). According to Judge, Cable, Boudreau and Bretz (1995), career satisfaction refers to the satisfaction obtained from the external and internal aspects of the careers of working individuals. At this point, while external factors express concrete and measurable aspects such as income and promotions, internal factors are related to the subjective perceptions and evaluations of individuals regarding people's career development and success (Avcı & Turunç, 2012). Objective factors regarding an individual's work and personal factors (one's values, expectations, motivation and behaviors) are elements that are taken into account when evaluating a person's career (Greenhaus, 1987). However, career satisfaction is seen as a complementary criterion in achieving career success and valuing the career as a whole (Gattiker & Larwood, 1989). Generally, career satisfaction is also measured as subjective career success, defined as the satisfaction people get from their own career success (Joo & Park, 2010).

Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley (1990) argue that employees' satisfaction with their careers is related to achieving key goals, such as overall professional goals, achievements, income-related goals, career advancement and acquiring new skills. In other words, career satisfaction is related to meeting career goals and expectations of success. At this point, the resources and financial supports offered to employees are important factors to underline (Conley & Muncy, 2005). In brief, career satisfaction is the representation of

individuals' belief in the consistency of their career development with their goals, values and preferences (Seibert & Kraimer, 2001).

Career and/or job satisfaction have also been mentioned to some extent in various theories in the literature. For example, Holland (1959) defined 6 personality types (Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, Conventional) in his Occupational Typology Theory and argued that the choice of a profession suitable for the personality type of individuals is a reflection of the personality on the business world. According to this theory, individuals seek suitable environments where they can use their talents, skills, solve problems, reflect their values and attitudes, and prefer business environments that achieve this harmony.

- Individuals with realistic personality are practical, strong and they give importance to concrete things, and have less developed interpersonal relationships. Those who reflect this personality type look for work environments where muscle, motor and manual skills are important, applications such as construction, repair, etc. and they prefer solving concrete problems.

- Individuals with investigative personality are rational, meticulous, introverted, analytic and they listen their own thoughts. They give importance to the scientific method and are interested in mathematics and science.

- Individuals with artistic personality are creative, excited, dreamy, sensitive and they have strong intuitions. They prefer aesthetic activities that are not systematic and allow imagination.

- Individuals with social personality are responsible, empathetic, cooperative, helpful and friendly people. They lack mechanical and scientific skills; seek work environments that require social, educational and verbal skills.

- Individuals with enterprising personality are extroverted, dominant, persuasive, adventurous and curious. They prefer business environments that require persuasion, intervention and leadership skills.

- Individuals with a conventional personality are regular, careful, meticulous people who care about details, methods and success. Their imaginations are not well developed. They seek business environments that involve systematically organizing and processing information, requiring record keeping, calculation, and computer use.

According to Holland (1959), occupational satisfaction is positively related to the compatibility of the characteristics of a person's personality type with the work environment. Besides, it depends on the experience, abilities, values and achievements of the individuals. In addition to this, Donald Super (1953) argued in the Theory of Developmental Self-Concept that individuals reflect their self-designs, that change over time and develop with experience, during making a career choice. Moreover, that career development continues throughout life. Super states that preferences and competencies change with time and experience. Super evaluated this process of change in career development in five stages: growth (0-14 years), exploration (15-24 years), establishment (25-44 years), maintenance (45-64 years), and decline (65 and up).

- In the growth phase, an individual explores the environment he/she is in during physical and psychological growth, and tries adult roles through games and/or fantasy. Self-concept comes to the fore with behaviors such as developing attitudes and needs, directing himself/herself and his/her life, setting goals, discovering the meaning of work and the business world.

- In the exploration phase, an individual gets to know himself/herself and develops clearer ideas about occupations and their characteristics, and the career alternatives suitable

for him/her. In circumstances such as temporary decisions, leisure activities, part-time jobs and school; after trial and error and evaluations, he/she is ready for a career choice and starts working in a job, makes plans to achieve some career goals.

- In the establishment phase, an individual starts to work and adapts the self-concept to professional roles. There are stages of getting used to the job, fulfilling the requirements of this job, consolidating its place and seeking higher positions with more responsibility over time and having financial advantages.

- In the maintenance phase, an individual tends to maintain his/her job position and professional satisfaction; development and changes, ups and downs may be seen. The individual learns new things about his/her job, tries to adapt to technological developments, attends various training programs and congresses.

- In the decline phase, an individual's interest and energy in work decreases with physical changes, he/she starts to reduce the pace of work and make retirement plans. More time is devoted to family and engagement in social roles may be increased.

Super suggests that people experience career satisfaction based on their view of themselves at each developmental stage. Career patterns are shaped by factors such as individuals' skills, mental capacity, personality traits, educational level, socioeconomic level of parents, career maturity and career opportunities. Job and career satisfaction depends on finding suitable options for an individual's self concept, interests, skills, needs, values and personality traits. According to Super (1984), career satisfaction of people is affected by differences in jobs, changes in responsibilities or the implementation of any innovation in the working environment (as cited by McGinley, 2009). Gottfredson (1996) argued in the Circumscription and Compromise Theory that the career choice decision matures in parallel with the development of the self-concept during the developmental process.

Career goals are the attempts to reveal one's self-concept. In the career development process, the individual creates professional stereotypes according to the personality traits of the people he/she works with, the working environment and conditions, and the awards obtained at the workplace and current lifestyle. In this direction, occupational alternatives that conflict with one's self are eliminated. Career satisfaction and job satisfaction are related to how consistent one's career is with one's self-perceptions. According to the Theory of Needs, the extent to which any job or organization provides opportunities for development and experience to employees and how well it can meet their relationship needs is an important element in determining the job/ career satisfaction of employees (Maslow, 1954). When organizations meet these needs through some means such as rewards, praises, promotions, rise in salary; they provide their employees with the necessary tools to reach their potential. Depending on an individual's attitudes, values, beliefs, needs and abilities, meeting one or more of these needs by the workplace ensures that he/she gets satisfaction from his/her career (Buckley & Petrunik, 2005).

2.1.1. The Importance of Career Satisfaction and Its Role in Business Life

Employees have become one of the most important investment resources for today's organizations (August & Waltman, 2004). Efficient use of human resource in an organization depends on the wishes, desires and enthusiasm of the employees. Therefore, ensuring the career satisfaction of the employees is an important element for their efficient work (Kumudha & Abraham, 2008). Career also gives the individual internally a sense of achievement, by means of taking responsibility, earning more money, providing status and prestige, and being more respected as a result of progressing in a preferred job (Akat & Budak, 1994). Career is an outstanding fact in providing the employee's need for self-development, increasing self-confidence, gaining social identity and status. In this respect, career satisfaction is an internal and psychological state of career process related to the

individual's achievements and well-being (Zacher, 2015). In addition to this, career satisfaction is one of the primary factors that also determines the workforce turnover rate (Joo & Park, 2010).

It is stated that employees with a higher level of career satisfaction are more committed to their workplace and therefore more likely to contribute to the success of the institution they work for (Peluchette, 1993). As a result of career dissatisfaction, results like leaving the job, being less involved in the job and showing lower performance may be encountered (Korman, Wittig-Berman & Lang, 1981). Unwillingness to work, loss of productivity, loss of performance, stress, decrease in organizational commitment, psychological disorders, negative states like feelings of inadequacy may occur as a result of an employee's dissatisfaction (Çarıkçı, Oksay, Çiftçi & Derya, 2009).

Career satisfaction, which is one of the most important factors affecting employees, is also important for the motivation and development of employees (Martins, Eddleston & Veiga, 2002). For organizations, it is very important to ensure employee satisfaction in terms of creating customer satisfaction, increasing quality and maximizing profits (Çetin & Dündar, 2010). Therefore, the level of satisfaction of working individuals from their careers is important for organizations to develop practices that may increase their career satisfaction levels. In summary, career satisfaction contributes to the achievement of both personal and organizational goals and good performance of employees (Kumudha & Abraham, 2008).

2.1.2. Related Studies

Many factors related to career satisfaction are being mentioned in the literature. It is seen that these factors are related to the organization and the environment along with the individual variables. The elements associated with career satisfaction are clearly listed as the personal factors (demographic variables, talent and personality traits), job factors (job

characteristics and rewards) and organizational factors (Chen, 2008). The job itself, its benefits to the individual, working conditions, income and promotion opportunities, relations with the work environment, the knowledge, skills and values of the employee are the elements that help to get satisfaction from his/her career (Kitapçı & Sezen, 2002).

Ng et al. (2005) aimed to examine the predictive variables of the concept of objective and subjective career success in their meta-analysis study on career success. For this purpose, the articles in which career success criteria including salary, promotion and career satisfaction in 2003 and before were examined. To examine relationships with career success in the study, many variables such as human capital (e.g. work experience, educational level, social capital), stable individual differences (e.g. five-factor personality traits), organizational support (e.g. supervisor support, training and skill development opportunities), sociodemographic characteristics (e.g. gender, race, age, marital status) were discussed. In the related study, career satisfaction as a representative of subjective career success was examined and it was concluded that among the human capital factors; hours worked, job orientation, education level, career planning, political skills and social capital were associated with career satisfaction. Race and marital status as sociodemographic characteristics were associated with career satisfaction. Among organizational factors; supervisor support, career support, training and skill development opportunities were associated with career satisfaction. Looking at personal differences, it was seen that there was a relationship between career satisfaction and emotional stability, responsibility, extraversion, agreeableness, openness, proactivity and locus of control.

Valcour and Ladge (2008) examined the effects of career path and family characteristics variables on career success in their study with 916 working mothers. Three career path variables in the study (career gaps, interorganizational mobility, time spent in part-

time jobs); two psychological variables (career identity, self-efficacy); four family variables (number of children, age at first birth, year after first birth, career priority for couples) and income and career satisfaction were considered as success criteria. Valcour and Ladge (2008) indicated that at the stage of data collection, they measured career satisfaction with the Career Satisfaction Scale developed by Greenhaus et al. (1990), and obtained income information by asking the participants. In addition, career identity with a 4-item scale (Lodahl & Kojner, 1965), and self-efficacy with a 4-item scale (Lachman & Weaver, 1998) were assessed. Considering family variables, questions about career priority and child birth history were asked, and mathematical calculations were made with information such as age at first birth and time after first birth, date of birth of participants and age of children. In order to obtain information about career path variables, participants were asked about their work history. Statistical tests such as regression, correlation analysis and factor analysis were carried out in the moderator effect model in which three variables were used together. Self-efficacy, which was considered as a psychological variable in the related study, showed a positive relationship with income and career satisfaction.

Abele and Spurk (2009) conducted a 7-year study to examine the effects of occupational self-efficacy and career development goals as a variable of psychological capital on the objective and subjective career success of 734 full-time employees with higher education level. While income and hierarchical status are considered as the objective success, career satisfaction is discussed on behalf of subjective success. As measurement tools; GPA, Professional Self-Efficacy Scale (Abele, Stief & Andra, 2000), Career Development Goals Scale (Seifert & Bergmann, 1983) and a form that includes questions about monthly earnings and hierarchical status as objective achievement were used (as cited in Abele & Spurk, 2009). Answers were coded and Career Satisfaction Scale (Greenhaus et al., 1990) was used as subjective success criterion. The hypotheses of the study were tested with the structural

equation model. As a result of the study; it was found that the occupational self-efficacy levels of individuals at the beginning of their career at the beginning of their graduation had a positive effect on salary and status (objective career success) after 3 years, and on salary change and career satisfaction (subjective career success) after 7 years. Additionally, participants with high professional self-efficacy at graduation were found to be more satisfied with their careers after seven years than those with low professional self-efficacy.

Rigotti, Korek and Otto (2018) conducted a study with 581 career-advanced employees using a cross-lagged research model to examine the antecedents of career self-efficacy beliefs and the role of career self-efficacy on subjective career success (career satisfaction). Employees were invited to study twice, with a one-year interval, via email with a link to an online survey. Rigotti, Korek and Otto (2018) asserts that Vocational Self-Efficacy Scale (Rigott, Schyns & Mohr, 2008) was used to measure career self-efficacy, and the 5-item Career Satisfaction Scale (Greenhaus et al., 1990) was used to measure career satisfaction in their study. In the measurement of success based on self-evaluation, they used 3 subscales (pro-social success, reaching a goal, career success) of a measurement tool (Grebner, Elfering & Semmer, 2008) with a total of 13 item. In addition, a 3-item measurement tool for measuring excessive demands (Schulz, Schlotz & Becker, 2004), 5-item Multi-Factor Leadership Scale for transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1995), 5-item Emotional Irritation Scale for emotional tension (Mohr, Müller, Rigotti, Aycan & Tschan, 2006) were used. The hypotheses were tested with the structural equation model. In the study, it was concluded that career self-efficacy affected career satisfaction positively.

2.2. Self Efficacy

The concept of self-efficacy was first used by Albert Bandura in 1977 as the building block of Social Learning Theory. Self-efficacy is one of the main factors that form the center of Social Cognitive Theory and significantly affect human behavior (Pajares, 2002). General

self-efficacy is defined as one's belief in the ability to organize and carry out actions necessary to achieve certain attainments (Bandura, 1997). In other words, self-efficacy refers to a person's belief in the ability to succeed in a task or to reach a predetermined goal (Bandura, 1997). In this context, self-efficacy refers not to the level of the individual's abilities, it refers to the individual's belief in the competence of the related abilities (Çetin, Tekmen & Şentürk, 2016).

2.2.1.Sources of Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1986) identifies personal characteristics (cognitive and affective states, physical characteristics), external-environmental factors and explicit behaviors as mechanisms that affect each other. This interaction process is called mutual determinism. Accordingly, individual, environment and behavior affect each other.

Self-efficacy is a dynamic feature that interacts with the environment as well as other motivation mechanisms, self-control mechanisms (e.g. outcome expectations), personal abilities and performance achievements. Therefore, perception of self-efficacy has a characteristic that will change according to knowledge and experience (Bandura, 1986). It was suggested that self-efficacy beliefs are fostered by four main sources (Bandura, 1997,1986; Lent, Brown & Hackett, 1994):

- Performance achievements: It is related to the information obtained from successful and unsuccessful experiences and activities. Bandura (1997) points to performance achievements as the main source for self-efficacy. From this aspect, successfully mastering in a task positively affects an individual's belief in the capacity to successfully complete other tasks.

- Indirect learning (observed experiences, modeling): Another factor affecting the self-efficacy perception is the observation of the successes and failures of others (model) similar to oneself. While observing that a role model successfully completes a job / task increases the self-efficacy of the individual, observing that the relevant model fails may decrease the individual's self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994). Bandura (1997) indicates that age, expertise, the level of similarity between the model and the observer, and performance against a difficult job are the main characteristics of a decent model.
- Social persuasion (verbal suggestions about whether the person will succeed in): When verbal support is provided to a person that he/she can accomplish any task, the probability of that person to perform the task increases. However, when it is stated that they do not have the skills to do a task, that person is likely to leave that job (Bandura, 1994). Therefore, the supportive discourses of the environment in which a person is, is an important factor that improves his/her belief in himself/herself.
- Physiological-emotional state of the person (such as anxiety, excitement): Stressful situations affect individuals' decision-making mechanisms by causing emotional arousal (Bandura & Adams, 1977). Stress, fear and anxiety accelerate negative affective states and influence self-efficacy adversely, thus leading to self-fulfilling prophecy or inability to fulfill the feared task (Pajares, 2002). Positive affect is associated with a higher level of self-efficacy (Kavanagh & Bower, 1985). Employees with high self-efficacy beliefs may see psychological arousal as an energizing factor, while employees with low self-efficacy tend to evaluate it as a performance-lowering factor. Moreover, being physically fit and healthy contributes to a person's self-efficacy; on the contrary, being exhausted or stressed can negatively affect self-efficacy (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). In this direction, the negative and positive affect

given by the body physiologically has the power to shape the self-efficacy levels of individuals.

Bandura (1989) examined the basic characteristics underlying the self-efficacy of the individual under the headings of cognitive processes, emotional processes and control process. He states that the evaluation of one's own competence (cognitive processes) is effective in determining personal goals. Individuals with high self-efficacy have a higher level of desire to set more challenging goals and their effort to achieve these goals. On the other hand, it is stated that individuals with low self-efficacy levels display more avoidant attitudes in setting goals. People's self-efficacy beliefs also affect the amount of stress and depression (emotional processes) experienced in risky or difficult situations (Bandura, 1989). When individuals think that they can overcome risky or difficult situations, they feel less uncomfortable and they can reduce stress and anxiety by controlling possible risks (Bandura, 1995).

The control process refers to the perception of the individual regarding the root causes of events in his life. People believe that what they experience is controlled by external forces such as fate or luck, or by internal forces such as personal decisions and effort (Neill, 2006; cited in Zulkosky, 2009). As an example of the belief in the existence of the internal control process, a person with high self-efficacy believes that cognitive and emotional processes should be used to achieve the desired result.

2.2.2.The Importance of Self-Efficacy and Its Role in Business Life

Many effects of the self-efficacy belief of the individual can be mentioned. Bandura (2000) suggests that individuals' behavioral choices, determination towards the goals set, effort put into the task, patience and resilience in the face of negative situations and obstacles

are affected by their self-efficacy perceptions. Self-efficacy affects the level of stress and anxiety experienced by individuals while dealing with an activity (Pajares & Schunk, 2001).

It is suggested that self-efficacy is the basis of motivation and personal achievements (Pajares, 2002). Perceived self-efficacy is a structure that determines what to do with the possessed abilities, skills and also affects performance (Lent et al., 1994). Cognitively motivated individuals make decisions about what they can do in the future by guiding their behavior with the predictions they have. Thus, they perform appropriate behaviors with action plans designed to shape their personal goals and futures (Bandura, 1993). Individuals with higher self-efficacy are more confident in their own abilities to complete work tasks and achieve positive results (Bandura, 1986). For example, Judge and Bono (2001) point out that there is a relationship between self-efficacy and job performance.

While successful experiences in job increase the level of self-efficacy, failures decrease the individual's self-efficacy level. However, if the individual's self-efficacy perception is high, the failures he / she will experience do not affect him / her very much (Bandura, 1986). However, if the individual's self-efficacy perception is too high, the failures he / she will experience do not affect him / her much (Bandura, 1986). Self-efficacy is a structure specific to a domain or task (such as mathematics self-efficacy, career decision making self efficacy, career-related self-efficacy). In addition, people differ in their self-efficacy beliefs regarding behaviors in different areas. When people see themselves as competent in an activity and expect the activity to produce valuable results, they will show constant interest in this activity. (Lent, Brown & Hackett, 2002).

Hackett and Betz (1981) stated that low self-efficacy would prevent a person from trying to fulfill the task even if he is quite sure that the performance of that task will lead to desired results. According to Lent et al. (1994), social cognitive career view assumes that self-efficacy beliefs, career outcome expectations, cognitive-personal variables of career goals

(intentions, plans or desires to enter a particular career direction) are key mechanisms in career development. Outcome expectations are one's beliefs about the consequences of his/her actions (Hackett & Betz, 1981). Bandura (1977) states that outcome expectations can be obtained from the same informative sources as efficacy expectations. Personal goal is defined as an individual's intention to engage in a certain activity or produce a specific result (Bandura, 1986). By setting goals, people help to regulate and direct their behaviors in order to continue their behaviors for a long time and increase the probability of achieving desired results even without external rewards (Lent et al., 1994).

Successful achievement of individuals' goals increases their self-efficacy perceptions (Schunk, 2001). Bandura (1986) argued that both self-efficacy and outcome expectations help people to identify important aspects of human behavior, such as the activities they will continue and the activities they avoid. The point of view of social cognitive theory is that people's choice and performance goals are significantly influenced by their self-efficacy and outcome expectations. The social cognitive view assumes that relevant self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations are sources of development of career-related interests, goals, and choices (Rasdi, İsmail, Uli & Noah, 2009).

From a social cognitive perspective, performance in career is related to two factors; the level of attainment individuals gain in job duties and the degree of persistence in a particular work activity despite any obstacles (Lent et al., 1994). According to Stajkovic and Luthans (1998), self-efficacy is one of the most effective psychological processes for producing desired outcomes in business life. Self-efficacy is related to intrinsic motivation, continuity, effort and goals. Besides, it contributes more to job performance than personality traits (Luthans, 2011). For example, occupational self-efficacy positively affects career motivation, career effort and performance (Bandura, 1997; Lent et al., 1994).

According to Schunk (1995), self-efficacy is not the only factor on behaviors. Unless there is the necessary knowledge and skills, high self-efficacy alone does not ensure a good level of performance. Career-related self-efficacy reflects the belief that individuals are able to manage their careers successfully (Day & Allen, 2004). In other words, career-related self-efficacy is a phenomenon that represents personal belief in pursuing career goals successfully (Rigotti, Korek & Otto, 2018). Accordingly, self-efficacy can be both the premise and the output of success through cyclical causality (Lent et al., 1994). If the self-efficacy perception is strong, the difficulty level of the goals people set is high, and these people are strongly committed to their goals (Bandura, 1994). In addition, many variables such as stress management, problem solving, positive emotions, high motivation and positive social relationships are associated with high self-efficacy beliefs (Ünsal, 2014, as cited in Durmuş, Fikret, & Özkan, 2019).

2.2.3. Related Studies

Some studies in the literature suggest that self-efficacy is an important motivational and social-cognitive predictor of career success. (Ballout, 2009; Pan, Sun, & Chow, 2011). Rasdi et al. (2009), in their study in which they formed a theoretical framework for evaluating career success, classified variables that have predictive potential on managers' subjective and objective career success in four main groups. These were individual factors (self-efficacy, self-esteem, career aspirations and work-centeredness), organizational factors (perceived organizational support, organizational socialization), managerial competencies (networking behaviors, computer skills) and person-environment fit (person- job and person-organization fit). According to the researchers, career success should be functionalized using both objective and subjective career success. In this model, self-efficacy was expressed as an important individual variable of career success. The researchers recommended conducting empirical studies to investigate the aforementioned relationships.

Chughtai (2008) investigated the effect of authentic leadership on the objective (hierarchical status) and subjective (career satisfaction) dimensions of career success and the mediating effect of career self-efficacy in this relationship with 162 full-time employees from different departments of a food and beverage company in Pakistan. Chughtai (2008) denoted that 16 questions about authentic leadership (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing & Peterson, 2008), 5 questions about career self-efficacy (Higgins, Dobrow & Chandler, 2008), 5 questions about career satisfaction (Greenhaus et al., 1990) were used. Hierarchical status was learned by giving yes/no answers to three variables (delegate work, project responsibility, official leadership position). Age, gender and education were included as control variables. Methods such as descriptive statistics, structural equation modeling, factor analysis were used in the analysis of the data. According to the results obtained, positive relationships with career self-efficacy, career satisfaction and hierarchical status were observed. In addition, it was concluded that authentic leadership was positively related to career self-efficacy and age was positively related to career satisfaction. Career self-efficacy fully mediated the relationship of authentic leadership with status, and partially mediated its effect on career satisfaction.

Ballout (2009) aimed to examine the moderating role of self-efficacy in the relationship between career commitment and objective and subjective career success in a study with 180 bank employees. In the related study, self-efficacy was measured with an 11-item scale (Kossek, Roberts, Fisher & Demarr, 1998), career commitment with a 17-item scale (Colarelli & Bishop, 1990), career satisfaction with a 5-item scale (Greenhaus et al., 1990) were evaluated, and the salary level representing objective career success was asked to the participants (as cited in Ballout, 2009). Gender, education and work experience were used as control variables. In addition to descriptives such as mean, standard deviation and correlation, analyzes such as multiple hierarchical regression method and post hoc tests were used. The results showed that career commitment, self-efficacy and control variables were

significantly related to career success variables (except gender and career satisfaction). Self-efficacy showed positive significant relationships with salary level and career satisfaction. The strongest correlations were found between career commitment and career self-efficacy, and between career commitment and career satisfaction. The interaction term between self-efficacy and career commitment for career satisfaction was found significant and positive. It was revealed that career commitment had a positive relationship with both salary level and career satisfaction. In addition, it was observed that career self-efficacy had a moderating role in the positive effect of career commitment on objective and subjective career success.

Yalalova and Zhang (2017), in their study with 422 Russian employees from different industries, examined the relationship between self-efficacy and career satisfaction, the mediating effect of willingness to work, and the moderator effect of gender in this relationship. In the related study, Yalalova & Zhang (2017) stated that they used a 10-item scale (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995), a 5-item scale for career satisfaction (Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Wormley, 1990), a 6-item scale for study effort (Brown & Leigh, 1996), and 6 demographic questions to measure self-efficacy. Descriptive statistics, Pearson and Spearman correlation analysis, and linear regression were used in the analysis of the data. According to the findings, self-efficacy showed positive relationships with willingness to work, career satisfaction, self- gender, and work effort. Moreover, work effort and gender was positively related. A positive but non-significant relationship was found between career satisfaction and gender. Employees' willingness to exert a high level of work effort was found to mediate the relationship between self-efficacy and career satisfaction. Gender did not have a moderator effect on the relationship between self-efficacy and career satisfaction, but it was determined that gender was positively associated with employees' willingness to exert a high level of work effort.

Ngo and Hui (2018) examined the relationships between two different individual orientations and career satisfaction, and the mediating role of self-efficacy and job engagement in this relationship with 222 employees of a business in Hong Kong. Ngo and Hui (2018) indicated that they examined protean career tendency with a 7-item scale (Baruch, 2014), employment commitment with a 5-item scale (Nordenmark, 1999), self-efficacy with an 8-item scale (Chen, Gully & Eden, 2001), work commitment with a 9-item scale (Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006), and career satisfaction with a 5-item scale (Greenhaus et al., 1990). Gender, age, working time in the organization, education level, and employment status were determined as control variables. The data were analyzed with tests such as structural equation modeling and path analysis, as well as descriptive statistics and correlation analyses. According to the findings obtained from the study, protean career orientation and employee commitment were positively correlated with career satisfaction. It was understood that job engagement and self-efficacy had a mediating effect on these relations. It was also observed that there is a positive correlation between self-efficacy and career satisfaction.

Pan, Sun, and Chow (2011) investigated the effect of supervisor mentoring on personal learning and career outcomes and the moderating effect of self-efficacy in this relationship, in a study they conducted with 226 employees and their supervisors in four manufacturing companies in China. The data were collected by applying a scale, supervisor mentoring with 16 items (Noe, 1988), personal learning with 12 items (Lankau & Scandura, 2002), self-efficacy with 3 items (Spreitzer, 1995), job performance with 4 items (Farh & Cheng, 1997), career satisfaction was evaluated with 5 items (Greenhaus et al., 1990). The obtained data were tested with methods such as descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, factor analysis and path analysis. According to the results of the study, self-efficacy was positively associated with personal learning, job performance, and career satisfaction. Self-efficacy regulated the mediating effects of supervisory mentoring on career satisfaction

through personal learning; The mediating effects on job performance were stronger when subordinates had higher self-efficacy. On the other hand, the mediating effect on career satisfaction was stronger when employees' self-efficacy was lower.

2.3. Career Anchors

The meaning of career is different for each individual. This situation brings different needs of people with different career values (Schein, 2007). People value different aspects of their careers. In this respect, they follow some of their desires throughout their careers as they do in their general lives (Dyke & Duxbury, 2011). These desires, which constitute an important aspect of the inner career of individuals, are based on their professional self, their beliefs and values about being valuable and talented in the professional field (Rosenberg, 1979). In this context, Edgar Schein's "career anchors (career orientations/career values)" model is the most widely accepted model among studies aimed at determining the factors that affect an individual's career choices and decisions (Schein, 1978). The formation of this concept, which was introduced to the literature by Edgar H. Schein and Thomas De Long, dates back to Schein's 13-year longitudinal studies with 44 graduates at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in the 1960s. The reasons underlying the career preferences of individuals were investigated in these interviews and studies (Yarnall, 1998).

A person's career tendency is formed by the influence of personal (needs, motivation, personality) and environmental (such as family, cultural context) factors and turns into career anchors that represent important career values (Gürbüz & Sıgır, 2012). Schein (1978;1990,1996); defines a career anchor as an internal identity or occupational self-concept that develops as a person gains experience in life and professional area. An individual's career anchors are the representation of his/her career values that guide professional decisions, including perceived abilities, core values and motivations (Schein, 1978). Schein (1990) states that career anchors are important components of an individual's career self, which involve

needs, interests and values. When faced with an important and difficult career choice, individuals will not compromise their career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009).

Schein (1978) points out three important components of career anchors. These components are the individual's perceived abilities and strengths based on success in different work environments; motivations and needs based on the feedback he/she receives and opportunities for self-knowledge and testing; attitudes and values based on the comparison of the norms and values of the individual with the work environment. Du Toit (2010) characterizes career anchors as part of the conscious content of the soul. Career anchors act as motivational forces (meta-competencies) that guide individuals' career decisions and preferences for work and study environments (Schein, 1990). Career meta-competencies include awareness of career anchors that guide one's career decisions and career satisfaction experiences, emotional literacy in coping with failures, and behavioral adaptability (Coetzee, 2008; Coetzee & Bergh, 2009). According to Schein (1990), as individuals gain experience in their life and career, they discover the dominant career anchor by 30 years of age. Schein (1985) sees these career anchors as personal values that he cannot give up if he is forced to make a choice. With the help of his experiences and feedback received, a person develops a dominant career anchor in 5-10 years. This anchor becomes a balancing force on the employee's total personality, which is guiding, directing, restricting future career choices of him/her (Schein, 1990). Feldman and Bolino (2000) also emphasize that individuals in the workforce can make more accurate assessments of their abilities, needs and values over the next few years. People become aware of their career values during promotion, dismissal and job changes (Erdoğan, 2003). The dominant career anchor reflects how people want to express or use their personal resources around three poles and their long-term preferences for work and work environments. These include motives and needs, self-perceived talents and abilities, and subjective career-related values and attitudes (Schein, 1990, 1996).

Schein's theory emphasizes that every person should have a distinguished career value. By determining the best career management strategies of employees, there could be professions/jobs that will serve these career orientations (as cited by Vermeulen, 2015). Schein (1978) further argues that a standard by which an individual evaluates his or her own success largely reflects his/her internal career anchor. While some studies support Schein's single career anchor idea (Igbaria, Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1991), there are researchers who focus on individuals' primary, secondary, or more career anchor profiles for multiple career and life goals (e.g. Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Rodrigues & Guest, 2010). In his early work in the 1970s, Schein classified career anchors into five categories: reliability/stability, autonomy/independence, technical-functional competence, general managerial competence, and entrepreneurial creativity. With the following studies carried out after 1980, the categories of service or dedication to a cause, pure challenge, and lifestyle were added to the career anchors and a total of 8 categories were discussed (Schein, 1990).

2.3.1. Types of Career Anchors

2.3.1.1. General managerial competence: An individual with a general managerial competence anchor deals management issues and sees management skills as a value in itself. The most important components of this anchor are; interpersonal competence (directing, managing and supervising individuals for the effective achievement of organizational goals), analytical competence (identifying and resolving problems in situations of uncertainty and lack of knowledge), and emotional stability (capacity to eliminate or reduce interpersonal and emotional crises and assume high responsibility) (Schein, 1990). Schein (1980) indicates that basic identities of these people and their feelings of success are closely related to the success of the organization they work for.

People who have general managerial competence anchor are sensitive to status symbols and interested in responsibility, leadership and activities that contribute to the organization's success. These people expect to receive higher salaries from their subordinates in the organization, in other words, they care about internal equality. They value short term rewards and seek promotion generally based on merit, performance and outcomes. Being promoted to higher areas of responsibility means appreciation for them (Schein & Maanen, 2013). These people are excited to analyze and solve problems in uncertain situations, like to bring people together to achieve common goals and encourage individuals in crisis situations. (Feldman and Bolino, 1996).

2.3.1.2. Technical/functional competence

Individuals with a dominant technical/functional competence anchor desire to specialize and progress in their own fields (Schein, 1978). These individuals prefer to be trained in a field they specialize in and they want to increase this expertise by experience (Schein, 2006). They care about being good at what they do, herewith not dealing with issues such as promotion and management (Schein, 1980). They get bored quickly when their job is not of a quality that they can test and use their talents and skills.

They demand maximum autonomy in implementing their goals and adequate resources to get the job done in the best possible way (Schein & Maanen, 2013). For these individuals, success is determined by feedback that they are experts and the opportunity to engage in more challenging tasks, rather than financial rewards (Schein, 1978). People in this group value recognition by their peers more than rewards. Because external equality is important to these people; they compare their salaries with the earnings of others at the same skill level. They expect to be paid for their skill level based on education and work experience. Since they care about being technically competent, it is important for these people to be provided with various educational opportunities (Schein & Maanen, 2013).

2.3.1.3. Entrepreneurial creativity

People with entrepreneurial creativity career value especially care about starting a new business or developing new products or services with their own efforts. Although this anchor is similar to the career anchor called autonomy-independence, the dominant feature of these people is that they prefer to use their freedom in new projects and be creative (DeLong, 1982). Indeed, entrepreneurial individuals do not avoid taking risks. They desire to produce new ideas, adopt jobs that have their own initiatives or can be their own boss; and they motivate themselves with this enthusiasm (Schein, 2006). They want career systems that allow them to be where they need to be throughout their careers.

Money is a measure of their success for those who are dominant in this career anchor (Schein & Maanen, 2013). These people get bored of being attached to something for a long time and want to switch from project to project (Danziger & Valency, 2006). Making new initiatives is more attractive for these people than executing the previously established order (Danziger, Rachman-Moore & Valency, 2008).

2.3.1.4. Security/Stability

Individuals with a dominant security /stability career value are primarily interested in jobs where they feel safe and comfortable. They worry more about the results of the work than the content of the work done. Good payment and working conditions are more important to them than any other motivational tool. They prefer predictable salary increases, seniority promotion and various insurance packages (Schein & Maanen, 2013). Schein (1990) states that factors such as future anxiety, security and working conditions may be important for everyone; but for individuals with a dominant career anchor of security/stability, these factors limit all career choices. According to the studies, security/stability career anchor can be divided into job security and geographical security according to the position prioritized

(Schein, 1980, DeLong, 1982). For example, individuals with security anchor do not desire geographic mobility; in addition, they are concerned about financial security or job security. Because they do not like change, their career security continues in the form of permanent relationships with employers (Cerdin & Pargneux, 2010). Social security, health and financial security in retirement are the most important factors in career choices for them. These people may prefer to be in high positions if their abilities allow (Schein, 1990).

2.3.1.5.Autonomy/Independence

An individual with a prominent career value of autonomy/independence wants his/her working life to be under his/her own control (Danziger & Valency, 2006). Autonomy/independence anchored people stay away from rules, working hours, dress codes and other procedures within an organization. While some organizations are more open to freedom, people with this career anchor find organizational life restrictive and intrusive, so they want to find and evaluate employment options where they can determine their own destiny (Schein, 1980). The stricter rules in large organizations lead them to smaller organizations (Schein, 2006). They do not prefer to carry out managerial work, but for some, being in management is preferable because it allows them to determine working methods with flexible conditions (Chapman, 2015). If they are going to work in an institution, they prefer time-bound jobs defined within their field of expertise (project-based, contracted, etc.). However, they may choose to stay in place if greater responsibilities or positions would limit the person's freedom. They prefer pay for performance, bonuses, instant wins etc. For these people, references, medals and awards means more than promotions or title changes (Schein & Maanen, 2013).

2.3.1.6.Lifestyle

People whose career anchor is lifestyle value flexibility and personal growth. Working in organizations that care about personal and family issues makes them feel comfortable (Schein, 1990). They accept rules and restrictions when there are options that give them time and space in the institution they work for (working part-time when necessary, traveling as much as their family situation allows, working in an organization which have predictable working hours, etc.) (Schein & Maanen, 2013). Schein (1990) explains why this career anchor has become widespread with the changes in the workforce, and in the number of female employees and dual career spouses. People in this group will make sacrifices in their careers in order to maintain their life balance (Chapman, 2015) but they need to ensure integration between other aspects of life (family situation and personal development needs) and their work life and career. Schein (2006) indicates that these people have another dominant anchor, but they have chosen to be subordinate to this anchor.

2.3.1.7. Service or dedication to a cause

For individuals with career anchors of service/dedication to a cause, expressing their values is more important than using their talents (Schein, 1990). A person with this career anchor may have values such as helping others, inventing something that saves lives, creating better working conditions (Schein, 1980). What makes these people happy in business life is seeing the people they help create positive changes in their lives (Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2002; as cited in Günay, 2018). People with this career anchor are more interested in jobs that will meet their values rather than their skills (Danziger & Valency, 2006). They want benefits such as external equality, fair wages; and prefer promotion to areas that recognize and realize their values, rather than material gains. They expect from their superiors and colleagues to understand and share their values. In addition, they value educational opportunities, meetings and awards (Schein & Maanen, 2013).

2.3.1.8.Pure challenge

Individuals with the career value of pure challenge want to overcome and prove impossible problems and obstacles. In particular, these people have an interest in a job or profession that allows them to feel like they are overcoming tough competitors. (Schein, 1990). For individuals working in this group, it is important to win in the face of tough competitors or problems, not the work done. The biggest motivation for an individual with this career anchor is to solve big problems, overcome obstacles and defeat tough competitors (Danziger & Valency, 2006). These people see life as boring if they do not encounter a problem that is difficult enough to test themselves. Some of these people may turn to the field of general management to show, prove and test themselves in difficult management areas (Schein, 2006).

There are various views on the classification and characteristics of career anchors. Feldman and Bolino (1996) grouped Schein's eight career anchors into three main groups: General managerial, technical-functional and entrepreneurial creativity values on the basis of talent; security-stability, autonomy-independence and lifestyle on the basis of needs; pure challenge and dedication to a cause values on the basis of values. Derr (1986) mentioned 5 basic internal career orientations by making use of Schein's studies: getting ahead, getting secure, getting high, getting free and getting balanced. In addition, Schein (1978; 1985) argued that after career anchors are developed, they remain stable throughout one's career; Derr (1986) evaluated career anchors as a structure that can change as a result of interaction with the environment and important events that occur in the workplace and in one's personal life. Career anchors can be changed, but fundamental changes require effort and are often unpredictable (Feldman, 1989).

DeLong (1982) suggested replacing the career anchor with the term career orientation, which refers to one's capacity to choose certain characteristics of a profession based on one's

motives, interests, and competencies. He also identified three new types of career orientations (identity, service, and diversity) in addition to Schein's (1978) five originals.

2.3.2.The Importance of Career Anchor and Its Role in Business Life

Career expectations of individuals are the reflection of future representations of the points they want to reach in their careers (Greenhaus et al., 2010). It appears that career anchors have an important place in understanding what kind of expectations employees have and how organizations respond to these expectations (Jarlstrom, 2000).

Career anchors are developed and adapted based on external experiences and actions. Employees discover and evaluate career anchors by using both their own observations and external feedback about their behavior in various situations at work (Erdoğan, 2003). Schein (1990) indicates that awareness of one's career anchors and how they affect their job and career satisfaction has been associated with positive career choice outcomes. When there is a harmony between individuals' career anchors and their jobs, this harmony will enable them to achieve positive career outcomes, to be satisfied, productive and effective (Schein, 1985). Since most employees cannot fully achieve this unification, many variables are encountered in the name of career in society (Danziger & Valency, 2006). It has been shown that individuals' career anchors positively affect their subjective work experiences, life satisfaction, job/career satisfaction, sense of happiness, perception of work as a valuable activity, and satisfaction with their perceived employability (Coetzee, Bergh & Schreuder, 2010; Coetzee & Schreuder, 2011). Herrbach and Mignonac (2012) state that career anchors affect the way individuals interpret the work environment and shape their subjective career success experiences. The desires, values and goals behind the career anchors of individuals affect career choices and decisions, as well as job and career satisfaction (Lumley, 2010).

2.3.3. Related Studies

There are studies in the literature that examine the relationship between career anchors and career satisfaction through various contexts and variables.

Igbaria, Greenhaus, and Parasuraman (1991) examined the career orientations, demographic characteristics, job type and career outcomes (career satisfaction, desire to leave, organizational commitment) of 464 technical professionals. A demographic information form and a 41-item career orientation inventory (Schein, 1985) were used to obtain the data; career satisfaction with 5 items (Greenhaus et al., 1990); organizational commitment with 15 items (Porter et al, 1976), intention to leave with a single item (Parasuraman, 1982), perceived professional characteristics with 8 items and 5 added items from Allen and Katz (1986), boundary spanning activities with 10 items (Miles & Perreault, 1976) were measured. Gender, age, marital status, education, salary, organizational level, tenure factors were considered as demographic variables. ANOVA and chi-square analyzes were used to evaluate the data. According to the findings obtained; technical-functional competence and general managerial competence were the most characteristic career anchors, while entrepreneurial creativity was the least characteristic. It was observed that career anchors were not related to age, education, marital status, tenure at work, organization and information systems area, but were related to gender. A higher percentage of men were technical career anchor oriented, while a higher percentage of women were lifestyle career anchor oriented. Employees with managerial competence, autonomy or service career anchors; were more likely to remain in management positions than those with a dominant career anchor of security, technical, or pure challenge. A significant relationship was found between job type and career anchors. In the light of the relevant findings, the researchers concluded that employees who are in harmony between their career anchors and their work environments experienced higher job and career satisfaction

than employees who experienced dissonance; their intention to leave the organization they work for was lower and their commitment to the organization increases.

Igbaria, Kassicieh, and Silver (1999), in their study with 78 R&D personnel in engineering and manufacturing organizations, examined the dimensions and levels of career anchors and their relationships with individual and work-related outcomes (satisfaction, commitment, job acceptance, willingness to stay in the organization). In the study, a questionnaire including open-ended questions was applied to measure demographic variables such as gender, marital status, age, education level, working time in the job, working time in the organization. Researchers of the relevant study stated that career orientation was measured with the 25-item shortened version of the career anchors inventory developed by Schein (Igbaria & Baroudi, 1993). Job adoption, with an 8-item scale adapted from Kanungo (1982); discretionary power with 3 items taken from a workforce scale developed by Nixon (1985); career satisfaction Greenhaus et al. (1990) with a 5-item scale; organizational commitment was assessed with the 9-item shortened version of an organizational commitment questionnaire developed by Porter, Carmpton, and Smith (1976). Intention to leave was measured by a single item used by Igbaria, Greenhaus, and Parasuraman (1991), asking individuals how long they plan to continue working for their current organization. Average scores of career anchors were calculated and correlation analyzes were performed, and ANOVA analyzes were performed to examine personal variables and career anchors. In the related study, there was a positive relationship between career satisfaction, geographic security and lifestyle values. According to the results obtained, while job security, service and lifestyle were the strongest career anchors; managerial competence, entrepreneurship and technical-functional competence were the career anchors obtained at the lowest level. In the study, gender, age and marital status were used as personal variables. While managerial competence and pure challenge were higher in men; lifestyle career anchor was higher in

women. Geographic security, service, lifestyle and entrepreneurship are higher among married workers. On the other hand, single employees were found to have higher pure challenge and technical orientation. The age variable was found to be related to job security and managerial competence.

Jiang, Klein and Balloun (2001); in their study with 101 information systems employees, examined the relationships between internal career anchors, external career situations and career satisfaction. Items measuring participants' internal career anchors were adapted from a 36-item scale (Crepeau, Crook, McMurtrey, 1992). To measure external career job design, 8 items in the job opportunities scale of Ferratt, Short & Agarwal (1993), which adapted Hackman and Oldham's (1975) job description questionnaire, were used. Career satisfaction was evaluated with a 5-item scale (Grenhaus et al., 1990). The data obtained in the study were evaluated in the light of regression analysis, and it was seen that internal and external career anchors were positively related to career satisfaction. In other words, the stronger a person's internal career anchors and the better the external career elements provided by the organization they work for, the higher the career satisfaction level.

Sakal and Yıldız (2015) examined the relationships between individualism and collectivism values, career anchors and career satisfaction with 145 mid-level managers. Sakal and Yıldız (2015) indicated that they used a 16-item scale developed by Triandis and Gelfand (1998) and validated by Li and Aksoy (2007) was used to measure individualism and collectivism values. In order to measure career anchors, a 40-statement scale in Schein's (1990) study was used. To measure career satisfaction, Greenhaus et al. (1990)'s 5-point career satisfaction scale was used. Methods such as descriptive statistics, correlation and regression were used in data analysis. The findings obtained from the study showed that there is a positive relationship between career anchors technical functional competence, security-stability, lifestyle dimensions and career satisfaction. Moreover, the career satisfaction score

of female employees were significantly higher than that of male employees. It was seen that the career anchors that stand out in the research sample are lifestyle, technical-functional competence, security-stability and service-dedication to a cause.

Günay (2018) conducted a research with 250 people working in textile sector businesses in order to reveal the differences between X and Y generation employees in determining the relationships between career anchors and career satisfaction. First, a form containing demographic questions was used to obtain the data. Günay (2018) indicated that 5-item scale for measuring career satisfaction (Gerçek, Atay& Dünder, 2015); and a 25-item scale (Gürer, Solmaztürk & Tın, 2014) was used to evaluate career anchors. In the analysis of the obtained data, frequency analysis, correlation analysis, multiple regression analysis, t-test and one-way ANOVA analysis were performed. It was found that female participants had more career satisfaction than male participants; that graduate graduates have higher career satisfaction; it was concluded that the career satisfaction of the participants was higher than the participants with more than 1 year of work experience than those with less than 1 year of work experience. In addition, it has been observed that the career satisfaction of the managers was higher than the employees. When the results of Pearson correlation analysis were examined, positive and significant correlations were obtained between career satisfaction and security/order, service/dedication to a cause, autonomy/independence, pure challenge, technical/functional competence and lifestyle variables. The extent to which career anchors affect career satisfaction was examined according to generational differences. It was seen that security/stability, achieving the difficult/ pure challenge and lifestyle affect career satisfaction positively, while entrepreneurial creativity affects negatively in the Y generation. In the X generation, on the other hand, it was seen that security/order and lifestyle had a positive effect on career satisfaction.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Model

Since the purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between career satisfaction levels of employees, self-efficacy levels and career anchors, the related research was in exploratory correlational survey model. The purpose of survey research is to describe the current situation regarding the research subject (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2018). Correlational surveying models aim to determine whether there is a change or the degree of change between two or more variables. Correlational studies are from the relational survey model (Karasar, 2005).

There are two sub-types of correlational research as exploratory and predictive research. In exploratory correlational studies, an important event is tried to be understood by analyzing the relationships between variables. In predictive correlational studies, the extent to which one or more independent variables explain the dependent variables is investigated. (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2018). Since the purpose of the related research is to discover the relationship between research variables, the research design was defined as the exploratory relational correlational research model.

3.2. Study Group

The study group of the research consisted of employees in a company operating in various fields of expertise in the automotive sector in Bursa. After learning the number of employees within the company and making the necessary calculations to determine the sample size, the required number of participants determined. While creating the sample, the convenience sampling method and criterion sampling method were used. In the convenience sampling method, the sample is selected from easily accessible and practicable units taking

into account time, money, etc. In criterion sampling, the sample is formed from the person, object, situation or events that have the characteristics determined related to the problem situation (Büyüköztürk, 2012). For this study, the criteria for inclusion in the study group is summarized as follows: People to be included in the study group were expected to have been working in the relevant institution for at least 1 year.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

3.3.1. Personal Information Form (PIF): This form (Appendix-1) prepared by the researcher is an information form that includes question items such as gender, age, graduated field (social sciences / physical sciences), task focus (human oriented/ non- human oriented), years of experience in the organization, monthly income (socioeconomic status). The relevant form was used to reveal the demographic structure of the study group.

3.3.2. Career Satisfaction Scale (CSS): Career Satisfaction Scale was developed by Spurk, Abele, and Volmer (2015) to measure career satisfaction levels of employees. The scale was adapted into Turkish by Akın and Alabucak (2017). The scale consists of 5 items, one dimension, and has a 5-point Likert type rating ("Not suitable for me (1)" and "Fully suitable for me (5)"). The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the scale was found .90.

When the original article of the scale is examined, it is stated that the single-factor structure obtained as a result of the exploratory factor analysis was retested with the confirmatory factor analysis, and the model fit indices were found at an acceptable level ($\chi^2 = 39.69$, $df = 20$, $CFI = .99$, $RMSEA = .07$, $SRMR = .02$). When the reliability study of the relevant scale is examined, it can be seen that the researchers who developed the scale found that each item measured in the same way by comparing the items of the scale between 4 occupational groups. It was observed that the factor loads of the first item did not change ($\lambda = 1$); the factor loads of the second item varied between .97-1.10, the third item varied between

.74-.87, the fourth item varied between .56 and .78, and the fifth item varied between 1.04-1.16. An examination of the values of factor parameters showed that there were little differences between professions. Accordingly, it was observed that the residual variance of the first item in 4 occupational groups was .20, the residual variance of the second item varied between .13-.19, the third item varied between .48-.65, the fourth item varied between .36-.47, and the fifth item varied between .09-.21. It was observed that all items had low residual variance and items were highly reliable.

According to the item analysis conducted to measure the differentiation power of the items of the scale in the Turkish adaptation study conducted by Akın and Alabucak (2017), the corrected item-total correlation coefficients were found to be between .49 and .069. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis performed to examine the construct validity, the one-dimensional model was found to fit perfectly ($\chi^2 = .68$; $SD = 4$; $RMSEA = .000$; $SRMR = .0071$; $CFI = 1.00$; $GFI = 1.00$, $AGFI = .99$; $NFI = 1.00$). The reliability of the Career Satisfaction Scale was determined as $\alpha = .81$ as a result of the reliability analysis conducted by Akın and Alabucak (2017). As a result of the repeated analysis in this study, the reliability coefficient was found to be $\alpha = .828$. Therefore, it was concluded that the scale is reliable (Büyüköztürk, 2011).

3.3.3. General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES): The General Self-Efficacy Scale was developed by Sherer, Maddux, Mercandante et al. (1982) in order to determine the self-efficacy levels of individuals. The regulated form of the scale is a five-point Likert type. The original version of the scale consisted of 36 items. As a result of the factor analysis taken, some items were eliminated and a two-factor structure that includes general self-efficacy (Cronbach alpha = .86) and social self-efficacy (Cronbach alpha = .71) was established. Factor 1 explained 26.5% of the variance and consisted of 17 items. The second factor explained 8.5% of the variance and included 6 items. The improved scale was applied to a

new sample for the purpose of verifying the original factor structure, and the results were the same as the original two-factor solution.

In order to test the construct validity, the correlations obtained with both subscales and the measurement tools measuring some personality structures such as the Internal-External Control Scale and its subscale named as the Personal Control Subscale, Marlowe - Crowne Social Desirability Scale, the Ego Strength Scale, the Interpersonal Competency Scale, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale were examined. The correlation levels of the relevant scales with the mentioned scales were found in appropriate direction and at a medium level; the conceptual relationships predicted by the self-efficacy scale were confirmed. In the second application that was conducted for the purpose of measuring the criterion validity of the relevant scale; a questionnaire including demographic variables aiming to measure the success in vocational, educational and military fields were applied and it was observed that the results were related to the scores obtained from the General and Social Self-Efficacy subscales. These results demonstrated the structure of the self-efficacy scale and evidence for the criterion validity.

Yıldırım and İlhan (2010) adapted the relevant scale to Turkish and worked on the General Self-Efficacy form of the scale in their adaptation study. The factor structure of the scale examined by performing exploratory factor analysis and varimax rotation. Therefore, it was observed that there was a three-factor structure (Beginning, Persistence, Sustaining Effort - Insistence) with an eigenvalue above 1. The first factor's eigenvalue was 4.150 and explained 20.2% of the variance; second factor's eigenvalue was 1.786 and explained 11.9% of the variance; the eigenvalue of the third factor was 1.114 and explained 9.5% of the variance. However, the three-factor structure explained 41.47% of the variance. The item loads varied between .43 and .70.

Beck Depression Inventory, Spielberger Trait Anxiety Inventory, Locus of Control Scale, Learned Resourcefulness Scale, Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory was used to assess the validity of the scale. Significant statistical correlations were found between the General Self-Efficacy Scale and other scales. During the examination of criterion-related validity, the scores obtained from the General Self-Efficacy Scale were compared with the scores obtained from the Beck Depression Scale and Spielberg Trait Anxiety Inventory. Results showed that the scale could distinguish between low and high levels of depression and anxiety ($t = 5.846$, $p < .0001$ for depression; $t = 8.355$, $p < .0001$). The reliability study of the relevant scale showed the internal consistency reliability coefficient as .80. As a result of the split-half reliability analysis, Guttman Split-half coefficient was .77. Item-total correlations and Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for each item of the scale, and it was observed that these values ranged from .78 to .81. For test-retest reliability, the data obtained from a sample that accessed a second time were analyzed and the test-retest coefficient is found to be .69. In addition, the researchers state that instead of considering each factor as a subscale, it is appropriate to evaluate all items as a whole.

Respondents give the answers from "None (1)" to "Very Good (5)" to the question of "How much does it describe you?" in the scale items. Each question is scored between 1 and 5 and there are reverse-coded items (items 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, and 17). Total scores that can be obtained from the scale range between 17 and 85. Higher scores indicate that the individual's self-efficacy belief increases (Yıldırım & İlhan, 2010).

The reliability of the General Self-Efficacy Scale was determined as $\alpha = .800$ as a result of the reliability analysis conducted by Yıldırım and İlhan (2010). As a result of the repeated analysis in this study, the reliability coefficient was found to be $\alpha = .803$. Therefore, it was concluded that the scale is reliable (Büyüköztürk, 2011).

3.3.4. Career Anchors Scale (CAS): To evaluate career anchors, Career Anchors Scale developed by Solmaz and Gizir (2014) was used. During the development of the scale, Career Anchors Inventory developed by Schein (1990b); Career Values Scale developed by Chandler and Jansen (1991) and adapted by Aktaş (2004); Career Values Scale developed by Igbaria and Baroudi (1993) and adapted to Turkish by Erdoğan (2004) and related literature were used (as cited in Solmaz and Gizir, 2014).

Explanatory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were performed by the researchers who developed the scale to determine the validity and test the factor structure. As a result of EFA, it was seen that the scale had a 9-factor structure with an eigenvalue greater than 1 and explained 60.46% of the total variance. The total factor loads of the scale items ranged from .47 to .94. However, items 4 and 6 were excluded from the scale because they showed low item-total correlation. Moreover, items 10 and 13 were loaded into another dimension that was not conceptually appropriate, and item 29 was loaded into more than one dimension. In addition to EFA analysis, CFA analysis was performed and the factors measured by the relevant item groups and the characteristics of the factors were re-tested. As a result of the analysis, the 4th, 6th, 10th, 13th and 29th items were removed and a 4-point Likert-type evaluation system with 28 items and 9 factors ("Not at all (1) " and "Very Important (4)") was obtained. These factors are called General Managerial Competence, Technical Functional Competence, Entrepreneurial Creativity, Pure Challenge, Autonomy-Independence, Service and Dedication to a Cause, Job Security, Geographical Security and Lifestyle. Security and Stability career anchor, one of the career anchors mentioned in Schein's works, divided into two dimensions as "geographic security" and "job security" in this measurement tool. When the Lambda values showing the factor loadings of the scale items were examined, it was seen that the item factor loads varied between .59 and .88.

The reliability of the Career Anchors Scale was determined as $\alpha=.870$ as a result of the reliability analysis conducted by Solmaz and Gizir (2014). As a result of the repeated analysis in this study, the reliability coefficient was found to be $\alpha=.81$. Therefore, it was concluded that the scale is reliable (Büyüköztürk, 2011).

3.4. Data Collection Process

In order to conduct the research, permission was obtained from the researchers who adapted or developed the relevant scales for the use of measurement tools to be used in the research. Then, an application was made to the Yeditepe University Ethics Committee to obtain the necessary permissions to collect the data. After planning for the implementation, various departments of the company where the research would be conducted were informed. After the approval, the necessary information was obtained from the Human Resources department of the organization. Then, the questionnaires and an information form with explanations about the research were prepared, the forms were delivered to the employees and the data were collected.

3.5. Data Analysis

3.5.1 Preliminary Analyses

The data collected within the scope of the research evaluated via quantitative analysis methods. SPSS 25 statistical program was used for the related analyses. During the preparation of the data set, missing value and extreme value analyzes were performed in order to understand whether the data were normally distributed. Then, the kurtosis and skewness coefficients of the relevant research variables were calculated in order to understand whether the data set normally distributed. As a result of the research conducted to examine the relationships between the career satisfaction levels, self-efficacy levels and career anchors of the employees, firstly this study investigated whether the data set (319 participants) obtained

contains missing value and it was found that there was no missing value. Mahalanobis distance calculation made for analyzing whether there was an extreme value in the data set. The calculations showed that 13 participant scores were determined as extreme values. Therefore, they were removed from the data set. The analysis of the data continued with the remaining 306 participants. After clearing the data from extreme values, the kurtosis and skewness coefficients of the relevant research variables were calculated in order to understand whether they showed a normal distribution. The results are shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1.

Skewness and Kurtosis Values of Variables

Dependent Variable Score	N	Kurtosis	Skewness
Career Satisfaction	306	-.330	-.527
Self-Efficacy	306	-.067	-.550
Career Anchors	306	-.264	.089

As seen in Table 3.1, the kurtosis and skewness coefficients of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors variables are all in the range of -1.00 to +1.00. According to Büyüköztürk (2011), it is necessary for these values to be between -1.00 and +1.00 in order to ensure normal distribution in social sciences. Moreover, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), the range of these values between -1.50 and +1.50 is considered sufficient to ensure a normal distribution. Therefore, the data showed normal distribution.

In addition, demographic and occupational characteristics of the participants, as well as data on career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores determined by using descriptive statistical methods such as frequency and percentage analysis, arithmetic mean and standard deviation. Pearson correlation analysis conducted for the purpose of determining the relationships between career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchor scores. Comparison of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores according to

demographic and occupational characteristics was carried out using independent sample t-test, one-way ANOVA (analysis of variance) and Kruskal Wallis analyses. In case of significant difference in one-way ANOVA results, comparisons between groups were made with Tukey HSD multiple comparison test. Analyzes were performed at 95% confidence interval and $p < .05$ significance level.



4. FINDINGS

4.1. Findings Regarding the Demographic and Occupational Characteristics of the Participants

A total of 306 working individuals participated in this study conducted to examine the relationships between career satisfaction, self-efficacy levels and career anchors of employees. Table 4.1 shows the distribution of the participants according to demographic and occupational characteristics.

Table 4.1.

Distribution of Participants by Demographic and Occupational Characteristics

		n	%
Gender	Female	48	15.7
	Male	258	84.3
Age	20-29	39	12.7
	30-39	137	44.8
	40-49	105	34.3
	50-59	25	8.2
Graduated field	Physical Sciences	245	80.1
	Social Sciences	61	19.9
Task focus	Human-Oriented	89	29.1
	Non-human Oriented	217	70.9
Years of experience in the relevant institution	1-5 years	104	34
	6-10 years	67	21.9
	11-15 years	41	13.4
	16 years and above	94	30.7
Monthly income	2.000-2.999 TL	4	1.3
	3.000-3.999 TL	21	6.9
	4.000-4.999 TL	73	23.9
	5.000 TL and above	208	68
Total Score		306	100

As seen in Table 4.1, 15.7% (n=48) of the participants were female and 84.3% (n=258) were male; 12.7% (n=39) were between 20-29 years old, 44.8% (n=137) were between 30 -39 years old, 34.3% (n=105) between 40-49 years old, and 8.2% (n=25) were

between 50-59 years old. 80.1% (n=245) of the participants were physical sciences graduates and 19.9% (n=61) social sciences graduates. Also, 29.1% (n=89) were carrying out human-oriented tasks and 70.9% (n=217) were carrying out non-human oriented tasks.

Moreover, 34% of participants (n=104) have 1-5 years, 21.9% (n=67) have 6-10 years, 13.4% (n=41) have 11-15 years, and 30.7% (n=94) have over 16 years working experience in the relevant organization. Regarding monthly income, 1.3% (n=4) of the sample stated 2.000-2.999 TL, 6.9% (n=21) stated 3.000-3.999 TL, 23.9% (n=73) stated 4.000-4.999 TL and 68% (n= 208) stated 5.000 TL and above.

4.2. Descriptive Findings of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchors

Scores

In Table 4.2, descriptive statistics of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores and sub-dimensions are presented as a result of the evaluation of the answers given by the participants to the scale items.

Table 4.2

Descriptive Findings of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchors Scores

Variables	N	Min.	Max.	M	SD
Career Satisfaction	306	7.00	25.00	17.25	3.49
Self-Efficacy	306	50.00	85.00	70.12	7.91
<i>Getting Started</i>	306	17.00	45.00	37.76	5.25
<i>Persistence</i>	306	13.00	25.00	20.69	2.67
<i>Sustaining Effort-Insistence</i>	306	6.00	15.00	11.67	1.93
Career Anchors	306	60.00	105.00	81.88	9.06
<i>Job Security</i>	306	6.00	12.00	10.63	1.37
<i>Lifestyle</i>	306	6.00	12.00	10.40	1.44
<i>Service - Dedication to a Cause</i>	306	4.00	12.00	9.75	1.77
<i>Autonomy - Independence</i>	306	6.00	16.00	11.70	2.24
<i>General Managerial Competence</i>	306	4.00	16.00	11.23	2.90
<i>Enterpreneriual Creativity</i>	306	2.00	8.00	5.40	1.76
<i>Pure Challenge</i>	306	3.00	12.00	7.55	1.93
<i>Geographical Security</i>	306	2.00	8.00	5.03	1.86
<i>Technical-Functional Competence</i>	306	4.00	16.00	9.92	2.33

As seen in Table 4.2, the participants' career satisfaction mean scores were found to be (M=17.25, SD=3.49), and their self-efficacy score averages were found to be (M=70.12, SD=7.91). The mean scores of Starting subscale of self-efficacy (M=37.76, SD=5.25), the mean scores of Persistence subscale (M=20.69, SD=2.67) and the mean scores of Sustaining Effort/Insistence subscale (M=11.67, SD=1.93) were obtained. The average score of the participants' career anchors was found to be (M=81.88, SD=9.06). Sub-dimensions of career anchors showed that the average score of 9 dimensions as follows: for technical-functional competence (M=10.18, SD=2.79), general managerial competence (M=11.22, SD=2.89), entrepreneurial creativity (M=5.39, SD=2.79), autonomy and independence (M=11.69, SD=2.23), pure challenge (M=7.54, SD=1.93), service and dedication to a cause (M=9.75, SD=1.76), lifestyle (M=10.40, SD=1.43), job security (M=10.63, SD=1.36) and geographic security (M=5.03, SD=1.85).

4.3. Relationships Between Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchors Scores

The findings obtained as a result of the Pearson correlation analysis conducted for determining the relationships between career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchor scores are given in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

Relationships Between Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy, and Career Anchor Scores

Variables	1	2	3
1. Career Satisfaction	1		
2. Self-Efficacy	.171*	1	
3. Career Anchor	.039	.162*	1

* $p < .01$

As seen in Table 4.3, a weak level of positive ($r=.171$) and significant relationship found between career satisfaction and self-efficacy ($p < .01$). It was observed that the

relationship between career satisfaction and career anchors was not at a significant level ($p > .01$). A weak level of positive ($r = .162$) and significant relationship was found between career anchors and self-efficacy ($p < .01$).

4.4. Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Demographic and Occupational Characteristics

4.4.1. Gender

Table 4.4 presents the findings of the independent sample t-test, which was conducted to compare career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores by gender.

Table 4.4

Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Gender

	Gender	N	M	SD	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>
Career Satisfaction	Female	48	16.75	3.17	-1.092	304	.276
	Male	258	17.35	3.55			
Self-Efficacy	Female	48	70.31	6.59	.214	76.380	.831
	Male	258	70.08	8.14			
Career Anchors	Female	48	80.15	7.27	-1.710	78.887	.091
	Male	258	82.20	9.34			

As seen in Table 4.4, the scores obtained from career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors did not differ significantly by gender ($p > .05$).

4.4.2. Age

Table 4.5 presents the findings of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which was conducted to compare career satisfaction, self-efficacy, and career anchors scores by age.

Table 4.5*Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Age*

	Age	n	M	SD	Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Career Satisfaction	20-29	39	17.18	3.03	Between Groups	271.486	3	90.495	7.934	.000*
	30-39	137	16.28	3.43	Within Groups	3444.632	302	11.406		
	40-49	105	18.28	3.43	Total	3716.118	305			
	50-59	25	18.40	3.34						
Self-Efficacy	20-29	39	70.44	7.20	Between Groups	18.363	3	6,121	.097	.962
	30-39	137	69.88	8.07	Within Groups	19065.402	302	63,130		
	40-49	105	70.35	8.47	Total	19083.765	305			
	50-59	25	69.96	5.68						
Career Anchors	20-29	39	82.51	7.80	Between Groups	24.206	3	8.069	.097	.961
	30-39	137	81.88	9.58	Within Groups	25037.075	302	82.904		
	40-49	105	81.60	9.15	Total	25061.281	305			
	50-59	25	82.00	8.04						

* $p < .001$

As seen in Table 4.5, while the career satisfaction scores of the employees showed a significant difference according to age ($F(3,302)=7.934$, $p < .001$); self-efficacy ($F(3,302)=0.097$, $p > .001$) and career anchors ($F(3,302)=0.097$, $p > .001$) scores did not differ significantly by age ($p > .05$). Also, Tukey HSD multiple comparison (post-hoc) test was performed to determine whether career satisfaction scores differ significantly between which age groups and the results are given in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6

Multiple Comparison (Post-hoc) Findings on the Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchors Scores by Age

Dependent Variable	(A) Age	(B) Age	Difference Between Means (A-B)	p
Career Satisfaction	20-29	30-39	.89	.463
		40-49	-1.10	.309
		50-59	-1.22	.494
	30-39	20-29	-.89	.463
		40-49	-1.99	.000**
		50-59	-2.12	.022*
	40-49	20-29	1.10	.309
		30-39	1.99	.000**
		50-59	-.12	.998
	50-59	20-29	1.22	.494
		30-39	2.12	.022*
		40-49	.12	.998

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

As seen in Table 4.6, the career satisfaction levels of the participants between the ages of 40-49 ($M=18.28$, $SD=3.43$) and the career satisfaction levels of the participants between the ages of 50-59 ($M=18.40$, $SD=3.34$) were found to be significantly higher than the participants in the 30-39 age group ($M=16.28$, $SD=3.43$). The career satisfaction levels of the participants in the 20-29 age group ($M=17.18$, $SD=3.03$) were among the groups aged 40-59 and 30-39.

4.4.3. Graduated Field

Table 4.7 presents the findings obtained as a result of the independent sample t-test, which was conducted to compare career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores according to graduated field.

Table 4.7

Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Graduated Field

	Graduated Field	n	M	SD	t	df	p
Career Satisfaction	Physical Sciences	245	17.35	3.35	0.831	304	0.408
	Social Sciences	61	16.89	4.00			
Self-Efficacy	Physical Sciences	245	69.84	8.05	-1.210	304	0.227
	Social Sciences	61	71.21	7.27			
Career Anchors	Physical Sciences	245	81.57	8.85	-1.194	304	0.233
	Social Sciences	61	83.11	9.85			

As seen in Table 4.7, career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores did not differ significantly according to graduated field ($p>.05$).

4.4.4. Task Focus

Table 4.8 presents the findings obtained as a result of the independent sample t-test, which was conducted to compare career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores according to task focus.

Table 4.8

Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Task Focus

	Task Focus	n	M	SD	t	df	p
Career Satisfaction	Human-Oriented	89	18.19	3.22	3.045	304	.003*
	Non-Human Oriented	217	16.87	3.53			
Self-Efficacy	Human-Oriented	89	70.33	7.55	.294	304	.769
	Non-Human Oriented	217	70.03	8.07			
Career Anchor	Human-Oriented	89	81.03	9.24	-1.041	304	.299
	Non-Human Oriented	217	82.22	8.99			

* $p<0.01$

As seen in Table 4.8, self-efficacy scores did not differ significantly according to task focus ($t(304)= 0.294, p>.05$). Also, career anchor scores did not differ significantly according to task focus ($t(304)=-1.041, p>.05$). However, career satisfaction scores differed significantly according to the task focus ($t(304)=3.045, p<.01$). Means demonstrated that the career satisfaction of the participants who carried out a human-oriented task ($M=18.19, SD=3.22$) was found to be significantly higher than the participants who did not carry out a human-oriented task ($M=16.87, SD=3.53$), ($p<.05$).

4.4.5. Years of Experience in the Relevant Organization

Table 4.9 shows the findings obtained as a result of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which was conducted to compare career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores according to years of experience in the organization.

Table 4.9

Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Years of Experience in the Relevant Organization

	Years of experience	n	M	SD	Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F	p
Career Satisfaction	1-5 years	104	16.87	3.53	Between Groups	405.384	3	135.128	12.326	.000**
	6-10 years	67	16.27	3.39	Within Groups	3310.734	302	10.963		
	11-15 years	41	16.02	3.64	Total	3716.118	305			
	16 years and above	94	18.93	2.83						
Self-Efficacy	1-5 years	104	69.74	7.54	Between Groups	185.609	3	61.870	.989	.398
	6-10 years	67	71.21	7.54	Within Groups	18898.156	302	62.577		
	11-15 years	41	68.68	8.78	Total	19083.765	305			
	16 years and above	94	70.38	8.17						
Career Anchors	1-5 years	104	81.89	9.17	Between Groups	50.244	3	16.748	.202	.895
	6-10 years	67	81.19	8.42	Within Groups	25011.037	302	82.818		
	11-15 years	41	82.49	10.00	Total	25061.281	305			
	16 years and above	94	82.07	9.08						

**** $p<.001$**

As seen in Table 4.9, career satisfaction scores differed significantly according to years of experience ($F(3,302)=12.326$, $p<.001$). However, self-efficacy ($F(3,302)= 0.989$, $p>.05$) and career anchor scores ($F(3,302)=0.202$, $p>.05$) did not differ significantly according to years of experience in the organization. Thereupon, Tukey HSD multiple comparison (post-hoc) test was performed in order to determine between which groups the difference in career satisfaction scores was and the findings are given in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10

Multiple Comparison (Post-hoc) Findings on the Comparison of Career Satisfaction Scores by Years of Experience in the Relevant Organization

Dependent Variable	(A) Years of Experience	(B) Years of Experience	Difference Between Means (A-B)	P
Career Satisfaction	1-5 years	6-10 years	.60	.659
		11-15 years	.84	.515
		16 years and above	-2.06	.000**
	6-10 years	1-5 years	-.60	.659
		11-15 years	.24	.982
		16 years and above	-2.66	.000**
	11-15 years	1-5 years	-.84	.515
		11-15 years	-.24	.982
		16 years and above	-2.90	.000**
	16 years and above	1-5 years	2.06	.000**
		11-15 years	2.66	.000**
		16 years and above	2.90	.000**

**** $p<.001$**

As seen in Table 4.10, only the career satisfaction scores of the participants who have worked for 16 years or more ($M=18.93$, $SD=2.83$) was higher than the average scores of those who have worked for 1-5 years ($M=16.87$, $SD=3.53$); 6-10 years ($M=16.27$, $SD=3.39$) and 11-15 years ($M=16.02$, $SD=3.64$). However, when the mean scores of those with 1-5 years, 6-10 years and 11-15 years of employment were compared, no difference was found between the relevant groups ($p>.05$).

4.4.6. Monthly income

Table 4.11 presents the findings obtained as a result of the Kruskal-Wallis H test, which was conducted to compare career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores according to monthly income.

Table 4.11

Comparison of Career Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy and Career Anchor Scores by Monthly Income

	Monthly Income	n	Mean Rank	Kruskal-Wallis H	df	p
Career Satisfaction	2.000-2.999 TL	4	124.38	1.855	3	.603
	3.000-3.999 TL	21	135.31			
	4.000-4.999 TL	73	149.62			
	5.000 TL and above	208	157.26			
	Total	306				
Self Efficacy	2.000-2.999 TL	4	145.50	4.189	3	.242
	3.000-3.999 TL	21	170.07			
	4.000-4.999 TL	73	136.03			
	5.000 TL and above	208	158.11			
	Total	306				
Career Anchors	2.000-2.999 TL	4	125.63	.466	3	.926
	3.000-3.999 TL	21	151.24			
	4.000-4.999 TL	73	155.92			
	5.000 TL and above	208	153.42			
	Total	306				

As seen in Table 4.11, career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchor scores did not differ significantly according to monthly income ($p > .05$).

5. CONCLUSION

The data of this study carried out to examine the relationships between career satisfaction, self-efficacy levels and career anchors of employees were collected from 319 employee participants by questionnaire method. As a result of the normality analyzes, no missing values were found and the data of 306 working individuals were included in the analysis with the cleaning of the extreme values. In addition, it was determined that the kurtosis and skewness coefficients of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors were within the range of values suggested in the literature.

According to the descriptive analyzes made first, it was seen that the majority of the participant profile consisted of men and individuals in the 30-49 age group, and the number of participants in the 20-29 and 50-59 age groups was less. However, the majority of the participants were graduated from departments in the field of science and work in non-human-oriented tasks. Looking at the years of experience of the participants in the relevant institution, it was seen that individuals with a work experience of 1-5 years and more than 16 years participated in the study, the majority reported a monthly income of 5,000 TL and above, and a monthly income of at least 2,000-3,000 TL.

The mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum values of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores were calculated. The results of the central tendency measurements of the related variables are presented in the Table 4.2 of the findings section. Related analyzes were performed on the total scores of the responses given to the Demographic Information Form, Career Satisfaction Scale, General Self-Efficacy Scale and Career Anchors Scale.

Accordingly, low-level positive and significant relationships were found between self-efficacy and career satisfaction, and between self-efficacy and career anchors. It was observed

that the relationship between career satisfaction and career anchors was weakly positive, but not at a significant level.

In regard to the results obtained as a result of the independent sample t-test, which was conducted to understand whether the scores of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors differ significantly by gender, it was observed that the scores obtained from the scales of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors did not differ significantly according to gender.

According to the findings obtained as a result of the independent sample t-test, which was conducted to understand whether career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores differ significantly according to graduated field; career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchor scores did not show a significant difference according to graduated field.

When the findings obtained as a result of the independent sample t-test, which was conducted to compare career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores according to task focus were examined, it was seen that only career satisfaction scores differed significantly according to the task focus. When the averages were examined, the career satisfaction of the participants who carried out a human-oriented task was found to be significantly higher than the participants who did not carry out a human-oriented task.

According to the findings obtained as a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which was conducted to compare career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores according to years of experience, career satisfaction scores differed significantly according to years of experience in the organization. On the other hand, self-efficacy and career anchor scores did not differ significantly according to years of experience in the organization. Thereupon, Tukey HSD multiple comparison (post-hoc) test was performed in order to determine between which groups the difference in career satisfaction scores was, and the findings obtained were found to be significantly higher than all of the

other participants with a working period of 16 years or more. This was followed by the average scores of those with 1-5 years of employment, the average scores of those with 6-10 years of employment, and the average scores of those with 11-15 years of employment.

When the findings obtained as a result of the Kruskal-Wallis H test, conducted to compare the scores of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors according to monthly income; it was observed that career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchor scores did not differ significantly according to monthly income.

Necessary analyzes were performed on the total scores of the responses to the Demographic Information Form, Career Satisfaction Scale, General Self-Efficacy Scale and Career Anchors Scale. Accordingly, low-level positive and significant relationships were found between self-efficacy and career satisfaction, and between self-efficacy and career anchors. It was observed that the relationship between career satisfaction and career anchors was weakly positive, but not at a significant level.

According to the results obtained as a result of the independent sample t-test, which was conducted to understand whether the scores of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors differ significantly by gender, it was observed that the scores obtained from the scales of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors did not differ significantly according to gender.

The career satisfaction between the ages of 20-29 decreases considerably between the ages of 30-39 and rises again between the ages of 40-59 and reaches a level that differs significantly from the 30-39 age period. The highest career satisfaction belongs to the participants between the ages of 40-59. This was followed by participants aged 20-29 and participants aged 30-39. The career satisfaction levels of the participants aged 40-59 differed significantly from the participants aged 30-39.

According to the findings obtained as a result of the independent sample t-test, which was conducted to understand whether career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchor scores differ significantly according to graduation area, career satisfaction self-efficacy and career anchor scores did not show a significant difference according to graduated field (physical / social sciences).

Considering the findings obtained as a result of the independent sample t-test, which was conducted to compare career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores according to task focus, it was seen that only self-efficacy scores did not differ significantly according to task focus. In addition, career anchor scores did not differ significantly by task focus. However, career satisfaction scores differed significantly according to the task focus. When the averages were examined, the career satisfaction of the participants who carried out a human-oriented task was found to be significantly higher than the participants who did not carry out a human-oriented task.

According to the findings obtained as a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which was conducted to compare career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores according to years of experience in the relevant organization, career satisfaction scores differed significantly according to years of experience. According to the findings obtained as a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which was conducted to compare career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores according to years of experience, career satisfaction scores differed significantly according to years of experience in the organization. On the other hand, self-efficacy and career anchor scores did not differ significantly according to years of experience. Then, Tukey HSD multiple comparison (post-hoc) test was performed in order to determine between which groups the difference in career satisfaction scores was, and the findings obtained were found to be significantly higher than all of the other participants with a working experience of 16 years or

more. This was followed by the average scores of those with 1-5 years of employment, the average scores of those with 6-10 years of employment, and the average scores of those with 11-15 years of employment.

When the findings obtained as a result of the Kruskal-Wallis H test conducted to compare the scores of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors according to monthly income were examined, it was observed that career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchor scores did not differ significantly according to monthly income.



6.DISCUSSION

This research was conducted to examine the relationship between career satisfaction levels, self-efficacy levels and career anchors of employees. In addition, the status of each variable according to demographic characteristics such as gender, age, years of experience in the relevant institution, graduated field, task focus, monthly income were examined. The data obtained were evaluated in the light of quantitative analysis methods. Considering the demographic structure of the study, it is possible to say that the majority of the participants are male employees who have graduated from the fields of science, carry out non-human-oriented tasks, are under the age of 40, are in the first / middle stages of their careers in terms of years of experience in the organization and can be described as having a good income.

Bursa province has an important position in terms of industry and hosts many automotive companies that will contribute to the automotive sector and subsidiaries where the workforce factor is important. The fact that male employees employed in enterprises in the automotive sector are more than female employees is generally observed in regions that come to the fore with industry. In such companies, fields such as mechanics and engineering have offered more opportunities to the male workforce, these fields have become areas where women avoid careers (Aksoy, 2020), but today it can be observed that this situation has begun to change. For example, according to the report titled “Women in the Turkish Automotive Industry” prepared in cooperation with Deloitte and the Automotive Industry Association in 2017, the rate of women among white-collar employees working in the automotive industry is stated as 25%. According to the data, the automotive sector predominantly prefers women who have received education in fields such as engineering, business and economy.

Emphasis has been placed on employing more women in recent years, the importance of women employees in establishing a work-family life balance and the perspective of women

on their careers gain importance. Increasing female employment in large automotive companies draws attention (Otohaber,2016). 52% of women think that they can reach their main career goals in the automotive industry, as reported in "Women in the Turkish Automotive Industry'' (2017). In addition, 57% of women working in the automotive sector stated that they are satisfied with working in this field. For this reason, it may be possible to create a more balanced sample of male and female participants in various sectors in future studies on internal resources such as career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors.

Similarly, it is expected for the automotive industry that the participants who carry out human-oriented tasks such as human resources and team leadership are less than those working in engineering and technical fields. Organizations in the automotive sector are in close association with business lines such as mechanics, sub-industry, iron and steel, petrochemistry, glass, plastic, textile and electronics. It also serves sectors such as agriculture, tourism, defense, transportation, infrastructure and construction that need motor vehicles and is closely related to the marketing, dealer, service, fuel, finance and insurance (Kabasakal, 2021). For this reason, it was seen that the distribution of the participants, who worked in non-human-oriented tasks and people-oriented tasks, where technical skills were actively used, was close to the estimated one. As a result of the research, it can be thought that the participants have medium-good levels of career satisfaction and career anchors and good level of self-efficacy.

When the relationships between career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors are examined, it has been determined that there are low-level positive but significant relationships between self-efficacy and career satisfaction and between self-efficacy and career anchors.

As a matter of fact, in the study conducted by Yalalova and Zhang (2017), it was seen that there was a positive and significant relationship between self-efficacy and career satisfaction.

Ballout (2009) also found positive and significant relationships between self-efficacy and career satisfaction. In the study conducted by Kendir and Özkoç (2018), it was stated that there was a positive, significant but weak relationship between self-efficacy and career satisfaction variables. Chughtai (2008) found a positive and significant relationship between career self-efficacy and career satisfaction. In the study of Pan, Sun, and Chow (2011), self-efficacy was positively related to career satisfaction. In their research, Abele and Spurk (2009a) showed that the professional self-efficacy measured at the beginning of the career had a positive effect on the salary change and career satisfaction after 7 years. In the study conducted by Valcour and Ladge (2008), self-efficacy showed a positive relationship with career satisfaction. According to the findings obtained in the study by Ngo and Hui (2018), it was seen that there was a positive correlation between self-efficacy and career satisfaction. Considering that high self-efficacy levels of individuals are associated with positive career outcomes, this positive relationship may be the result or antecedent of personal interpretations formed through the interaction of the individual's goals and expectations with his internal processes and the fulfillment of expectations.

In this study, a positive correlation was also found between self-efficacy and career anchors, and no similar study was found to detect this relationship. Each career anchor put forward by Edgar Schein reflects different motivations that stand out in the individual. For example, for the individual whose technical-functional career anchor is dominant, it is important to specialize in his field and to do the best work in this context. The level of belief of these people achieving a certain goal or task may provide clues that will shape the behavior patterns and motivation of the person in working life with the effect of the dominant career anchor in the realization of the career goal. Therefore, an in-depth analysis of the relationship between these two variables may reveal important results.

It was determined in this study that there was no significant relationship between career satisfaction and career anchors. In other words, there is no statistically significant relationship between career satisfaction and career anchors. In terms of averages, autonomy-independence was the career anchor with the highest rate. This was followed by career anchors in general managerial competence, lifestyle and job security. It has been observed that these findings are partially consistent with the studies in the literature. For example, in the study conducted by Igbaria, Kassicieh, and Silver (1999), it was found that career satisfaction was positively related to geographical security and lifestyle values; service, job security, and lifestyle values were determined to be the most common career values. Jiang, Klein, and Balloun (2001) observed that internal and external career anchors were positively related to career satisfaction. In other words, the stronger the internal career anchors and the better the external career factors provided by the organization, the higher the career satisfaction. Career satisfaction was positively correlated with geographic security and lifestyle career values. While managerial and technical competence values were at the lowest level in the sample of the study, service, job security, and lifestyle values were found at the highest level in the sample. In addition, Sakal and Yıldız (2015) state that there is a positive and significant relationship between career anchors, technical functional competence, security-stability, lifestyle dimensions and career satisfaction.

Important results were also obtained as a result of the comparison of career satisfaction, self-efficacy and career anchors scores according to demographic and occupational characteristics. Gender, age, graduated area, task focus, working period and monthly income do not significantly differentiate self-efficacy and career anchors. Accordingly, it can be considered that all participants have similar levels of self-efficacy and career anchors, regardless of gender, age, graduation area, task focus, years of experience in the organization and monthly income. Self-efficacy is positively related to income and career

satisfaction in Valcour and Ladge (2008)'s Chughtai (2008) indicates career self-efficacy was positively associated with both career satisfaction and hierarchical status.

Looking at similar studies and researcher comments on career satisfaction, it was seen that there were no consistent results regarding the relationships between demographic variables and career satisfaction. Peluchette (1991) also emphasized that while in some studies examining career satisfaction, significant differences were not observed in terms of gender factor, while in others, gender made a difference in terms of career satisfaction. In the study conducted by Yalalova and Zhang (2017), it was determined that the career satisfaction variable of women is higher than that of men. In Ballout (2009)'s research, career commitment, self-efficacy, and the control variables gender, work experience, and education were significantly correlated with the career success variables with the exception of gender and career satisfaction. The additional responsibilities that female employees have due to their family roles are seen as one of the factors affecting career satisfaction. Therefore, it is expected that different results will be obtained in the relationship between the gender factor and career satisfaction. Another reason for this situation may be the requirements of the employee profiles in the sector in terms of competency and qualification, and the different trends in female and male employee profiles according to the sectoral characteristics. Since factors such as graduation area, the characteristics of the field of study, age, income may also differ according to the sectoral characteristics and the competencies and expectations of the employee profile, different results can be obtained in larger sectors and samples.

Career satisfaction differed significantly in this study according to age, task focus and years of experience. The career satisfaction of the employees in the 40-59 age range was found to be the highest and it differed significantly from the employees in the 30-39 age range. Participants between the ages of 20-29 represented career satisfaction between these two groups. Therefore, it can be said that career satisfaction between the ages of 20-29

decreases considerably between the ages of 30-39, and rises again between the ages of 40-59 and reaches a level that differs significantly from the 30-39 age period. Considering the studies conducted between career satisfaction and age, similarly, it has been observed that while career satisfaction is high in the 20s, it decreases in the 30s, but starts to rise again in the following period (Peluchette, 1991). It can be expected that the level of meeting the expectations of young employees at the beginning of their careers will have a significant impact on their career satisfaction. It can be expected that the level of meeting the expectations of young employees at the beginning of their careers will have a significant impact on their career satisfaction. As the age of the employees increases, there is an increase in the level of satisfaction in their careers by means of increasing experience affects the compliance positively (Toker, 2007). Therefore, it can be said that the result obtained in this study is compatible with the current opinions.

In terms of task focus; the career satisfaction of employees who carry out people-oriented tasks was found to be significantly higher than those who do not carry out people-oriented tasks. It is stated by Gerçek, Elmas-Atay and Dündar (2015) that the education, competencies and work experiences of the employee are directly related to career satisfaction. Non-human-oriented tasks are those that require more technical knowledge and skills, emphasizing time management and planning. People-oriented tasks depict a structure that requires the best management of human resources and, in this respect, developing personal skills as well as interpersonal skills. Since they have a mental structure that focuses more on their own personal development, it can be thought that the satisfaction level of the individuals involved in these tasks is higher in their careers. In addition, human-oriented tasks, which have a structure that includes interpersonal communication and interaction, can have the power to make individuals feel that they contribute to society, and this may bring them satisfaction from their careers.

It has been observed that employees who have a working life of 16 years or more in the relevant organization have a significantly higher career satisfaction than those who have less working life. It is pointed out that factors such as work experience and years of experience in the relevant organization are directly related to the career goals and career satisfaction of the employees (Knight, 2006).

However, it can be expected that employees who have less work experience and who are new to work will have higher career satisfaction levels. There are also studies showing that those who have worked in the same organization for longer have lower career satisfaction than those who have just started (e.g. Amstrong & Cameron, 2005). This may be due to the fact that these individuals think that the opportunity to find a job, to develop, to progress in other institutions or to be promoted in the institution decreases by working in the relevant organization for a long time. An employee wants reward systems such as wage and promotions applied in his/her workplace to be in line with his/her expectations and targets, and ensure their existing rights are respected and that any discrimination is not made. As stated by Gerçek, Atay and Dündar (2015), it is possible to state that the career satisfaction of employees who believe that they have achieved their goals and who perceive that they are presented with the necessary opportunities for their development will be at a high level. It is suggested that there will be uncertainty in career satisfaction due to the sense of uncertainty in the perceptions of individuals who work in a shorter period of time (e.g. Loi, Hang-yue & Foley, 2004). These situations can also be explained by the new career approaches towards working life, not being tied to an organization and the desire to manage one's own career.

As a result; the distribution of employees in non-human-oriented tasks where technical skills are actively used, jobs that are stated to be predominantly male in the historical process, and people-oriented tasks where interpersonal skills are important, are not balanced in terms

of gender and task focus in this study. It can be said that this is an expected result in terms of the competencies of the participants and the qualifications of the company they work for.

However, the fact that the participants who perform human-oriented tasks based on interpersonal communication and interaction have a better level of career satisfaction indicates that this may have an effect that increases the belief that employees in these jobs have important contributions at the organizational and individual level. In addition, it was determined that the participants had medium-good levels of career satisfaction and career anchors and good self-efficacy.

Considering that high self-efficacy levels are associated with significant career outcomes, the positive relationship between self-efficacy and career satisfaction offers important ideas in terms of the interaction of the individual's internal processes and the results obtained. It can be thought that the high self-efficacy shown by the employees can positively affect the career satisfaction, which is one of the subjective evaluations of the individual in business life. The positive correlation between self-efficacy and career anchors is important in terms of conducting and comparing similar studies that can detect this relationship in different employee groups. Career anchors of individuals can give an idea about their different motivations for their careers.

The lack of a significant positive relationship between career anchors and career satisfaction is thought to be due to limitations related to the sample. Career satisfaction differed significantly in this study according to age, task focus and years of experience. However; gender, age, graduated field, task focus, years of experience and monthly income did not significantly differentiate the group's self-efficacy and career anchors. The demographic variables mentioned in this study are frequently used in the literature, and since they may differ according to the sectoral characteristics and the competency and expectations of the employee profile, different results can be obtained in different samples.

In terms of averages regarding career anchors, autonomy-independence was the career anchor with the highest rate. This was followed by general-managerial competence, lifestyle and job security. Accordingly, it can be thought that the changes brought about by the changing career understanding today may affect the career values of the employees.

7.SUGGESTIONS

One of the important limitations of the research is that it was studied in a small sample for financial and practical reasons within the pandemic conditions existing in our country during the years 2020-2021. Larger samples may be determined and employees working in various institutions and organizations in different provinces or sectors may be included in the studies to be conducted on this subject.

Today, the increasing importance given to career satisfaction, the differentiation of the demographic characteristics of the working groups necessitate the formation of many application and development opportunities for the employees who undertake the responsibility of managing their careers in order to manage the human resources both operationally and psychologically effectively and efficiently. For this reason, the importance of conducting studies with various organizations affiliated to the private and public sector and with various professional groups such as academics and artists becomes evident.

The reasons for the low level of positive relationship between career satisfaction and self-efficacy and career anchors may be due to the fact that most of the participants are in the early or middle stages of their careers. Moreover, the training and development opportunities available in the company they work for, the remuneration policies, the variability of the criteria for evaluating the quality and quantity of human resources practices may be other influential factors, as well as the mixed feelings and thoughts and concerns about the future caused by the sense of uncertainty created in the pandemic conditions. For this reason, it is not possible to generalize the results, and it is recommended to conduct similar studies and compare the results, considering that the results are valid for the sample in which the research was conducted.

It has been observed in the literature that the relationships between the concept of career satisfaction and many demographic variables were examined and different results were reached. In the light of the mutual interaction process which is also emphasized in Social Cognitive Career Theory, valuable data will be obtained and implementations for career counseling and development will be shaped by examining the correlational and causal relationships of variables reflecting subjective perceptions and evaluations, as well as with other internal resources such as career commitment, career motivation, occupational commitment, career commitment, and environmental variables such as organizational support, relations in work environment, training and development opportunities.

In addition, with a longitudinal study examining the, career satisfaction, career anchors and self-efficacy levels of employees may be monitored from year to year. In addition, concepts related to qualitative research designs can be explored in depth with semi-structured interviews.

Career anchors theory put forward by Schein, one of the prominent views in the literature, provides important data that will help to understand and predict the dominant trends that will shape the career journey of employees and the sense of satisfaction obtained from career in today's business world. More than one career anchor may be prominent in individuals, as some researchers after Schein have suggested. When the content of studies on the similar content is examined in the literature, it is observed that important balance points such as work life and family life outside of the inner world of individuals can be influential factors in their career steps. For this reason, more research is needed to examine the relationships between career anchors and career satisfaction, career anchors and person-environment compatibility, and person-job compatibility in more detail.

Finally, these type of researches may be repeated in various sectors in different countries. Moreover, relations of internal and external factors (e.g. cultural context and working conditions) and the effects of these relations on career satisfaction may be examined.



REFERENCES

- Abele, A. E., & Spurk, D. (2009a). How do objective and subjective career success interrelate over time? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(4), 803–824. doi: 10.1348/096317909X470924
- Abele, A.E. & Spurk, D. (2009b). The longitudinal impact of self-efficacy and career goals on objective and subjective career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74 (1), 53-62. doi: /10.1016/j.jvb.2008.10.005
- Akat, İ., & Budak, G. (1994) *İşletme yönetimi*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.
- Akın, A., & Alabucak, E. (2017). Kariyer doyumu ölçeği (KDÖ) Türkçe formu: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *1. Uluslararası İpekyolu Akademik Çalışmalar Sempozyumu Bildiri Tam Metin Kitabı* (p. 174-188). Nevşehir: ISSAS.
- Aksoy, A.R. (2020, 6 Mart). Otomotiv sektöründe kadının yeri ve önemi [Blog yazısı]. Erişim adresi: <https://blog.ford.com.tr/otomotiv-sektorunde-kadinin-yeri-ve-onemi>
- Anafarta, A., & Yılmaz, Ö. (2019). Kariyer tatmini ve işten ayrılma niyeti arasındaki ilişkide işe adanmışlığın aracılık rolü. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 11(4), 2944-2959. doi: 10.20491/isarder.2019.786
- Armstrong-Stassen, M., & Cameron, S. (2005). Factors related to the career satisfaction of older managerial and professional women. *Career Development International*, 10(3), 203-215. doi: 10.1108/13620430510598328
- Arthur, M. B., Hall, D.T., & Lawrence, B.S. (1989). *Handbook of career theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (1996). Introduction: the boundaryless career as a new employment principle. In M. B. Arthur, & D. M. Rousseau (Eds)., *The boundaryless career:*

A new employment principle for a new organizational era (pp.3-20). New York: Oxford University Press.

Arthur, M. B., Khapova, S. N., & Wilderom, C. P. (2005). Career success in a boundaryless career world. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26 (2), 177-202. doi: 10.1002/job.290

Aryee, S., Wyatt, T., & Stone, R. (1996). Early career outcomes of graduate employees: the effect of mentoring and ingratiation. *Journal of Management Studies*. 33(1), 95-118. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.1996.tb00800.x.

August, L., & Waltman, J. (2004). Culture, climate, and contribution: Career satisfaction among female faculty. *Research on Higher Education*, 45(2), 177-192. Retrieved from: www.jstor.org/stable/40197343

Avcı, U., & Turunç, Ö. (2012). Dönüşümcü liderlik ve örgüte güvenin kariyer memnuniyetine etkisi: Lider-üye etkileşiminin aracılık rolü. *Uluslararası Alanya İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(2), 45-55. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315841751>

Aytaç, S. (1997). *Çalışma yaşamında kariyer*. İstanbul: Epsilon Yayıncılık.

Aytekin, I., Erdil, O., Erdoğan, N., & Akgün, A. E. (2016). Academicians' career capital and career satisfaction: The mediation effect of research productivity. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 16(6), 1921–1945. doi: 10.12738/estp.2016.6.0412

Ballout, H. I. (2007). Career success: The effects of human capital, person-environment fit and organizational support. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(8), 741–765. doi: 10.1108/02683940710837705

Ballout, H. I. (2009). Career commitment and career success: Moderating role of self-efficacy. *Career Development International*, 14(7), 655-670. doi: 10.1108/13620430911005708

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Regulation of cognitive processes through perceived self-efficacy. *Developmental Psychology*, 25(5), 729–735. doi:/10.1037/0012-1649.25.5.729.
- Bandura, A. (1994). *Self-efficacy*. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (Ed.). (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511527692.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2(1), 21-41. doi: 10.1111/1467-839X.00024
- Bandura, A. (2000). Self-efficacy: The foundation of agency. In W. J. Perrig & A. Grob (Eds.), *Control of human behavior, mental processes, and consciousness: Essays in honor of the 60th birthday of August Flammer* (pp. 17–33). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Bandura, A., Adams, N.E. (1977). Analysis of self-efficacy theory of behavioral change. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 1(4), 287–310. doi: 10.1007/BF01663995
- Baruch, Y. (2004). Transforming careers: from linear to multidirectional career paths: Organizational and individual perspectives. *Career Development International*. 9(1), 58-73. doi: 10.1108/13620430410518147
- Barutçugil, İ. (2004). *Stratejik insan kaynakları yönetimi*. İstanbul: Kariyer Yayınları.

- Buckley, L. B. & Petrunik, M. G. (1995). Socio-demographic factors, reference groups and the career orientations, career aspirations and career satisfaction of Canadian police officers. *American Journal of Police*, 14(2): 107-148. doi: 10.1108/07358549510102785.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2011). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2012). *Örnekleme yöntemleri* (PDF belgesi). 15.11.2020 tarihinde <http://w3.balikesir.edu.tr/~msackes/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/BAY-Final-Konulari.pdf> adresinden erişildi.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2018). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Cable, D.M., & De Rue, D.S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5), 875-884. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.5.875
- Cerdin, J.L. & Pargneux, M.L. (2010). Career anchors: A comparison between organization-assigned and self-initiated expatriates. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 52(4), 287-299. doi: 10.1002/tie.20350
- Chapman, J. R. (2015). Fostering career management using career anchor theory. In P. J. Hartung, M. L. Savickas, & W. B. Walsh (Eds.), *APA handbook of career intervention, Vol. 2. Applications* (pp. 507–520). American Psychological Association. doi: 10.1037/14439-037
- Chen C.P. (2008). Career Guidance with Immigrants. In Athanasou, J.A., Van Esbroeck, R. (Eds), *International handbook of career guidance*. Springer, Dordrecht. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-6230-8_21

- Chughtai, A. A. (2008). Impact of job involvement on in-role job performance and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 9(2), 169–183.doi: 10.21818/001c.17123
- Coetzee, M. (2008). Psychological career resources of working adults: A South African survey. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34(2), 10–20. doi: 10.4102/sajip.v34i2.491
- Coetzee, M., & Bergh, Z. C. (2009). Psychological career resources and subjective work experiences of working adults: An exploratory study. *Southern African Business Review*, 13(2), 1-31. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228371666_Psychological_career_resources_and_subjective_work_experiences_of_working_adults_An_exploratory_study
- Coetzee, M., & Schreuder, A.M.G. (2009). Psychological career resources as predictors of working adults' career anchors: An exploratory study. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 35(1), 117-127. doi: 10.4102/sajip.v35i1.833
- Coetzee, M., Bergh, Z., & Schreuder, D. (2010), The influence of career orientations on subjective work experiences : Original research. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8 (1), 1-13. doi: 10.4102/sajhrm.v8i1.279
- Conley, S., Muncey, D.E., You, S. (2005). Standards- based evaluation and teacher career satisfaction: A structural equation modeling analysis. *J. Pers Eval Educ*, 18, 39-65.
- Çarıkçı, İ. H., Oksay, A., Çiftçi, M., & Derya, S. (2009). Türk Yöneticilerinde İş Aile Yaşam Çatışması. *International Davraz Congress*, 24-27 September, Isparta, p. 159-160.
- Çetin, B., & Dünder, G. (2010). İşletmelerde Uygulanan Toplam Kalite Yönetimi Uygulamalarının Performans Değerlendirme Fonksiyonuna Etkisi. *9. Ulusal İşletmecilik Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı*, Zonguldak, s.137-141.

- Çetin, C., & Mavisu, H. (2018). Hedef belirleme=Nesnel kariyer başarısı???. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5 (20), 219-241. doi: 10.16990/SOBIDER.4039
- Çetin, A., Tekmen, E.E., & Şentürk, M. (2016). Mesleki bağlılık ve mesleki öz-yeterlik algısının bilgi paylaşma davranışına etkisi. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 6(2), 289-315. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/382472>
- Danziger, N., & Valency, R. (2006). Career Anchors: Distribution and impact on job satisfaction: The Israel Case. *Career Development International*, 11(4), 293-303. doi: 10.1108/13620430610672513
- Danziger, N., Rachman-Moore, D., & Valency, R. (2008). The construct validity of Schein's Career Anchors Orientation Inventory. *Career Development International*, 13(1), 7-19. doi: 10.1108/13620430810849506
- Day, R., & Allen, T. (2004). The relationship between career motivation and self-efficacy with protégé career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(1), 72-91. doi: 10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00036-8.
- DeFillippi, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1994). The boundaryless career: a competency-based perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 307-324. doi:10.1002/job.4030150403
- Delong, T.J. (1982). Reexamining the career anchor model. *Personnel*, 59(3), 50-61.
- Demirdelen, D., & Ulama, Ş. (2013). Demografik değişkenlerin kariyer tatminine etkileri: Antalya'da 5 yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. *Sakarya Üniversitesi İşletme Bilimi Dergisi*, 1(2), 65-89. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/jobs/issue/22917/245394>
- Derr, C. (2008). Five definitions of career success: Implications for relationships. *Applied Psychology*, 35(3), 415 - 435. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.1986.tb00940.x.

- Durmuş, A., Otlu, F., & Özkan, Ö. (2019). Sosyal bilişsel kariyer teorisi ve öğrencilerin serbest muhasebeci mali müşavir olma hedefleri: İnönü Üniversitesi uygulaması. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 18 (4), 1381-1398. doi: 10.21547/jss.464775.
- Du Toit, D. (2010). *The relationship between archetypal values, career orientations, perceived career success and meaningfulness*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of South Africa, Pretoria.
- Dyke, L., & Duxbury, L. (2011). The implications of subjective career success. *Journal for Labour Market Research*, 43(3), 219-229. doi: 10.1007/s12651-010-0044-4.
- Eby, L. T., Butts, M., & Lockwood, A. (2003). Predictors of success in the era of the boundaryless career. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(6), 689–708. doi: 10.1002/job.214
- Elmas-Atay, S. (2017). Work values fit and subjective career success: the moderating role of work engagement. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(3), 113-120. doi: 10.32479/irmm.5740
- Erdoğan, N. (2002). Yeni kariyer yaklaşımları ve kariyer değerlerindeki değişim. *I. Ulusal Bilgi, Ekonomi ve Yönetim Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı*, Kocaeli.
- Erdoğan, N. (2003). *Kariyer geliştirme: Kuram ve uygulama*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
- Erdoğan, N. (2004). Career orientations of salaried professionals: The case of Turkey. *Career Development International*, 9(2), 153-175. doi: 10.1108/13620430410526193.
- Evans, C. (1996). A review of career anchors in use. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(4), 609-615. doi:10.1080/13594329608414883
- Feldman, D. C. (1989). Careers in organizations: Recent trends and future directions. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 135–156. doi:10.1177/014920638901500202

- Feldman, D. C., & Bolino, M. C. (1996). Careers within careers: reconceptualising the nature of career anchors and their consequences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 6(2), 89-112. doi: 10.1016/S1053-4822(96)90014-5
- Feldman, D.C., & Bolino, M.C. (2000). Career patterns of the self-employed: Career motivations and career outcomes. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 38(3), 53-67. Retrieved from: <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.467.5387&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Fu, J.R. (2010). Is information technology career unique? Exploring differences in career commitment and its determinants among it and non-it employess. *International Journal of Electronic Business Management*, 8(4), 272-281. Retrieved from: <http://ir.lib.kuas.edu.tw/bitstream/987654321/13884/2/84-Is+Information+Technology+Career+unique+Exploring+Differences+in+Career+Commitment+and+its+Determinants+among+IT+and+Non-IT+Employees.pdf>
- Gattiker, U., & Larwood, L. (1986). Subjective career success: A study of managers and support personnel. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1(2), 78-94. doi: 10.1007/BF01018805
- Gattiker, U. E., & Larwood, L. (1989). Career success, mobility and extrinsic satisfaction of corporate managers. *The Social Science Journal*, 26(1), 75–92. doi: 10.1016/0362-3319(89)90039-6
- Gerçek, M., Atay, S.E., & Dündar, G. (2015). Çalışanların iş- yaşam dengesi ile kariyer tatmininin, işten ayrılma niyetine etkisi. *Kafkas Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 6(11), 67-86. doi: 10.18025/kauibf.6.10.2015.94384
- Gottfredson, L. S. (1996). Gottfredson's theory of circumscription and compromise. In D. Brown & L. Brooks (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (pp. 179-132). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Gökdeniz, İ., & Merdan, E. (2011). Kişilik ile kariyer seçimi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Aksaray Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(2), 23-36. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/aksarayiibd/issue/22553/240997>
- Greenhaus, J.H. (1987). *Career management*. Orlando, Florida: Dryden Press.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job-performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 64-86. doi: 10.2307/256352
- Greenhaus, J. H., Callanan, G. A., & Godshalk, V. M. (2010). *Career management*. London: Sage Publications.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Callanan, G. A., & Godshalk, V. M. (2018). *Career management for life*. Routledge.
- Günay, G. (2018). *Kariyer çapaları ve kariyer tatmini arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesine yönelik X ve Y kuşağı çalışanları üzerinde bir araştırma* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Arel Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Gürbüz, S., & Sıgır, Ü. (2012). Kariyer çapalarının, temel benlik değerlendirilmesi ve kültürel değerler ile ilişkisi: Türkiye ve ABD karşılaştırılması. 20. *Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi*, İzmir.
- Hackett, G., & Betz, N. E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 18, 326-336. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(81)90019-1
- Hall, D. T. (1976). *Careers in organizations*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman & Co.
- Hall, D., & Chandler D. (2005). Psychological success: When the career is a calling. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(2), 155-176. doi: 10.1002/job.301

- Herrbach, O., & Mignonac, K. (2012). Perceived gender discrimination and women's subjective career success: The moderating role of career anchors. *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*, 67(1), 25-50. doi: 10.7202/1008194ar
- Heslin, P.A. (2005). Conceptualizing and evaluating career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(2), 113-136. doi: 10.1002/job.270
- Igarria, M., Greenhaus, J., & Parasuraman, S. (1991). Career orientations of MIS employees: An empirical analysis. *MIS Quarterly*, 15(2), 151-169. doi: 10.2307/249376
- Igarria, M., Kassiech, S., & Silver, M. (1999). Career orientations and career success among research, and development and engineering professionals. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 16(1), 29-54. doi: 10.1016/S0923-4748(98)00027-7
- Järllström, M. (2000). Personality preferences and career expectations of Finnish business students. *Career Development International*, 5(3), 144-154. doi:10.1108/13620430010371919
- Jiang, J., Klein, G., & Balloun, J. (2001). The joint impact of internal and external career anchors on entry-level IS career satisfaction. *Information & Management*, 39(1), 31-39. doi: 10.1016/S0378-7206(01)00077-5
- Joo, B.K.B., & Park, S. (2010). Career satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention: The effects of goal orientation, organizational learning culture and developmental feedback. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 31(6), 482-500. doi: 10.1108/01437731011069999
- Joo, B.K.B., & Ready, K.J., (2012). Career satisfaction: The influences of proactive personality, performance goal orientation, organizational learning culture, and leader-member exchange quality. *Career Development International*, 17(3), 276 – 295. doi: 10.1108/13620431211241090

- Judge, T.A., Cable, D.M., Boudreau, J.W. & Bretz, R.D. (1995). An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 48 (3), 485-519. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01767.x
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits-self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability-with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 80–92. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80
- Kabasakal, İ. (2021). Pandemide ivme kazanan sektör: Otomotiv. Ods Danışmanlık. Retrieved from: <https://odsdanismanlik.com/tr/makaleler/pandemide-ivme-kazanan-sektor-otomotiv/>
- Kale, E. (2019). Proaktif kişilik ve kontrol odağının, kariyer tatmini ve yenilikçi iş davranışına etkisi. *Journal of Tourism Theory and Research*, 5(2), 144-154. doi: 10.24288/jttr.527358
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kavanagh, D. J., & Bower, G. H. (1985). Mood and self-efficacy: Impact of joy and sadness on perceived capabilities. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 9(5), 507–525. doi: 10.1007/BF01173005
- Kendir, H., & Özkoç, A. (2018). Otel işletmelerinde çalışanların kariyer tatmini ve kariyer bağlılığı ilişkisinde öz yeterliliğin rolü. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 6(4), 78-112. doi: 10.21325/jotags.2018.299
- King, Z. (2004). Career self- management: Its nature, causes and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65(1), 112– 133. doi: 10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00052-6
- Kitapçı, H. ve Sezen, B. (2002). Çalışanların tatminini belirleyici unsurlar üzerine bir araştırma: Kariyer süreci örneği. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12 (1), 219-230.

- Knight, D. K. (2006). The impact of retail work experience, career expectation, and job satisfaction on retail career intention. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 24(1), 1-14. doi: 10.1177/0887302X0602400101
- Koçel, T. (2013) *İşletme yöneticiliği (14. Baskı)*. Beta Katsayısı Basım, İstanbul.
- Kong, H., Cheung, C., & Song, H. (2012). From hotel career management to employees' career satisfaction: The mediating effect of career competency. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 76-85. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.03.002
- Korman, A. K., Wittig-Berman, U., & Lang, D. (1981). Career success and personal failure: Alienation in professionals and managers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(2), 342–360. doi:10.2307/255846.
- Kumudha, A., & Abraham, S. (2008). Organization career management and its impact on career satisfaction: A study in the banking sector. *The IUP Journal of Bank Management*. 7(3), 48-58. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/5105350_Organization_Career_Management_and_Its_Impact_on_Career_Satisfaction_A_Study_in_the_Banking_Sector
- Kuzgun, Y., Sevim, S., & Hamamcı, Z. (1999). Mesleki doyum ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 2(11), 14-18. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tpdrd/issue/21431/229745>
- Lent, R.W. & Brown, S.D. & Hackett, G. (2002). Social cognitive career theory. In Brown, D. & Associates, *Career Choice and Development 4th Ed.*, (pp. 255-311). San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.

- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 45(1): 79-122. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1994.1027
- Loi, R. & Ngo, H.Y. & Foley, S. (2004). The effect of professional identification on job attitudes: A study of lawyers in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 12(2), 109-128. doi: 10.1108/eb028988.
- Lounsbury, J. W., Steel, R. P., Gibson, L. W. & Drost, A. W. (2008). Personality traits and career satisfaction of human resource professionals, *Journal Human Resource Development International*, 11(4), 351-366. doi: 10.1080/13678860802261215
- Lumley, E.J. (2009). *Exploring the relationship between career anchors, job satisfaction and organisational commitment* (Unpublished master's thesis). Department of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, University of South Africa, Pretoria.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior (12th Edition)*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195187526.001.0001
- Martins, L., Eddleston, K., & Veiga, J. (2002). Moderators of the relationship between work-family conflict and career satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 399-409. doi: 10.2307/3069354.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. Harpers.
- Mavisu, H. (2010). *Bireysel kariyer planlamanın aşamalarından biri olarak hedef belirleme ve kariyer başarısı ilişkisi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Mcginley, D.M. (2009) *Effects of career and marriage on newlywed individuals, marital*

and career satisfaction (Unpublished doctorate thesis). University of Florida, Florida.

Nauta, A., van Vianen, A., van der Heijden, B., van Kam, K., & Willemsen, M. (2009). Understanding the factors that promote employability orientation: The impact of employability culture, career satisfaction, and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(2), 233-251. doi: 10.1348/096317908X320147

Ng, T. W., Eby, L.T., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D.C. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta- analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 367-408. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00515.x

Ngo, H.Y., & Hui, L. (2018). Individual orientations and career satisfaction: The mediating roles of work engagement and self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Development*, 45(5), 425–439. doi: 10.1177/0894845317706759

Nowak, M. J., & Bonner, D. (2013). Juggling work and family demands: Lifestyle career anchors for female healthcare professionals. *International Journal of Healthcare Management*, 6(1), 3-11. doi: 10.1179/2047971912Y.0000000023

Orpen, C. (1994). The effects of organizational and individual career management on career success. *International Journal of Manpower*, 15(1), 27-37. doi: 10.1108/01437729410053617

Otluoğlu, K. Ö. Ç. (2014). Kariyer bağlılığının kariyer başarısı üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi üzerine bir araştırma. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 12(23), 349-363. doi: 10.11611/JMER283

Özdemir, Y., & Mazgal, S. (2012). Bir kariyer tercihi olarak girişimcilikte dışsal faktörlerin etkisi: Sakarya örneği. *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi*, 7(1), 87–102. Retrieved from: <http://acikerisim.lib.comu.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/handle/COMU/390>

- Pajares, F. (1997). Current direction in self-efficacy research. In M. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (pp. 1-49). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Pajares, F. (2002). *Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy*. Retrieved from <http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/eff.html>.
- Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. H. (2001). Self-beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy, self-concept and school achievement. In R. J. Riding & S. G. Rayner (Eds.), *International perspectives on individual differences: Self perception* (pp. 239–265). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Pan, W., Sun, L., & Chow, I.H.S. (2011). The impact of supervisory mentoring on personal learning and career outcomes: The dual moderating effect of self-efficacy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 78(2), 264-273. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2010.05.001
- Park, Y. (2018). Empirical investigation on the predictors of career satisfaction. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 50 (4), 165-171. doi: 10.1108/ICT-03-2018-0032
- Peluchette, J.V.E. (1991). *Individual difference, family, and organizational factors influencing career success and career satisfaction* (Doctoral dissertation). Southern Illinois University Pub, U.S.A.
- Peluchette, J.V.E. (1993). Subjective career success: The influence of individual difference, family, and organizational variables. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 43(2), 198-208. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1993.1042>
- Rasdi, R.M., Ismail, M., Uli, J., & Noah, S. (2009). Towards developing a theoretical framework for measuring public sector managers' career success. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33(3), 232-254. doi:10.1108/03090590910950596.

- Reh fuss, M.C., Gambrell, C.E., & Meyer, D. (2012). Counselors' perceived person–environment fit and career satisfaction. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 60(2), 145-151. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.2012.00012.x
- Rigotti, T., Korek, S., & Otto, K. (2018). Career-related self-efficacy, its antecedents and relationship to subjective career success in a cross-lagged panel study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-28. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2018.1460858
- Rodrigues, R. A., & Guest, D. (2010). Have careers become boundaryless? *Human Relation*, 63(8), 1157-1175. doi: 10.1177/0018726709354344
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sakal, O., & Yıldız, S. (2015). Bireycilik ve toplulukçuluk değerleri, kariyer çapaları ve kariyer tatmini ilişkisi. *Journal of Yaşar University*, 10(40), 6612-6623. doi: 10.19168/jyu.63260
- Sandık, U. (2016, 19 Aralık). Otomobil fabrikalarında kadın devrimi. *Otohaber*, Retrieved from: <https://www.sabah.com.tr/otohaber/haberler/2016/12/19/otomobil-fabrikalarinda-kadin-devrimi-1482131743>
- Schaubroeck, J., & Merritt, D. E. (1997). Divergent effects of job control on coping with work stressors: The key role of self-efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(3), 738–754. doi:10.2307/257061
- Schein, E.H. (1974). *Career anchors and career paths: A panel study of management school graduates* (Technical Report No.1). Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Sloan School of Management, 707-774. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/1878>
- Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs*. Boston: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

- Schein, E. H. (1980). Career theory and research: Some issues for the future. In C. B. Derr (Ed.), *Work, family and the career*. New York: Praeger.
- Schein, E.H. (1985). *Career anchors: Discovering your real values*. San Diego, CA: University Associate.
- Schein, E.H. (1990a). *Career anchors: Discovering your real values*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Schein, E. H. (1990b). *Career anchors and job/role planning: The links between career pathing and career development* (Working papers 3192-90). Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Sloan School of Management, 1-21. Retrieved from: <https://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/2315/SWP-3192-22603401.pdf>
- Schein, E.H. (1996). Culture: the missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(2), 229-240. doi:10.2307/2393715
- Schein, E. H. (2007). Career anchors revisited: Implications for career development in the 21st century. *NHRD Network Journal*, 1(4), 27-33. doi:10.1177/0974173920070407
- Schein, E. H., & Van Maanen, J. (2013). *Career anchors: The changing nature of careers participant workbook* (Vol. 407). John Wiley & Sons.
- Schunk, D. H. (1995). Self-efficacy and education and instruction. In Maddux, J.E. (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 281–303). The Plenum Series in Social/Clinical Psychology. Springer, Boston, MA. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4419-6868-5_10
- Schunk, D. H. (2001). Social cognitive theory and self-regulated learning. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 125–151). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

- Seer, B., & ınar, E. (2011). Bireycilik ve yeni kariyer ynelimleri. *Ynetim ve Ekonomi: Celal Bayar niversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakltesi Dergisi*, 18(2), 49-62. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/yonveek/issue/13695/165745>
- Seibert, S. E. & Kraimer, M. L. (2001). The five- factor model of personality and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(1), 1-21. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.2000.1757
- Seibert, S.E., Kraimer, M.L., & Liden, R.C. (2001). A social capital theory of career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 219–237. doi: 10.2307/3069452
- Shaver, K. H., & Lacey, L. M. (2003). Job and career satisfaction among staff nurses: Effects of job setting and environment. *The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 33(3), 166-172. doi: 10.1097/00005110-200303000-00008.
- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*, 51(2), 663–671. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1982.51.2.663
- Solmaz, B.., & Gizir, S. (2014). ğretim elemanlarının baskın kariyer apalarının incelenmesi: Mersin niversitesi rneęi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eęitim Bilimleri*, 4(5), 1743-1765. doi: 10.12738/estp.2014.5.2110
- Spurk, D., Abele, A., & Volmer, J. (2015). The career satisfaction scale in context: A test for measurement invariance across four occupational groups. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 23(2), 191-209. doi: 10.1177/1069072714535019
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 240–261. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.240

- Sturges, J., Conway, N., & Liefoghe, A. (2008). What's the deal? An exploration of career management behaviour in Iceland. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(4), 752–768. doi: 10.1080/09585190801953814
- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics (6th Ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Takawira, N. (2018). Career development of professional women: The role of person-centered characteristics on career satisfaction. In M.Coetzee, I. Potgieter, N.Ferreira (Ed.), *Psychology of Retention* (p.243-262). Switzerland: Springer, Cham. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-98920-4_12
- Taşlıyan, M., Arı, N., & Duzman, B. (2011). İnsan kaynakları yönetiminde kariyer planlama ve kariyer yönetimi: İİBF öğrencileri üzerinde bir alan araştırması. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 231-241. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/oybd/issue/16338/171064>
- TDK, (2019). Güncel Türkçe Sözlük. <http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php>. Access: 05.09.2019.
- Toker, B. (2007). Demografik değişkenlerin iş tatminine etkileri: İzmir'deki beş ve dört yıldızlı otellere yönelik bir uygulama. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 8 (1), 92-107.
- Tunçer, P. (2012). Değişen insan kaynakları yönetimi anlayışında kariyer yönetimi. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(1), 203-233. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/188002>
- Türkmen, M. & Yıldız, K. (2012). *Çalışma hayatında sınırsız ve çok yönlü kariyer yönetimi. Spor Yönetimi ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Dergisi*, 7(1), 4 -17. Retrieved from: https://arastirmax.com/en/system/files/dergiler/182910/makaleler/7/1/arastirmx_182910_7_pp_4-17.pdf

- Tüz, M.V. (2003). Kariyer planlamasında yeni yaklaşımlar. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(4), 169-176. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/sosbilder/issue/23119/246943>
- Uzunbacak, H., Zengin, S., & Çelik, Y. (2019). Sınırsız kariyerin kariyer başarısı üzerindeki etkisinde kariyer bağlılığının rolü. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24 (3), 629-642. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/sduibfd/issue/53005/704761>
- Valcour, M., & Ladge, J.J. (2008). Family and career path characteristics as predictors of women's objective and subjective career success: Integrating traditional and protean career explanations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73(2), 300-309. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2008.06.002
- Van Maanen, J. (1977). Experiencing organization: Notes on the meaning of careers and socialization. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), *Organizational careers: Some new perspectives* (p.15-45). New York: Wiley.
- Vermeulen, L. (2015). Career anchors and work behavioural style for career management in the South African Public Service. *European Scientific Journal*, 11(14). Retrieved from <https://eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/view/5704>
- Visagie, S & Koekemoer, E. (2014). What it means to succeed: Personal perceptions of career success held by senior managers. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 45(1), 43-54. doi: 10.4102/sajbm.v45i1.116
- Volmer, J., & Spurk, D. (2010). Protean and boundaryless career attitudes: Relationships with subjective and objective career success. *Journal for Labour Market Research*, 43(3), 207-218. doi: 10.1007/s12651-010-0037-3

- Wayne, S. J., Liden, R. C., Kraimer, M. L., & Graf, I. K. (1999). The role of human capital, motivation and supervisor sponsorship in predicting career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(5), 577–595. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199909)20:5<577::AID-JOB958>3.0.CO;2-0
- Yalalova, J., & Zhang, L. (2017). Self-efficacy and career satisfaction: The mediating role of work effort. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, 37, 252-263. doi: 10.2991/ictim-17.2017.31
- Yarnall, J. (1998). Career Anchors: Results of an organisational study in the UK. *Career Development International*, 3(2), 56-61.
- Yeşilyaprak, B. (Ed.). (2015). *Mesleki rehberlik ve kariyer danışmanlığı: Kuramdan uygulamaya (6.Baskı)*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Yeşilyaprak, B. (2017). *21.yüzyılda eğitimde rehberlik hizmetleri: Gelişimsel yaklaşım (27.Basım)*. Ankara: Nobel Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Yıldırım, F., & İlhan, İ.Ö. (2010). Genel Özyeterlilik Ölçeği Türkçe formunun geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 21(4), 301-308. Retrieved from: <http://www.turkpsikiyatri.com/pdf/c21s4/301-308.pdf>
- Yu, C. (2011). Chinese knowledge employees' career values, perceived organizational support and career success. *iBusiness*, 3(3), 274-282. doi: 10.4236/ib.2011.33036
- Yüksel, İ. (2005). İş-aile çatışmasının kariyer tatmini, iş tatmini ve iş davranışları ile ilişkisi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 19(2), 301-314. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/atauniiibd/issue/2688/35334>
- Zacher, H. (2015). Daily manifestations of career adaptability: Relationships with job and career outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 91 (1), 76-86. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2015.09.003

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 82–91. doi:10.1006/ceps.1999.1016.

Zulkosky, K. (2009). Self- Efficacy: A concept analysis. *Nursing Forum*, 44(2), 93 - 102. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6198.2009.00132.x.



APPENDICES

Appendix-1: Personal Information Form

Bu çalışmanın amacı çalışanların kariyer tatmini, öz-yeterlik düzeyleri ve kariyer çapaları arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Yanıtlarınız gizli tutulacak ve yalnızca sözü edilen tez çalışması için kullanılacak olup, ad-soyad gibi kimliğinizi belli edecek bilgiler istenmemektedir. Soruları cevaplamadan önce, çalışmaya katılmayı onaylıyorsanız ‘‘Katılmayı kabul ediyorum’’ seçeneğini işaretleyiniz. Lütfen soruları size en uygun cevaba göre eksiksiz cevaplandırınız. Katılımınız ve desteğiniz için teşekkür ederim.

Araştırmacının Adı - Soyadı: Aşkın Kutlu

Cinsiyetiniz?: Kadın Erkek

Yaşınız?

Mezun olduğunuz bölüm

Şu anda çalışmakta olduğunuz şirketteki göreviniz:

Kurumunuzda çalışma süreniz (deneyim yılınız)?

1-5 yıl 6-10 yıl 11-15 yıl 16 yıl ve üzeri

Aylık kazancınız?

2000-2999 TL

3000-3999 TL

4000-4999 TL

5000 TL ve üzeri

Appendix-2: Career Satisfaction Scale

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri okuduktan sonra kendinizi değerlendirip sizin için en uygun seçeneği işaretleyiniz.		Bana hiç uygun değil	Bana uygun değil	Kararsızım	Bana uygun	Bana tamamen uygun
1.	Kariyerimde şu ana kadar elde ettiğim başarılarından memnunum.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Kariyerimde şu ana kadar kaydettiğim ilerleme, kariyer hedeflerini karşılama açısından beni tatmin ediyor.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Kariyerimde şu ana kadar kaydettiğim ilerleme, maddi kazançla ilgili hedeflerimi karşılama açısından beni tatmin ediyor.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Kariyerimde şu ana kadar kaydettiğim ilerleme, terfi ve yükselmeye ilgili hedeflerimi karşılama açısından beni tatmin ediyor.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Kariyerimde şu ana kadar kaydettiğim ilerleme, yeni beceriler geliştirmeye ilgili hedeflerimi karşılama açısından beni tatmin ediyor.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix-3: General Self-Efficacy Scale

Aşağıda çeşitli konulardaki düşüncelerinizi öğrenmek üzere cümleler verilmiştir. Cümlede geçen ifadenin sizi ne kadar tanımladığını lütfen size uygun olan bölmeye işaretleyiniz.

Sizi ne kadar tanımlıyor?

Çok

Hiç

İyi

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Planlar yaparken, onları hayata geçirebileceğimden eminimdir.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Sorunlarımdan biri, bir işe zamanında başlayamamamdır.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Eğer bir işi ilk denemede yapamazsam, başarıya kadar uğraşırım.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Belirlediğim önemli hedeflere ulaşmada, pek başarılı olamam.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Her şeyi yarım bırakırım.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Zorluklarla yüz yüze gelmekten kaçınırım.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Eğer bir iş çok karmaşık görünüyorsa onu denemeye bile girişmem.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Hoşuma gitmeyen bir şey yapmak zorunda kaldığımda onu bitirinceye kadar kendimi zorlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Bir şey yapmaya karar verdiğimde hemen işe girişirim.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Yeni bir şey denerken başlangıçta başarılı olamazsam çabucak vazgeçerim.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Beklenmedik sorunlarla karşılaştığımda kolayca onların üstesinden gelemem.	1	2	3	4	5

12. Bana zor görünen yeni şeyleri öğrenmeye çalışmaktan kaçınıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Başarısızlık benim azmimi arttırır.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Yeteneklerime her zaman çok güvenmem.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Kendine güvenen biriyim.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Kolayca pes ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Hayatta karşıma çıkacak sorunların çoğuyla baş edebileceğimi sanmıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix-4: Career Anchors Scale

Lütfen her ifadeyi sizin için önem derecesini düşünerek aşağıdaki ölçeğe göre değerlendiriniz.

	Kariyer Çapaları Ölçeği	Hiç Önemli Değil	Biraz Önemli	Önemli	Çok Önemli
1.	Kariyerimde bir kurumdaki diğer çalışanları yönlendirebileceğim bir mevkiye yükselmek	1	2	3	4
2.	Uzmanlığım dışında bir alanda terfi etmektense uzman olduğum alanda gelişebileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
3.	Kendi çalışma saatlerimi seçme özgürlüğü sağlayabilecek bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
4.	Sosyal güvence ve iyi bir emeklilik programı garanti eden bir kurumda çalışmak	1	2	3	4
5.	İnsanlığa gerçek katkılarımın olabileceği bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
6.	Tamamen kendi fikrim olan bir şeyi yaratabileceğim ya da üretebileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
7.	Zor problemler üzerinde çalışabileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
8.	Kendi hayatımı istediğim şekilde yönlendirmeme olanak sağlayan bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
9.	Bir kurumdaki diğer çalışanların işlerini koordine edip yönetebileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4

10.	Sadece uzmanlık alanımda yöneticilik yapabileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
11.	Kurallar, prosedürler, kılık kıyafet ve benzeri kurumsal kısıtlamalardan bağımsız bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
12.	Bana uzun vadeli ve istikrarlı bir iş sağlayabilen bir kurumda çalışmak	1	2	3	4
13.	Önemli bir hedefe bağlanıp kendimi bu hedefe adayabileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
14.	Kendi işimi kurmak ve geliştirmek	1	2	3	4
15.	Zor problemlerle yüzleşip onları çözebileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
16.	Kişisel ve ailevi gereksinimlerle kariyer gereksinimlerini dengeleyebileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
17.	Bir kurumdaki diğer çalışanları etkileyebilecek kararlar alabileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
18.	Kariyerim boyunca kendi uzmanlık alanımda kalmak	1	2	3	4
19.	İşimi bildiğim gibi yapabilme ve planlayabilme özgürlüğü tanıyan bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
20.	Güven ve istikrar duygusu hissetmemi sağlayan bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
21.	Toplumun refahı için hizmet edebileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
22.	Kendi işimi kurmamı sağlayacak fikirler araştırmak	1	2	3	4
23.	Sürekli olarak zor problemlerle karşılaşacağım ortamlar sağlayan bir kariyer	1	2	3	4

24.	Aileme ve kariyerime her zaman aynı oranda ağırlık verebileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
25.	Bir kurumda yönetici pozisyonuna yükselebileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
26.	Sadece uzmanlık alanıma yönelik becerilerimi sürekli olarak geliştirebileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
27.	Bana güven ve istikrar duygusu verebilecek bir kurumda çalışmak	1	2	3	4
28.	Becerilerimi başkalarının yararına kullanabileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
29.	Üretiminde doğrudan yer aldığım pek çok ürün ve fikrin olduğu bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
30.	Özel hayatım ve iş hayatımı uyumlu bir şekilde sürdürmeme olanak sağlayan bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
31.	Şehir değiştirmemi gerektirmeyecek bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
32.	Herhangi bir düzeyde yöneticiliğe terfi etmektense alanımda uzmanlaşabileceğim bir kariyer	1	2	3	4
33.	Farklı şehirdeki bir göreve terfi etmektense bulunduğum şehirde çalışmaya devam etmek	1	2	3	4

Appendix 5: Permit Documents of Scales



Appendix 6: Ethics Committee Permit Document

