A study examining the perceptions of career growth and aspirations of mid-level administrators in higher education was undertaken because, though there has been a large recent increase in the number and importance of mid-level administrators in higher education, the structure and nature of higher education organizations seem to constrain traditional career advancement opportunities for them. This is in part due to the few discernable career paths, the vague position hierarchy of status and prestige, the flat formal structure of the organization with few senior-level positions, and the non-tenure accruing nature of their positions. Also, many senior-level incumbents remain in those positions for several years. Limited research means it is not known whether the structural constraints of colleges and universities adversely affect mid-level administrators. The concerns behind this paper are: (1) the perceived career aspirations of mid-level administrators; (2) the motivating factors influencing their career decisions; and (3) the organizational factors they perceive as facilitating and inhibiting their career development. Following a discussion of conceptual organization, the methodology is described in terms of data source and sample, research approach, and data analysis and interpretation. Findings focus on career aspirations, planning style, field identity, experience, personal factors, career orientations, and perceptions of the organization. Results indicate that it is crucial to identify career orientations in order to understand perceptions of career growth, and that most participants find the work environment adequate or desirable. Organizational responsiveness may be the key to minimizing perceived barriers and creating renewed commitment and growth. Tables are included. Contains 18 references. (SM)
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Introduction

Higher education is a labor intensive field in which the character of the worklife directly affects the vitality of the enterprise and the quality of its services (Baldwin, 1982; Hipps, 1982). During the past two decades the largest increase in number of employees in higher education has occurred in the area of middle management. Today there is approximately one administrator for every three to five faculty members on a college campus and the majority of these administrators hold mid-level staff positions, below the level of vice-president or dean.

Despite increases in both the number of mid-level administrators and the importance of the functions they perform, the structure and nature of higher education organizations appear to constrain the traditional career advancement opportunities for mid-level administrators (Austin & Gamson, 1984; Kanter, 1979; Miner & Estler, 1985; Sagaria, 1985). Among the factors contributing to this are few discernable career paths and a vague position hierarchy of status and prestige (Kanter, 1979). Also, the flat formal structure of the organization with few senior-level positions, results in few sequential position levels. Moreover, the vast majority of mid-level administrators are in non-tenure accruing positions without faculty status. Therefore, they are denied access to most senior academic administrative positions such as deanships for which faculty status and/or tenure are prerequisites (Kraus, 1983; Miner and Estler, 1985). Another barrier to career opportunities for non-teaching staff is the fact that many senior
level incumbents such as chief student affairs officers remain in those positions for long periods of time such as six to eight years (Harder, 1983; Moore, 1983; Sherburne, 1970). Lastly, the skills and expertise of mid-level administrators are often perceived to be limited to a specific functional area in higher education such as admissions or continuing education (Austin and Gamson, 1984; Kraus, 1983); therefore, lateral movements across functions may also be constrained. Thus, several conditions in colleges and universities constrain traditional career advancement through upward mobility for mid-level administrators. This, in turn, may influence their aspirations.

Despite the limited administrative career opportunities portrayed in the scholarly literature, missing from the research are conceptions or descriptions of employees' careers that emerge from their needs and expectations. Thus, it is not known whether the structural constraints of colleges and universities adversely affect mid-level administrators. Stated differently, from a human resource perspective, understanding mid-level administrators' perceptions of their careers and their career aspirations is an important antecedent for ascertaining those aspects of the work environment that encourage these individuals to remain in an organization and contribute to high productivity as well as those aspects that discourage continuing employment and contribute to low productivity (Bailyn & Schein, 1976; Wheeless & Howard, 1983).

In examining career aspirations, it is important to identify the career influences and values that motivate administrators to do what they do. Career aspirations are affected by and can be understood in relationship to the values held by individuals and the factors that motivate them. For example, advancing to positions with increased prestige and financial
rewards may not be important to individuals who are highly motivated by the tasks that they perform and the skills they use. The outcomes that employees value and desire as well as their expectations for attaining them guide their career behaviors, decisions, and aspirations. (London, 1983). Hence, the identification of employees' needs is an important precursor for developing organizational responses to meet those needs.

This study examined the perceptions of career growth and aspirations of mid-level administrators in higher education. Three questions guided the research:

1) What are the perceived career aspirations of mid-level administrators?

2) What are the motivating factors that influence career decisions of mid-level administrators?

3) What organizational factors do mid-level administrators perceive as facilitating and inhibiting their career development?

Conceptual Orientation

Proponents of career development suggest that identifying and meeting employee needs influences organizational effectiveness (Gutteridge, 1983; Wheeless & Howard, 1983). Unfortunately, little is known about the forces and values that shape the career aspirations and needs of mid-level administrators. This paper represents an early effort to contribute to that knowledge base.

Edgar Schein’s (1978) career development theory provided the conceptual frame for the study. Schein contends that the interaction between the individual and the organization, over time, conceptually links people and their employing organizations. His research regarding career anchors, patterns of self-perceived talents and motives and values, provides a
useful guide for understanding personal motivators. Schein’s idea is broader than those typically associated with job values or motivations to work. He claims that career anchors influence career choices, determine decisions to move or stay, shape what individuals look for in life and influence their views regarding the future. Further, Schein hypothesizes that, once developed, career anchors remain stable over life, guiding, constraining, stabilizing, and integrating an individual’s career (Schein, 1978).

Schein’s career anchor concept evolved from a longitudinal study of alumni from the Sloan School of Management of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Most of Schein’s work on career anchors focuses on internal factors of motives, talents and values. Yet he emphasizes the importance of linking these personal factors with the organization’s ability to meet individual career needs. The typology of five career anchors consists of managerial competence, autonomy, technical/functional competence, security and creativity. Career anchors will influence changes or moves if the organizational context does not allow expression of the individual’s motives, values and talents.

Methodology

Data Source and Sample

In order to study perceptions of aspirations and career growth of mid-level administrators a population of mid-level, non-faculty administrators who held support positions such as director of employee relations, director of admissions, coordinator of academic advisement and development officer in one university was selected. A sample of forty administrators was randomly selected from a total of 358 mid-level non-faculty administrators, defined by job classification and salary data. The sample was employed at a major land grant university with an
organizational structure and personnel policies and practices similar to many large public research universities.

The sample was stratified by four functional categories including administrative affairs, student affairs, academic affairs and external affairs. These categories correspond with those used by the College and University Personnel Association (Van Alstyne, et.al., 1977) for higher education administrators' compensation surveys. In the present study function was determined by the unit in which the position was located and/or the person to whom the position reported in order to classify administrators by the tasks they performed and constituencies with whom they worked.

The sampling procedure was intended to select a group of individuals that was characteristic of the population of mid-level administrators at the university. In order to allow for comparisons by gender and functional administrative area, the sample consisted of almost equal numbers of men and women, as well as equal numbers from the four functional categories.

The study was conducted in one institutional setting in order to develop a thick description of an organizational environment. It was considered important to control for organizational environment because theoretically the careers would take place in the context of similar organizational policies and procedures (Rosenbaum, 1979; Sagaria and Johnsrud, 1987). Thus, the study should be considered as a necessary first step for understanding career development of mid-level higher education administrators and as the basis for further theoretical testing in other campus settings.

Research Approach

A qualitative approach was chosen to represent the multiple
constructions of reality of administrators and thereby create an understanding of their career aspirations and growth (Bogden & Biklen, 1982). As Miles and Huberman (1984) note:

[Qualitative studies] are a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in local contexts. With qualitative data one can preserve chronological flow, assess local causality, and derive fruitful explanations. Then, too, qualitative data are more likely to lead to serendipitous findings and to new theoretical integrations; they help researchers go beyond initial preconceptions and frameworks. Finally, the findings from qualitative studies have a quality of 'undeniability', as Smith (1978) has put it. Words, especially when they are organized into incidents or stories, have a concrete, vivid, meaningful flavor that often proves far more convincing to a reader - another researcher, a policy-maker, a practitioner - than pages of numbers. (p.15)

The research principles espoused by Lincoln & Guba (1985) and Miles & Huberman (1984) guided the study. The work of Lincoln & Guba is built upon the naturalistic inquiry paradigm, which assumes multiply constructed realities, interaction between the inquirer and respondent, and a context-bound phenomenon and value-bound inquiry (1981).

The interview was the chosen method because it provided a means for enabling mid-level administrators to reconstruct career experiences and construct anticipated career decisions. Moreover, because the present research focused of all three aspects of careers--past, present, and future the interview permitted "the respondent to move back and forth in time - to reconstruct the past, interpret the present, and predict the future, all without leaving a comfortable armchair" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 272).

An interview guide was developed. It was then pilot tested with administrators in the university population and refined in 1985. Schein's (1978) self-analysis guide to career anchors influenced several of the questions in the interview guide regarding the rationale behind past career
decisions, work values, motivating factors and perceptions of future decisions.

The potential interview questions developed for the study focused upon 3 areas of inquiry. The first was the career aspirations of mid-level administrators in higher education. This generated a series of questions about goals, professional identity and plans for the future. Examples of these questions were:

- Please describe the career goals, if any, you set for yourself at that time.

- Discuss any decisions concerning your career that you anticipate making in the future, and identify the factors that will influence your decisions.

The second area of inquiry was motivating forces (career anchors), and this inspired a set of questions about past career decisions and the reasons behind them, career needs, motivators and perceptions of the most important aspects of work to the participant. Some of these questions were:

- Please describe other positions you have held since your first professional position and tell me the reasons behind each of the decisions you have made.

- What makes you want to do your job?

- What would you consider to be those aspects of your work that are most important to you?

Finally, the third area of focus was the factors perceived to inhibit and facilitate career development. This suggested a series of questions on perceptions of facilitating and inhibiting factors, both past and future, and those linked to the university, where all participants were employed. Examples of these questions were:
- As you think about your career history, can you identify any factors that prevented you from doing things you may have wanted to, but couldn’t?

- What factors will facilitate your career development?

- What would you identify to be the factors about this university that have facilitated your career development? Inhibited career development for you?

Forty interviews were conducted to assure consistency of the information gathered. All interviews took place between February and May, 1986. They were done in the participants' offices, with the exception of one which was conducted in a participant's home. The interviews lasted between 50 minutes and 90 minutes. All interviews were audio recorded. The transcribing of the interviews was completed in June, 1986.

Participant resumes also were collected. These were used as a demographic data source to assist the interviewer to prepare for the interviews, and to aid in data analysis.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

An inductive analytic process (Miles and Huberman, 1984) was employed to organize the data so that final conclusions could be drawn. The data analysis consisted of three flows of activity: (1) data reduction, defined as the process of selecting and focusing, choosing emerging themes from the "raw data", in this case, interview transcripts; (2) data display, an organized assembly of information to be used for conclusion-drawing; and (3) conclusion-drawing/verification, the process of deciding what things mean, noting regularities, patterns, explanations and propositions, and verifying the "confirmability" of findings (Miles and Huberman, 1984).

Most data were displayed through the narrative text. However, graphs, charts and illustrations also were used to explore relationships and
typologies and interpretations of the findings.

The strategies used during data collection were helpful in initiating the analysis process during collection and in organizing material and thoughts for analysis after data collection. These techniques include: a contact summary sheet, used to note initial impressions, themes and characteristics of each respondent immediately after the interview, and to note methodological issues; reflective remarks, made in the form of memos and on the transcriptions as the tapes were being transcribed; storing text through transcription to keep accurate accounts of all data collected; the data accounting sheet, a quick check to determine if the major research questions were being answered; an interim site summary at the mid-way point of data collection, which allowed the researcher to reflect on gaps in the data, concerns, themes and strategies to avoid gaps in the remaining interviews; and finally, a coding scheme, which enabled responses to each interview question to be examined for repeated themes and patterns. The codes often were eventually used as labels in data display to identify a particular theme or phenomenon. In addition to these techniques used during data collection, other techniques recommended by Guba & Lincoln (1985) were used during analysis to ensure credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Findings

Career Aspirations

Our interviews indicate that mid-level administrators have many and varied career aspirations. The majority (65 percent) of participants planned to stay at the institution for the next one to five years. Within this group, however, more than half of them planned to eventually leave. In
addition, a small percentage (20 percent) planned to stay at the university for an extended period, more than five years.

These patterns of intended behaviors suggest a propensity to move, with a significant number of participants perceiving future moves out of the university. One reason these administrators may be planning to leave the university is their desire to stay within their current professional field. Many of the professional fields with which participants identified have employment opportunities outside of higher education. Furthermore, the percentage of administrators planning to stay only in a higher education environment (30 percent) is similar to the percentage of those considering moving to other work environments (33 percent) and those who are considering both options (22%). Several participants (15 percent) did not have plans and therefore were unable to speculate about future career decisions.

Four factors: planning style, field identity, experience, and personal factors, accounted for differences both in intention to remain in the organization and in other career aspirations. These factors were considerations for all respondents, although the relative influence of each factor differed among individuals and consequently shaped differences in perceptions of the future. Moreover, it is significant that each of the four factors was dynamic, that is, each had the potential to change over time. Because one or more of the factors can change at any time, an individual's career aspirations can also change. As adults move through life (Levinson, 1978; Vaillant, 1977) their perceptions of the future change. Thus, changing the nature of aspirations explains both differences in perceptions among participants at different life stages, and why perceptions change over time. In order to explain more fully this variation of career influences, each factor will be described.
Planning Style

Planning style, the amount of thought given to one's future and the period for which one plans, is useful for explaining the variations in career aspirations. Some participants were able to present well-defined long-term career plans, while others claimed that they had no such plans. Striking patterns emerged from the ways in which people planned their careers. Three types of planning styles emerged. The first is long-term progressive planning, which is characterized by envisioning a path to achieve a long-term goal. These individuals precisely identified careers and planned next stages. A second planning style, more common among these administrators, is short-term progressive planning; this is characterized by the absence of an end goal, but occasionally an individual thought about and planned a change such as a new job or new responsibilities. These individuals differed from long-term progressive planners in that they did not assess the relationship of a decision to an end goal and their planned change related to past experience. Third is short-term non-progressive planning. This is characterized by planning from one change to another, however, changes may not follow a logically connected path. This was a common pattern among this sample. As individuals assessed a next career step, they might have considered a change as a simple shift to a related position.

Slightly more than half the administrators would be considered non-planners. They worked without a defined career plan and perceived no control over choices. These individuals made decisions only when opportunities presented themselves. They often attributed their decisions to serendipity, describing their experiences as "falling into things" and "being in the right place at the right time." Among the non-planners was a
very small group (two percent) of accommodaters. These administrators had permitted other individuals to make career choices for them or they had made adjustments in their lives to the needs and preferences of others close to them. It is important to note that planning styles change over time, because of other factors becoming more predominant, as plans are refined, or as career goals become more clear.

Field Identity

The second factor is field identity. This describes the backgrounds, education, and professional affiliations of the mid-level administrators. Once field identity emerged as a factor influencing aspirations, interview data were examined in conjunction with participants' resumes to identify patterns. Three distinctive patterns emerged regarding respondents' field identification: (1) First, some respondents (17.5 percent) identified with higher education. These persons were most likely to have earned degrees in higher education or student personnel. These administrators held memberships only in professional organizations associated with higher education and their area of specialization such as the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education and the American College Personnel Association.

Second, the majority of administrators (70 percent) identify with fields that exist independent of the higher education sector. These include professional fields found in many employment sectors such as accounting, public relations, medicine, and computing. These individuals primarily held memberships in organizations not affiliated with higher education such as the Industrial Relations Research Association and the Public Relations Society of America.
Third, some respondents (17.5 percent) had dual affiliation. These individuals typically had pursued an advanced disciplinary degree but currently viewed themselves as higher education administrators. These individuals most often do administrative work as an alternative to full-time work in their discipline but with the goal of being employed in an higher education organization. Their resumes reflected dual affiliation with slightly more emphasis on disciplinary associations such as the American Musicological Society and the Modern Language Association than professional higher education associations such as the American Association for Higher Education.

Field identification influences career aspirations to the extent that individuals will focus their perceptions on opportunities within the domain of the field with which they identify. Therefore an individual's field identification defines, to some extent, the job market in which he or she competes. Also, employment opportunities differ by field, by demand, competition, and criteria for entry and advancement. Consequently, as respondents consider the future, their aspirations are influenced by the range of opportunities and the nature of the market in their field. For these reasons, the field identification and the strength of identification are the primary determinants of perceptions about employment.

Experience

The kinds and amounts of professional experiences in administrators' lives influenced aspirations in several ways. For some administrators, gaining professional experience led to refining goals; for others, new opportunities presented new options and professional contacts that led to changes in career. But experience influences perceptions in yet another way. When an administrator considers making a move, the kind of experience
he or she has gathered over a period of time will also influence the perceptions of those making hiring decisions. Consequently, the experience listed on an individual's resume determines, to a large extent, the perceived qualifications for a given position. Thus one's experience creates boundaries around the scope of opportunities that can be pursued.

**Personal Factors**

Career aspirations are influenced by life situations, such as health, being married to a spouse with a career, having a family, deciding whether or not to have children, having responsibilities for aging parents, maintaining relationships with significant others, and having financial obligations. During peoples' lives, a number of these factors come into focus and influence career perceptions. The struggle becomes one of balance; trying to manage both career and the demands of personal relationships and obligations. This was true for both men and women in this sample, although women solely faced the decision of whether or not to have children and the consequences of that on career.

This need for balancing career needs with other life choices influences career decisions, as people attempt to make such choices that minimize disruption to spouse or family. For the majority of administrators in this sample, personal factors, especially family and significant relationships, were cited as the most important aspect of life. Three male respondents expressed a sense of conflict when asked to identify life's most important aspect. They believed that a career provided the means to support a family and that it was equally, if not more important. One female, who is starting to build her career, identified professional self-development as most important, yet at the same time discussed the possibility that her career might be interrupted by her spouse relocating. Thus, personal factors also
often have a limit on an individual's freedom in making career choices and may lower career aspirations. Most administrators felt that personal factors would not be sacrificed for career, which may explain the predominance of short-term planners and non-planners. For many mid-level administrators the career may be important, but it is not their highest life priority at this time.

Diversity is the dominant characteristic of administrators' career aspirations. Mid-level administrators represent such a variety of fields and have such diverse educational backgrounds that generalizations become difficult. To be fully understood, careers must be considered on the individual level - understanding the interaction of planning style, field identity, experience and personal factors on aspirations.

Career Orientations

A second major finding of this study was the identification of seven career orientations. Career orientations are similar to Schein's (1978) career anchors in that they are patterns of self-perceived motives, values and talents. It was found, however, that orientations play a role different than Schein's career anchors.

Schein (1978) asserts that career anchors (patterns of motives, talents and values that people seek to express through their courses) influence career choices, affect decisions to move or stay, shape what individuals are looking for in life and color their views of the future. He contends that career anchors are a major force behind career decisions, that individual choices are driven by anchors and that anchors act to keep a career stable over time. Analysis of the data from this study indicates that factors other than career anchors influence career decisions. Career anchors were not the driving force behind decisions for the majority of these
administrators. Stated differently, an individual's career anchor was not the major reason for decisions such as changing positions or leaving an organization. However, a modified concept is applicable because a pattern of motives, values and talents could be identified for almost every participant. Therefore, to acknowledge the importance of a career grounding and its significant role in decision-making, we propose a career orientation as a variation on Schein's idea. This conceptual shift acknowledges that a career grounding as well as factors such as planning style, field identity, experience and personal factors collectively influence career decisions. In essence, a career orientation is less powerful than an anchor because it provides a lens for evaluating choices rather than driving a career. For example, once a decision is made to change positions within an organization, or to remain in a position, or to relocate, the career orientation serves to assess potential options. The orientation then becomes a screening mechanism to allow individuals to find a good fit between their skills and values and the requirements and rewards of a particular position in a given organization. In addition, it shapes the way a person approaches work and magnifies the most meaningful aspects of work for him or her such as job skills required or the work environment to the individual.

Seven career orientations emerged among the administrators: social impact, power impact, challenge, autonomy, stability, competence, and lifestyle. As Table 1 shows, two orientations predominated: social impact and challenge, accounting for the vast majority (76% of the sample).

---

Insert Table 1 About Here
Individuals also differed regarding whether they desired to make a social impact or power impact. Administrators with the social impact orientation, who comprised the largest number of participants, focused on a helping role, influencing people, and making a contribution to a social "good" (See Table 2). Those with the power impact orientation focused on a decision-making role, influencing the system, and making a contribution as a change agent in the organization. Kanter's (1977) definition of power is useful in understanding the intention of its use as a descriptor here: "the ability to get things done, to mobilize resources, to get and use whatever it is that a person needs for the goals he or she is attempting to meet" (p. 166).

The second most frequent orientation was challenge. Administrators with a challenge orientation valued learning new things, analyzing, problem-solving and hard work. They valued change in order to have personal challenge and to avoid boredom.

Two administrators had a stability orientation, valuing a predictable income and the ability to provide for other needs. Skill competence was a fifth orientation that was characterized by the desire to become expert at a particular skill. Autonomy also was identified as an orientation for one person who primarily valued being independent in a work setting. Finally, the desire to integrate work into a way of life defined a lifestyle orientation.

The predominant orientation among administrators in this sample was social impact. This includes administrators who view their role as service,
making a contribution, educating and interacting with other people. One plausible explanation for the predominance of this orientation is that when making initial career decisions, people often seek out work environments that are consistent with their values and skills (Holland, 1959). There is potential for good fit between the career orientation of social impact and an educational institution whose mission is teaching and service and which is an esteemed institution in society.

Perceptions of the Organization

Individuals were asked to identify organizational factors that facilitate and inhibit personal career development. The data suggest that as individuals identify organizational factors that facilitate and inhibit their careers, their perceptions will largely depend on their organizational knowledge and interpretation of that knowledge. An administrator’s interpretations are influenced by career orientations. Therefore, orientation determines, to a great extent, an individual’s perceptions of organizational factors inhibiting or facilitating career growth. For example, an individual with a power impact orientation who strives to reach senior-level decision-making positions could perceive a flat organization as inhibiting his or her opportunities to advance. In contrast, an individual with a service orientation may value an organizational goal of service and perceive it as necessary for staying motivated; whereas, an individual with a stability orientation may find the assurance of his/her position the most important function an organization serves.

Conclusion and Discussion

Collectively, these findings suggest that to understand perceptions of career growth it is important to first identify career orientations. Moreover, it is necessary to understand other factors that influence
perceptions of career aspirations, such as planning style, field identity and personal factors.

Although much of the literature describing the quality of work life for mid-level administrators in higher education identifies constraints on career development, the findings of this study indicate that most participants find the work environment adequate or desirable. The conditions identified in the literature as constraining opportunities are linked to organizational structure. They will be perceived as limiting to the extent that individuals' orientations lead to a desire to move up or laterally within the institution. Several of the orientations identified for participants in this study influence them to value aspects of the organization other than upward mobility, such as institutional mission or goals. However, there is still much progress to be made in encouraging and assisting with career development for university administrative employees.

Acquiring knowledge regarding career orientations and the factors influencing career aspirations is a beginning for an organization's understanding of employee career development. The centrality of career in peoples' lives varies and this will influence perceptions of career aspirations. For administrators for whom career is a major source of satisfaction, both career orientation and aspirations influence perceptions of organizational factors that facilitate and inhibit career growth. Both orientations and aspirations can be assessed for employees. Thus, through policies and the actions of superordinates, an organization can become responsive to individuals by shaping an environment in which employees can meet their career development needs. For the organization, meeting employees' needs holds the potential for positive morale, increased
productivity and retention (Gutteridge, 1983). For mid-level university administrators, organizational responsiveness may be the key to minimizing perceived barriers and creating renewed commitment and growth.
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**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Impact</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Service</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Social Contribution</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Education</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-People Interaction</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Impact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Competence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=38*

*Orientations could not be determined for two participants*
TABLE 2

**Career Orientations: Summary of Motives, Values, and Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Orientation</th>
<th>Social Impact</th>
<th>Power Impact</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Skill Competence</th>
<th>Lifestyle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-impact on people</td>
<td>-social welfare</td>
<td>-personal inter-relating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-impact on society</td>
<td>-helping/service</td>
<td>-counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-change for greater good; benefit of all</td>
<td>-education</td>
<td>-teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-changing the system</td>
<td>-decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-extrinsic rewards/recognition</td>
<td>-organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-impacting the organization</td>
<td>-power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>-problems</td>
<td>-learning new skills</td>
<td>-analyzing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-finding solutions</td>
<td>-personal growth</td>
<td>-problem-solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-perceived difficulty in tasks</td>
<td>-change to prevent boredom</td>
<td>-organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-flexibility</td>
<td>-independence</td>
<td>-creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-independent work</td>
<td>-risk</td>
<td>-self-initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-open environment</td>
<td>-variable</td>
<td>-variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>-stable job</td>
<td>-providing for needs</td>
<td>-variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-income</td>
<td>-stable employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Competence</td>
<td>-using the skill</td>
<td>-expertise</td>
<td>-variable (skill being developed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-recognition of skill</td>
<td>-excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>-integration of interests into work</td>
<td>-integration</td>
<td>-variable (consistent with interests)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>