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ABSTRACT

Through research pertaining to millennials, there a tendency to compare them to other generations in the workforce, thus treating millennials them as a homogenous group, devoid of internal differences. There is also a dearth of information pertaining to Kenyan millennials. This study seeks to determine the intra-generational differences between Kenyan millennials as an individual group, through the application of Schein’s career anchor theory to determine the career anchors (career priorities) as a way of understanding the cohort. The study extracts from a target population working at the head office of Twiga Chemicals, using a stratified random sampling method that obtained a sample of 32 millennials. The data instrument used was a close ended questionnaire. Data was processed and analyzed using Microsoft Excel Packages 2016, which used frequency count to determine frequency of each career anchor within each variable. Results found that intra-generational differences along the lines of age group, gender and career stage in particular, affect the career anchors of millennials. Organizations are recommended to segment millennials into smaller groups in order to understand the multidimensional nature of the group, as well as facilitate in setting realistic expectations about their abilities. Organizations are also recommended to strategically align their recruitment, selection and performance management in particular to millennial career goals, in order to mutually benefit from their tenure.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background of the study

At present, the worldwide workforce is generally comprised of three generations, Baby Boomers (1946-1964), Generation X (1965-1981) and Generation Y, more commonly referred to as millennials (Nichols, 2011). Millennials are individuals born between the years of 1980-2000 (Strauss & Howe, 1991 as cited in Sharf, 2015; Egri & Ralston, 2004). Many attempts to understand millennials have found researchers undergoing studies that compare them to previous generations in order to develop an understanding of their organizational behavior (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Macky, Gardner & Forsyth, 2008; Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman & Lance, 2010; Nichols, 2011). Much of this research has found that when compared to their older generational counterparts, millennials tend to be career tourists who are estimated to have a total of 15-20 jobs over the course of their careers (Deloitte, 2016). This has led to millennials being referred to as ‘loyalty challenged’ and ‘job hoppers’, as they display far more career diversity than their older generational counterparts (Deloitte, 2017; Meister, 2012).

The practice of comparing generational cohorts is based on the belief that distinct generational identities are the direct result of macro-environmental influences that create specific beliefs, values and expectations for each generation (Inglehart, 1997; Strauss & Howe, 1991 as cited in Egri & Ralston, 2004). However, while it is a valid assumption that individuals born in the same
birth era exhibit roughly the same behaviors, one must question whether this is approach paints an accurate picture of each generation concerned. According to Macky, Gardner and Forsyth (2008), there is a level of inherent subjectivity in generational comparison, as it leads to assumptions and stereotypes being formed about specific generations which have been found to be inconsistent with the realities of each generation. The inevitable outcome of this approach is that each respective generation is lumped into a single category, ignoring the internal demographic differences that create divergence between them.

A key problem that has emerged as a consequence of presenting generations, or more specifically, millennials a monolithic group, is the tendency to assume that millennials are all the same, irrespective of their regional and/or cultural differences. It is observed that on the topic of millennials, much of the research is based on western sample populations; but somehow, these results are often applied to millennials worldwide. Throughout management literature, it is agreed that cultural orientation plays a significant role in the organizational behavior, motivation, management and leadership of individuals. This begs the question of why millennials are not examined through the same culturally and regionally appropriate lens. Western nations, by virtue of being more politically, economically and technologically advanced; are inherently different from African ones. In the same vein, one can only assume that Western millennials are inherently different from African millennials, also known as ‘Afriennials’ (FCB Africa, 2017). There is therefore a need for information that segments millennials along different demographic lines (Odhiambo, 2018); to capture the internal differences between millennials themselves.

Research on millennials in Africa has sought to investigate the preferred leadership style of South African millennials (Kleinhans, 2017). This research found that although millennials dislike supervision, this does not automatically lend itself to a laissez-faire leadership style.
Instead, it was found that there is no single leadership style, but rather a combination of styles (autocratic, participative, transformational, laissez-faire, servant and communicative) that depend on the circumstances that warrant it. Leadership communication was determined to be more important to millennial employees, ensuring that it is frequent, unambiguous and open (Kleinhans, 2017). Other researches have examined the differences in generational motives regarding the preferences for certain recognition and rewards in the workplace, finding inconclusive results to support the idea that millennials prefer certain workplace rewards (Close, 2015).

Research that has used Kenyan millennials as a sample population has found that working millennials are difficult to retain, and are highly likely to leave their job if they are not engaged by it (Tubey, Kurgat & Rotich, 2015). Research has also found that Kenyan millennials in the workplace are influenced by factors such as relationships, technology friendliness, autonomy and flexibility, to name a few (Kamau, Njau & Wanyagi, 2014). Other research on Kenyan millennials has found that they are tech-savvy and adaptable in the workplace, but tend to have different work values and attitudes (Karugo, 2017). Collectively, this research demonstrates that it is easier to understand millennials, and their characteristics through auditing them internally, as an independent generational cohort.

The high turnover of Kenyan millennials begs the question of what they seek in their careers that causes them to constantly transition from one job to another. Understanding this would require an analysis into how millennials view their careers. To achieve this, Twiga Chemical Industries Limited (TCIL) has been selected as an organization to investigate. TCIL is a private company, operating in the chemical and allied sub-sector of the manufacturing industry in Kenya (Kenya Association of Manufacturers, 2018). This sector only makes up 9% of the manufacturing
industry. TCIL is a producer of high-quality agrochemicals, crop-protection, animal & public health products (Twiga Chemicals, 2018). TCIL is a fitting choice to use to investigate millennial career goals as it is a large, well-established company with several cross-functional departments, and routine internship programs that cut across managerial and technical fields. Companies of this stature and design tend to attract millennials, who are seeking recognition in a highly competitive employment market. The target group for this study are the millennial employees working at the head office of TCIL.

The essential purpose of this research is to utilize the sample mentioned to determine how different millennials are from one another, by measuring the changes in their career motives (anchors) as they age. The average age of the total Kenyan population is 19 years of age (CIA, 2017), with the 15-24-year age bracket being the largest percentage of the population (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2010 as cited in Odhiambo, 2017). This essentially means that the largest population in Kenya largely falls within the age range of millennials who are between 18-38 years of old (Strauss & Howe, 1991, as cited in Sharf, 2015; Egri & Ralston, 2004; Nichols, 2011). Considering how populous millennials already are, and their inevitably increasing dominance (millennials set to make up over 75% of the workforce by 2025; Deloitte, 2017); it is prudent, to say the least, to examine what they want out of their careers, and how this evolves with time.

1.2 Statement of the problem

A decent amount of research has focused on comparing millennials to other generations in the workplace to develop an understanding of their organizational behavior (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Macky, Gardner & Forsyth, 2008; Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman & Lance, 2010; Nichols, 2011).
Other research has used population samples of western millennials, and superimposed them on African millennials on the assumption that all millennials world-wide, are all the same (FCB Africa, 2017). Additionally, the themes of research that has examined Kenyan millennials are based round workplace productivity and behavior (Karugo, 2017), workplace expectations and attitudes (Tubey, Kurgat & Rotich, 2015; Kamau, Njau & Wanyagi, 2014), and the philosophical work ethics of millennials (Njuguna, 2016). None of the research mentioned distinguishes millennials from one another, but instead focuses on millennials as a collective group.

The treatment of millennials as a homogenous group devoid of internal differences, as well as the insufficiency of regionally, and empirically relevant information, warrants the need for more detailed investigation into this generational cohort.

1.3 Objectives of the study
To examine the effects of intra-generational differences on the career anchors of millennials working in the chemical and allied sector in Nairobi, using Twiga Chemicals as a case study.

1.3.1 Specific Objectives

1. To determine the intra-generational factors that affect the career anchors of millennials working in the chemical and allied sector in Nairobi
2. To determine the relationship between intra-generational differences and the career anchors of millennials working in the chemical and allied sector in Nairobi
3. To compare dominant career anchors of millennials from different intra-generational groupings in the chemical and allied sector in Nairobi
1.4 **Research Questions**

1. What are the intra-generational factors that affect the career anchors of millennials working in the chemical and allied sector in Nairobi?

2. To what extent do the intra-generational factors influence the career anchors of millennials working in the chemical and allied sector in Nairobi?

3. What are the differences and similarities between the intra-generational career anchors of millennials working in the chemical and allied sector in Nairobi?

1.5 **Justification of the Study**

Within a few years, millennials will dominate the workforce, placing unprecedented demands on employers. At present, the majority of information on millennials is based on sources that are either too broad, stereotypical or contextually irrelevant. This study provides much needed detail on millennials by distinguishing them from one another, producing results that are regionally relevant and representative. Furthermore, the investigation into what millennials seek from their careers at different ages, will give insight into the developmental evolution of millennials, that will facilitate the development of measures to support this group in the workplace.

It is hoped that this study will assist researchers and academics by adding to the limited body of literature available on Kenyan millennials. The empirical research undergone will also provide insight into the potential approaches that could be adopted to investigate the matter concerned.

This case study also seeks to benefit management at TCIL, by assisting them to understand the career needs of their millennial employees, and determine mutually beneficial methods of supporting these needs, while increasing productivity.
Finally, this study seeks to serve other organizations beyond TCIL, by educating them on millennial career development, such that appropriate managerial measures can be adopted to manage employee careers.

1.6 Scope of the Study

This study will be carried out between July and August, 2018. The study is carried out at the head office of Twiga Chemical Industries Limited based in Nairobi, Kenya. The target group for this research are the millennials working at the company between the ages of 22-38 years of age.

1.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has introduced the topic by providing a contextual explanation of issues pertaining to millennials in Kenya and the background of the topic. The research problem was also discussed, as well as the general and specific objectives of the study. The justification of the study was also provided, as well as the scope, which outlines the geographical and population boundaries of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter examines the literature available on career theories, as well as the empirically relevant research available on the topic of career anchors of working millennials. The chapter also produces a conceptual framework for this study that identifies relevant variables to utilize for research.

2.1 Theoretical Literature Review

2.1.1 Career Anchor Theory

Career anchor theory was developed by Edgar Schein in 1977 (Schein, 1978 as cited in Schein, 2006). The theory posits that an individual’s self-concept (i.e. values and needs), shapes their perception of their talents and skills, which in turn affects their motives and vocational choices. Vocational choices are thus referred to as career anchors as they are grounded in the values of each individual (Schein & Maanen, 2013).

According to Schein & Maanen (2013), there are 8 career anchors that influence vocational choices namely; security/stability, autonomy/independence, entrepreneurship/creativity, technical/functional competence, managerial competence, service/dedication to a cause, lifestyle and pure challenge. The characteristics of each anchor is explained in Table 1 below. According to Schein (1978 as cited in Schein, 2006), each individual has one dominant career anchor that
reflects their personal needs and desires. At present however, many writers assert that individuals have more than one dominant career anchor, that has emerged as a result of changes in the contemporary needs and preferences of workers in the current employment market (Suutari and Taka, 2004; Lazarova et al., 2014 as cited in Abessolo, Rossier, Hirschi, 2017).

To determine these anchors, Schein interviewed a small sample of 44 alumni graduates from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) over a period of 10-12 years, investigating why they have chosen to change jobs (Abessolo, Rossier, Hirschi, 2017). Initially, the study produced 5 primary career anchors, while the remaining 3 anchors were added with the assistance of his partner, De Long (Stelle & Francis-Smythe, 2007). The outcome of these interviews was the determination of a Career Orientation Inventory (COI), which was a 40-item questionnaire, where each of the 8 career anchors had 5 questions each.

Table 2.1: Adaptation of Schein’s Career Anchors (Source: Schein, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Anchor</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and stability (SE)</td>
<td>Primary need is to feel safe and secure in their careers. They are risk-aversive and enjoy the security that working life affords them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy and independence (AU)</td>
<td>Individuals with an aversion to ‘rules’ and prefer freedom of expression. They prefer work environments where there is freedom to work without supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship and Creativity (EC)</td>
<td>Individuals who find self-fulfillment in creating new ventures and exploiting creative ideas, much like an entrepreneur. They thrive on being able to convert these ideas into profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/functional competence (TF)</td>
<td>Individuals who are highly talented and motivated, and primarily enjoy being experts in their field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial competence (GM)</td>
<td>Individuals seeking management roles, with a primary goal to gain competence to climb the organizational ladder and influence policies that directly impact organizations competitive positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/dedication to a cause (secondary anchor) (SV)</td>
<td>Individuals who seek congruity between their personal values, and professional work. Occupational choices are based around causes that directly impact the society. These individuals make career choices less on their</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The key assertion of the career anchor theory is that one’s self-concept reveals their motivation (and vice-versa). This theory is relevant to this study as it asserts that one’s career anchor reveals their motives, while also supporting the view that individuals have dominant and dormant career values. It is therefore fitting to utilize the theory in this study to investigate the career motives of millennials by examining the dominant career anchors held by the target population.

### 2.2 Empirical Literature Review

#### 2.2.1 Intra-generational factors

Although generations have been depicted as homogenous groups, several authors have cited that there are differences between generations that are not to be ignored. According to Parvin and Ding (2017), millennials have several differences in work values, that are marked in distinguishable demographic qualities and attributes.

Their study on the differences in work values of generation Y, using a sample of millennials between the ages of 21-35 with 11-15 years of work experience. Individuals were all full-time Master’s degree students based in Klang Valley, Malaysia. A total of 10 interviews were conducted in the study (Parvin & Ding, 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifestyle (secondary anchor) (LS)</th>
<th>Individuals seeking balance between their personal life, family and careers. Their primary need is to integrate all areas of their lives and have everything working well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pure challenge (secondary anchor) (CH)</td>
<td>Individuals who enjoy unsolvable problems that test their maximum abilities and force them to find otherwise non-existent solutions. Primary need is to be highly engaged in the workplace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings of the study revealed that the key work values amongst generation Y included working for money, working for self-actualization and working for empowerment (Parvin & Ding, 2017). The researchers therefore concluded that millennial work values are multi-dimensional, and the nature of work is rapidly evolving.

According to Craft (2011), intra-generational differences are also recognizable in communication methods. The study used intra-generational factors such as gender, to explore the differences in preferred communication methods.

The instrument in this research was a survey, sent via email and obtaining 1,676 respondents, at the Western Kentucky University in the USA. The survey was used to test the sensitivity of each generation to different content (Craft, 2011). The outcome of the study was the conclusion that both in terms of intra and inter-generational factors, there were differences in message sensitivity. Craft concludes by making an overarching statement highlighting that the differences between and within generations are significant as each group and sub-group, tries to create their own social identity. The research therefore proves the legitimacy in understanding generations internally through segmentation.

The intra-generational analysis of millennials has also been conducted by authors such as Bargavi, Samuel and Paul (2017), who investigate the differences in the personality traits of millennials in the IT sector in India.

The sample used in this research included 525 millennials, who were in leadership roles in the IT industry in India. Respondents were predominantly male (80%). The data instrument used in this study was a survey questionnaire that measured the personality resilience inventory of millennials born between the years of 1982-2000 (Bargavi, Samuel & Paul, 2017). Data was
analyzed using multiple analyses of variation (MANOVA) techniques to whether differences between younger and older millennials were significant.

The results of the study generally found that when compared along the intra-generational differences of extroversion, openness, emotional stability and conscientiousness, older millennials born between 1980-1990 were more flexible and emotionally stable compared to their younger generational counterparts (Bargavi, Samuel & Paul, 2017). The results therefore support the practice of segmenting generations in order to determine whether or not demographic or personality-based factors influence them significantly.

### 2.2.2 Intra-generational Difference: Age

Research relevant to the age variable of this study is provided by Pande and Naik (2012) who examined career anchors of Indian professionals. The intention of their research was essentially to identify the hierarchy of career anchors within the sample concerned. The study therefore sought to determine the career anchors of respondents from the most, to the least important.

Their research study used a sample of Indian employees in the age group of 23-28 years of old. Respondents were required to have between 1-6 years of work experience. A sample of 1, 630 employees were selected, who each emerged from different sectors namely, retail, telecommunications, software and business process outsourcing call centers (Pande & Naik, 2012).

The data instrument used to attain responses was a close-ended questionnaire on a 6-point Likert scale. Respondents were asked to fill in each of the 41 items of the Career Orientation Inventory (COI), each correlating to one of nine career anchors. The use of 9 anchors is anomalous as
Schein’s original career orientation inventory contains only 8 factors. Pande and Naik (2012) outline that they added a ninth factor to serve as a subset within autonomy which they labelled as ‘work independence’. This additional factor concerns the individual’s interest in working alone (Pande & Naik, 2012). Aside from this ninth factor of work independence, other factors included stability/security, technical/functional competence, entrepreneurship/creativity, managerial competence, lifestyle, pure challenge, service/dedication to a cause, and autonomy/independence (Schein, 1978 as cited in Schein, 2006).

The validity of respondent’s ratings used factor analysis method, which reduces large quantities or numbers of variables into smaller, and more manageable factors (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). This was evidently necessary as the sample size was very large (1,630 respondents). Techniques to measure sampling adequacy included Barlett’s Test of Sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure (Pande & Naike, 2012).

The results of the study determined that the dominant career anchors for Indian professionals between the ages of 23-28 were managerial competence as the most dominant anchor, followed by lifestyle. The most dormant anchors were found to be pure challenge and autonomy (Pande & Naik, 2012). This means that professional Indian millennials are motivated to climb the organizational ladder and secure management roles, as well as placing a high amount of value on obtaining balance between their career and personal/family life (Schein, 1978 as cited in Schein, 2006).

This study pertains directly to this research as it examines both career anchors and millennials of a certain age, which are both variables in this research. Moreover, the study provides a hierarchy of millennial career anchors, which serves to benefit this research. Nonetheless, there are several gaps in the research.
To begin with, Pande and Naik’s (2012) research selects samples from the sectors of retail, telecommunications, software and outsourcing call centers. Though fitting for their study, there is a need to examine career orientations of individuals in other sectors and industries.

Another gap in the research presents itself in the use of career anchor theory. As mentioned earlier, Pande and Naik’s research (2012) added ‘work independence’ to the other 8 anchors determined by Schein (1978, as cited in Schein, 2006). This is addition is not part and parcel of career anchor theory thus, there is room for career anchor theory to be applied, free of any additions or modifications.

Furthermore, while the research examines the 23-28 age group which technically falls under the umbrella of millennials (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Nichols, 2011; Strauss & Howe, 1991 as cited in Sharf, 2015), this sample only represents a small portion of the larger age group that constitute millennials. There is therefore room for research that examines the career motives of millennials past the age of 28 years.

Even further, the use of factor analysis in this study is only fitting due to the large sample size concerned, that was sought to show representativeness of the larger population of Indian professionals (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Where smaller samples are utilized, this method will be rendered unnecessary. There is therefore a need for a research methodology on millennials that is more suitable for smaller sample populations, allowing for relationships between variables to be determined.

Finally, Pande and Naik’s (2012) study is based in India, which is culturally divergent to Kenya. Although they can both be broadly classified as developing nations, there are, assumably, several political, economic and socio-cultural differences between them that make them different from
one another. Additionally, the research does explicitly state the geographical location of the study within the country. As a result, it is unknown whether the sample of respondents lived in urban or rural settings. This warrants the need for research on career motives that is contextually relevant to Kenya, explicitly highlighting patterns between millennials in specific regions of the country.

In a study on the ways in which millennials are redefining work-life balance, Parker and Citera (2010) mention that issues pertaining to work life balance present themselves differently for men and women, but also need to be examined in relation to age in order to understand the issue at its core.

Their study sample utilized 543 individuals from across several generations (Baby Boomers, Gen X and Gen Y) to examine their relationship to work life balance. Results predictably found that there were generational differences between the groups. However, more importantly, Parker and Citera cite that generational differences have more to do with age, as a separate factor, rather than age. This therefore implies that it is necessary to examine generational cohorts internally.

### 2.2.3 Intra-generational Difference: Gender

In a study on the job millennial employee job expectations in the millennial generation, Liden (2015) found that while any generation has general similarities, it is not unusual to find significant differences between millennials on the basis of gender. Linden cites that women in general, for example, tend to place a higher emphasis on intrinsic job features, whereas men contrastingly place more emphasis on the extrinsic features of a job. Linden cites that it is important to closely examine and understand the intricacies of these generational differences in
order to gain an understanding of the generational cohort concerned. Gender should therefore be included as a variable in research pertaining to millennials,

Linden’s study involved the use of qualitative data to examine millennial job expectations. More specifically, the research utilized in-depth interviews to develop understanding of the matters. The sample included individuals born between the years of 1981 and 1990 who held a minimum of a Bachelor’s degree as well as at least one year of employment in the Baltimore-Washington metropolitan area in the US (Linden, 2015). Short interviews, telephone interviews were conducted with 20 participants, to identify job expectation themes.

Results of the study concluded that millennials tend to expect training, job-security, financial rewards, job responsibilities and career development opportunities from their work.

Other research on the significance of gender differences between millennials found that there are gender differences in the perceptions towards career paths. In their study on changes in career expectations found amongst undergraduate students, Armenio, Deslipp, Duffin, Meludie, Niaman and Sawatsky (2012) found that there were significant differences between how men and women view their careers. Data revealed that women appeared to be more optimistic regarding selected career paths and whereas men were not. Women believed more in equal opportunity and as a result, they were more positive regarding their career options. Men experienced more competition and were therefore more pessimistic about their options.

The research methodology of the study utilized 157 millennial respondents from at the University of Guelph in Canada. Data was analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) techniques to assess the degree to which the year of study impacted the career expectations of millennials.
The significance of gender-based differences was also captured by Fernandes, Hyde, Ives, Fleischer, Evoy and Marrum (2012) who studied differences between the work values of generation X and Y. The study found that there were significant differences in the career preferences of the genders. Females in the study were found to prefer more altruistic or social values in the workplace. The significance of gender differences was contradictory to their hypothesis which claimed that no gender difference would exist in work values within generation Y.

The research methodology for the study included a sample of 109 male and female respondents from both generations X and Y. Millennials were born between the years of 1980-1994. The data instrument was a questionnaire sent through the post, and based in Canada. Results found that while general generational differences were insignificant, gender differences were significant as females had a high affinity for the social altruistic model.

On the topic of gender and millennials, the research indicates that there are significant gender-based differences between millennials. This means there is further room to investigate and confirm this matter. Additionally, the fact that the research cited is based in the USA and Canada implies that more contextually relevant research would be appropriate. Finally, the use of millennials between the years of 1981-1990 and 1980-1994, shows that younger millennials born closer to the year 2000 have been excluded from research thus, there is room for the inclusion of younger millennials in research.

2.2.4 Intra-generational Difference: Career Stage

In a study on millennials and the workplace environment, Karugo (2017) explored whether millennials are perceived to be a positive influence on the workplace, and their effect on
workplace productivity. One discovery upon undergoing this research was that millennials focus on jobs that can provide a comfortable way of life, and have a desire for instant career growth. Therefore, in terms of career development, millennials have a premature ambition to advance rapidly in the workplace.

The study used a sample of millennials working in the HR and training department of the KRA. A 50-item questionnaire was used as the data instrument which was divided into 5 sections pertaining to demographic categorization, challenges faced in the workplace, perception of the benefits of having millennials in the workplace, workplace behavior and workplace productivity of millennials (Karugo, 2017).

Results of the study found that there are several perceived benefits of having millennials in the workplace such as their problem-solving skills, innovation, adaptability and willingness to learn (Karugo, 2017). Karugo concluded that strategic management of millennials is necessary to ensure their career ambitions are well managed.

Additional evidence to support the claim that millennials are driven by the possibility of attaining higher career levels is provided research conducted by Tubey, Kurgat and Rotich (2015). In their study on employment expectations among Kenyan millennials at final year students at Moi University, the study found that millennials are highly driven by promotions, and a need for constant growth and advancement opportunities. This affects their retention rates as they are likely to get easily frustrated, and leave a job, when they are unable to advance to higher organizational levels. Much of the attraction, they cite, is due to the perceived salary increase, increased responsibility and new titles afforded by being at higher career stages (Tubey, Kurgat & Rotich, 2015).
The methodology employed used questionnaires as a data collection tool, from a random sample of 100 millennials in their 4th year at Moi University’s School of Human Resource Development (Tubey, Kurgat & Rotich, 2015). Millennial respondents were born between the years of 1990-1995. Variables for measure were reward mechanisms, ideal workplace and motivational programs/activities/mechanisms. The outcome of the study found that millennials have high expectations from their employers, including minimal supervision, a challenging work environment, freedom to wear casual clothing and substantial compensation (Tubey, Kurgat & Rotich, 2015).

According to Kamau, Njau and Wanyagi (2014), career stages of millennials are dictated by their level of ambition. In their study on the factors that influence work attitudes of millennial evening students at Africa Nazarene University, the researchers found that ambition was a highly important factor to this generational cohort, and they show a high amount of interest in transitioning from one career stage to the next, with considerable haste. This ambition is the reason why millennials are always looking for greener pastures (Kamau, Njau & Wanyagi, 2014).

The methodology employed in this study utilized a sample of 41 evening university students who were engaged in both working, and part-time studies. The data instrument used was a questionnaire. Data was analyzed using factor analysis to identify and classify factors determined by literature to be relevant to millennials and therefore necessary to include in the questionnaire (Kamau, Njau & Wanyagi, 2014). The outcome of the research was the determination that ambition (i.e. career advancement), ranks the third out of 11 significant variables affecting millennial careers.
The literature discussed primarily used millennials at university as a sample (Kamau, Njau & Wanyagi, 2014; Tubey, Kurgat & Rotich, 2015). The other research cited was based in a public institution (KRA). Thus, while the research is contextually relevant as it is based in Kenya, there is room to explore millennial career in private institutions, using samples of millennials who are already in the workplace and not studying.

2.2.5 Intra-generational Difference: Education Level

According to Messenger (2017), learning plays a significant role in millennial development as it influences the way they learn in the organization. The study on the process of organizational learning of millennials in the workplace revealed that learning is a motivator for millennials, as it keeps millennials engaged and prevents boredom at work (Messenger, 2017). The study cites that for millennials without higher education qualifications, the likelihood of boredom is greater as they typically take on fewer complex roles. This implies that the education level of millennials affects their ability to remain engaged in the workplace.

The methodology for this research involved semi-structured interviews as well as qualitative thematic analysis to examine the relationship between millennials and organizational learning. 13 interviews were conducted. The study concluded that one’s learning experience, as well as the learning experiences offered in an organization, greatly drive the careers of millennials.

According to Fructoso (2015), millennials are changing the ways that we learn. In a study concerning the effects of millennials on education, the study found that millennials in the education system place demands on educational institutions in terms of the integration and consistent updating of current technologies to facilitate educational progress. Essentially, this reveals that millennials who have considerable experience in the field of higher education, are
more empowered, vocal and tenacious regarding their desire for state-of-the-art facilities. These traits are suggested to continue into working life to produce equally empowered, and demanding employees.

According to Emmanuel (2012), millennials are known to process information in a matter that contrasts that of previous generations. Emmanuel (2012) cites that it is inevitable for millennials in higher education institutions to be inclined towards learning styles that integrate the use of technology. Higher learning experiences of millennials thus affect the way millennials relate to technology, and in turn, the way in which millennials communicate in the workplace. It is therefore logical to assume that one’s level of education plays a role in influencing their communication style in the workplace, as well as their learning style.

The study on assessing millennials as the next generation of librarians used a mixed-method design in the form of an online survey and semi-structured interview (Emmanuel, 2012). The sample population included millennials born between the years of 1982 through 2001 in the United States.

Studies on education level and millennials has revealed a strong link between the level of education and engagement in the workplace (Messenger, 2017), as well as the influence of education on the use of technology and style of communication (Emmanuel, 2012; Fructoso, 2015). There is a need to explore these relationships further, as well as the need for more contextually relevant information on how education affects Kenyan millennials.
2.2.6 Career Anchors

To reiterate, career anchors refer to Schein’s (1978, as cited in Schein, 2006) 8 career anchors of stability/security, technical competence, autonomy/independence, entrepreneurship/creativity, managerial competence, lifestyle, challenge and service/dedication to a cause. Relevant authors who have used this theory are discussed below:

According to Steele and Francis-Smythe (2007), the career anchor theory provides sufficient means through which to analyze individual career priorities. In their study that empirically investigated the career anchors of 150 respondents based in the UK, they sought to examine the validity of this measure. Responses were attained from a mixture of private, public and voluntary sector organizations and used quantitative questionnaires as a data instrument, and factor analysis for testing (Steele & Francis-Smythe, 2007). To ensure reliability, the authors re-sent the questionnaires after a 12-month period.

The general findings of the study indicated that the career orientation inventory is internally reliable and can be used in career counselling and development.

Other researchers such as Vermeulen (2015) have found that career anchor theory is highly useful in examining the factors to reduce the underperformance in the workplace. The study suggested that many of the organizational challenges faced by those in the public service was based around the lack of career development models and practices, to boost employee morale through supporting their career ambitions.

The sample of the study were South African public service workers using a qualitative approach through the use of interviews and focus group discussions. A total of 10 focus group discussions
were performed, each with 15-25 participants per group. The outcome of the study was the aforementioned career management model, based on the employee’s behavioral work styles.

According to Meiliani (2014), career anchors are also a sufficient tool to use towards understanding job satisfaction. The study sought to understand the role that psychological empowerment plays in the context of Indonesia. The study used Schein’s single career anchor theory (1978), Feldman and Bolino’s multiple career anchor model (1996) and Locke’s (1976) model of job satisfaction (Meiliani, 2014).

The data approach used for this research was mixed-methodology (i.e. both qualitative and quantitative in nature). The sample provided with questionnaires included full time students from public universities in Indonesia, obtaining a total of 585 responses from 11 universities in the country. Additionally, interviews were conducted with 20 academics. Data analysis used factor analysis and frequency count.

Results found that security/stability and service were the most dominant career anchors in this group. Meiliani (2014) concluded that career anchor theory is a reliable and effective method to use in investigating job satisfaction, as well as other job outcomes such as commitment and job performance. Researchers are recommended to utilize modified versions of career anchor theory to examine the roles that they play in employees’ organizational behavior.

2.3 Summary and Research Gaps

The research gaps identified through empirical literature review reveal that the majority of studies examine older millennials, born closer to the years of 1980. There is therefore a need for information pertaining to younger millennials, as well as millennials in their middle ages. Additionally, as mentioned severally, a large majority of this information is based in geographic
contexts that are dissimilar to that of Kenya. Those that do relate to Kenya have used universities and public institutions from which to draw samples. There is therefore a gap in the information available on Kenyan millennials working in private companies. Finally, few of these studies examine the actual careers of millennials, looking instead at how millennials perceive their careers. There is therefore room for more information on millennials who are currently working, and can provide useful information regarding their current careers.

2.4 Conceptual Framework

Below is the conceptual framework for this study:

Independent Variable | Dependent Variable

![Conceptual Framework Diagram]

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework (Source: Author, 2018)
2.5 Operationalization of Variables

As indicated in the conceptual framework above, the variables in this research are age and career motives. The study seeks to determine how age affects the career motives of millennials in the workplace. To achieve this, the study will determine the age sub-groups in which each millennial is classified, and how this reflects in terms of their dominant and dormant career motives.
Table 2.2: Operationalization of Variables (Source: Author, 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operationalization of Variables</th>
<th>Operationalization of Career Anchor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age 22-27&lt;br&gt;Age 28-33&lt;br&gt;Age 34-38&lt;br&gt;Male&lt;br&gt;Female</td>
<td>Stability/ security (SE)&lt;br&gt;Autonomy/ independence (AU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneurship and creativity (EC)&lt;br&gt;Technical/ functional competence (TF)&lt;br&gt;Managerial competence (GM)&lt;br&gt;Service/ dedication to a cause (SV)&lt;br&gt;Lifestyle (LS)&lt;br&gt;Challenge (CH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Stage</td>
<td>1-3 years&lt;br&gt;4-6 years&lt;br&gt;7-9 years&lt;br&gt;10-12 years&lt;br&gt;13-15 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>High School Certificate&lt;br&gt;Higher Diploma&lt;br&gt;Bachelor's Degree&lt;br&gt;Master's Degree&lt;br&gt;PHD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter has examined the theoretical and empirical literature available on the topic of interest. A conceptual framework for the study has been outlined that serves as a guide for the study, by highlighting the relationship between study variables. Variables were then operationalized, explaining how they will be used in the study.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter highlights the methodology chosen to explore the topic in greater detail. More specifically, details on the research design, target population, sample technique/s, data instruments, pilot study, data collection, analysis, presentation and ethical considerations are provided, respectively.

3.1 Research Design

The purpose of research design is to assist in the development of problem-solving ideas ahead of the intended project (Colton & Covert, 2007). This research topic seeks to examine the effects of age on the career anchors of millennials in the chemical and allied sector in Nairobi, Kenya. The type of research chosen that satisfies this study is quantitative research, which structurally collects numerical data and analyses it through the use of statistics and presents it diagrammatically, and facilitates the process of gathering data to draw comparisons and make predictions (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). More specifically, the study utilizes descriptive statistics to compare and describe numerical information regarding variables. This approach was considered fitting to define the characteristics unique to the sample concerned.

3.2 Target Population

The population of a study refers to all the individuals that exhibit characteristics unique to the purpose of the study, while the target population refers to a specialized set of individuals with
characteristics from which inferences can be drawn (Colton & Covert, 2007). For this research, the population being examined are Kenyan millennials working in the chemical and allied sector in Nairobi. The target population are millennial employees working at the head office of Twiga Chemical Industries Limited in Nairobi.

Being that it is a large company in the sector, as well as the fact that there is a large number of millennials working in the company’s head office, TCIL was determined to be an appropriate company from which to use their target population. Furthermore, the target population comprises millennials of various ages, spanning across all the age categories identified in chapter 2 (age 22-27; 28-33 and 34-38). This was therefore a fitting target population as it permits the measurement age differences, which is a key variable in this study.

3.3 Sample and Sampling Technique

3.3.1 Sample

The sample selected for this research are Kenyan millennials between the ages of 22-38 years of age working at the head office of TCIL in Nairobi, Kenya. Respondents must have a minimum of a Bachelor’s degree to limit the influence of extraneous variables (i.e. influence of different education levels of career goals of millennials), (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

Although technically, millennials are between the ages of 18-38 years of age, the sample selected excludes millennials between 18-21 years old, as they are determined to be too young to have sufficient work experience from which to draw conclusive responses regarding career choices. Age 22 thus became the lower age limit for this research, which is also, non-coincidentally, the starting age of early adulthood outlined in the conceptual framework.
Sampling Frame

The sampling frame for this study draws from the target population of millennials which was 64 in total. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a minimum percentage of 30% of total cases from each group is required for research. The sample percentage selected for this study was 50% meaning a total of 50% of respondents were selected from the target population. The total number of samples required was therefore 33 in total. A high sample percentage was selected to ensure reliability of results, and also increase the diversity of responses for analysis.

Table 1.1: Sampling Frame (Source: Author, 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Target population of millennials</th>
<th>Sample of Millennials</th>
<th>Sample Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Accounting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement and IT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR and Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Care Division</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Affairs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Sampling technique

This study utilized a stratified random sampling method where members of the population are divided into homogenous subgroups before sampling (Mays, 2011). Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) cite that when using this method, the sub-groups that exist within the population must be
reproduced in the sample concerned. The population was thus initially divided on the basis of
generation, producing millennials as a generational cohort. The millennial population was then
further divided into age strata’s (ages 22-27, 28-33, and 34-38). The samples chosen were
selected from these strata’s, thus representing the large majority of the millennial population.

3.4 Instruments

A data instrument refers to a tool that serves the purpose of measuring and collecting data
(Colton & Covert, 2007). The instrument selected for this quantitative study is a close-ended,
self-report survey questionnaire, where respondents read and select the most fitting response for
them.

The questionnaire contained 24 close ended questions that were directly relevant to the
dependent variable of career anchor. Other questions involved the demographic information of
respondents i.e. age, sex, highest academic qualification and years of work experience. The
questions for the questionnaire were extracted from Schein’s career orientation inventory as they
pertain to career anchor theory.

The rating scale used was a 5-point Likert scale which was deemed appropriate to measure the
intensity/strength of responses (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Appendix II presents the
final survey questionnaire.
3.5 Pilot Study

3.5.1 Validity

Validity of research focuses on whether there is a relationship between research variables in terms of how fitting the data instrument is for the study (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). To achieve this, a pilot study was conducted on a random sample of millennials (who were not part of the sample and study). Their career anchors were determined and results were compared. This pilot study determined that the instrument was appropriate for the study.

3.5.2 Reliability test

Reliability refers to the extent to which selected data instrument will yield consistent findings (Easterby-Smith et al, 2008 as cited in Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). The four factors that could potentially harm the reliability of a study are participant error, participant bias, observer error and observer bias (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

To minimize participant errors, the study ensured that they were not excessively pressured to complete questionnaires in a short space of time. Additionally, the pilot study tested on 5 random millennial respondents revealed that when initially given all 40 questions in the career orientation inventory, respondents left many questions unanswered, and feedback found that the questions were found to be repetitive and ambiguous in nature. Furthermore, when using the 6-point Likert scale as applied in Schein’s (1978, as cited in Schein, 2006) original study, the majority of responses fell within the middle or neutral category, not producing strong results.

To reduce respondent fatigue and decrease the likelihood of participant error, questions were shortened to 24 in total, therefore asking 3 questions for each of the 8 career anchors. 8 of the
questions were altered to ensure full comprehension of what the question was asking. Also, the 6-point Likert scale was then altered to a 5-point scale, forcing participants to make conclusive decisions and not simply choose easier, neutral responses. Participant bias was minimized by ensuring anonymity to respondents, thus reducing pressure to give specific responses.

Observer error and bias was minimized through conducting the pilot study and ensuring the familiarity of the researcher with the scale employed.

Finally, testing was performed on 5 random individuals initially to test the instrument, then again after the instrument was tested (on a different sample), to examine the usefulness of the tool.

3.6 Data Collection Procedure

Data collection refers to the systematic gathering and measurement of research information (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). As mentioned, questionnaires were used to collect data for this study. Questionnaires were self-administered to the selected sample in person (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Respondents gave responses by ticking the appropriate box from a 5-point Likert scale. Completed questionnaires were labelled appropriately according to the ages of respondents (age 22-27-Group 1; 28-33- Group 2; 34-38- Group 3). Questionnaires were administered in person to avoid the privacy violation associated with online surveys sent to personal email addresses.

3.7 Data Analysis and Presentation

As the research methodology is quantitative in nature, it is fitting for data to be analyzed using a quantitative approach. The career anchors determined for each individual will be coded into
Excel Computer Packages to assist in the determination of response frequencies. Data will then be presented in the form of graphs and tables.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

3.8.1 Informed Consent

This was attained by sending a letter to the organization concerned (TCIL) informing them of the intention to utilize their company as a case study, as well as the title of the research project. This information was provided in a letter of introduction, provided in Appendix III.

3.8.2 Voluntary Participation

To ensure voluntary participation, the cover letter of the questionnaire mentioned that one had the option of participating in the research, but they were not obliged to do so. This ensured that those who did complete the questionnaire were voluntary participants.

3.8.3 Confidentiality

Confidentiality was maintained through the efficient and secure storage of the questionnaires (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). This ensured that only the researcher had access to respondent information.

3.8.4 Privacy

Participant privacy was achieved by not asking for personal information (i.e. name, address etc.). This made participants less vulnerable, as their personal information could not be misused.
3.8.5 Anonymity

As mentioned, none of the participants were asked to provide personal information thus, the researcher was unaware of their identity when computing results. Additionally, there were no signatures required to confirm consent to the questionnaire, which further protected respondents and ensured their anonymity.

3.9 Chapter Summary

This chapter has discussed the research design of this study, providing information regarding the target population, sample and sampling techniques and data instrument employed for this study. The chapter has also discussed the pilot study carried out prior to undergoing research, as well as the data collection procedure and analysis and presentation of data. Finally, the chapter touched on ethical considerations in research, more specifically pertaining to obtaining informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, privacy and anonymity to protect the respondents concerned.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the results and findings from primary research conducted on the aforementioned sample. The following chapter will present results pertaining to the background information of respondents, as well as details regarding their dominant and dormant career orientations. This chapter will also examine the limitations faced in the research process.

4.1 Presentation of Research Findings

Background information on respondents

A total of 32 respondents, which made 50% of the recommended sample size were obtained in complete form. 53% of respondents were males while 46% were female (see figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1: Gender distribution of respondents
Table 2.1: Age distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 22-27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 28-33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 34-34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest number of responses were from individuals aged 22-27 years of age who made up 38% of total responses. Age 28-33 and 34-38 made up 31% each of total responses with 10 respondents each, respectively (see Table 4.1).

Figure 4.2: Years of work experience

Individuals with 1-3 years of work experience were the largest percentage of respondents making up 53% of respondents. Millennials with 4-6 years of work experience was the second largest group at 22%, followed by 10-12 years of experience at 19%. Millennials with work experience of 7-9 years made up the smallest percentage with only 6% of respondents having this amount of
work experience. This means that there were more individuals in the early stages of their career than anything else.

Table 4.2: Highest Academic Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Academic Qualification</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of academic qualifications, all respondents had a minimum of a Bachelor’s degree, with 26 out of the 32 respondents (81%) having this qualification. 5 out of 32 individuals had Master’s degrees (16%), while only 1 individual had a PhD.

**Age Variable Results**

**Age 22-27**

Figure 1.3: Gender distribution Age 22-27
Gender distribution of ages 22-27 shows that there was a 50-50 distribution between males and females. To be exact, there were 6 male responses and 6 female responses in this age sub-group.

Figure 4.4: Primary and Secondary Dominant Career Anchors Age 22-27

The primary dominant career anchor for individuals in the 22-27 age group was found to be entrepreneurship and creativity (EC), with 8 out of 12 (67%) individuals holding this as the most important anchor. The secondary dominant career anchor for this age group was service (SV), with 3 out of 12 individuals holding this as a secondary priority (see Figure 4.4 and Table 4.3).
Table 4.3: Frequency of Responses for Age 22-27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Anchor</th>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Dominant Anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence (TF)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Competence (GM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence (AU)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability/Security (SE)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship/Creativity (EC)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (SV)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge (CH)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle (LS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5: Dormant Career Anchors Age 22-27

The most dormant career anchor amongst individuals aged 22-27 was stability and security (SE) with 42% (5 out of 12) millennials not valuing this anchor. Other anchors considered dormant to this group were technical/functional competence (17%) and managerial competence (17%).
Age 28-33

Table 4.4: Gender distribution Age 28-33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the age 28-33 category, there was an equal share of gender distribution with 5 out of 10 respondents being male, and the numbers with females (see Table 4.4).

Figure 4.6: Primary and Secondary Dominant Career Anchors Age 28-33

The primary dominant career anchors for individuals age 28-33 was entrepreneurship and creativity (EC) with 30% of respondents (3 out of 10 people) finding this to be a top most priority. The secondary dominant career anchor was lifestyle (LS), of which 30% of respondents also held as a secondary priority (see Figure 4.6 and Table 4.5).
Table 4.5: Frequency of Responses for Age 28-33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Anchor</th>
<th>Primary Dominant Anchor</th>
<th>Secondary Dominant Anchor</th>
<th>Dormant Anchor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence (TF)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Competence (GM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence (AU)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability/Security (SE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship/Creativity (EC)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (SV)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge (CH)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle (LS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most dormant career anchor for individuals between ages of 28-33 produced a tie, with stability/security (SE) and managerial competence (GM) both having 30% (3 out of 10) respondents holding this as a dormant career priority (see Figure 4.7).
Age 34-38

Table 4.6: Gender distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender distribution of respondents between ages 34-38 was 6 males (60%) and 4 females (40%), (See Table 4.6).

Figure 4.8: Primary and Secondary Dominant Career Anchors Age 34-38

The primary dominant anchor for individuals in the oldest age group between 34-38 years of age was technical/functional competence (TF) with 30% of individuals (3 out of 10) citing this as a primary career goal. The secondary dominant anchor was pure challenge (CH) which 40% (4 out of 10) respondents held as a secondary career priority (see Figure 4.8 and Table 4.7).
Table 4.7: Frequency of Responses for Age 34-38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Anchor</th>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Dominant Anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence (TF)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Competence (GM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence (AU)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability/Security (SE)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship/Creativity (EC)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (SV)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge (CH)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle (LS)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.9: Dormant Career Anchor Percentages Age 34-38

The most dormant career anchor for the age 34-38 sub-group of millennials was service (SV), with 40% (4 out of 10) respondents not holding this as a top priority. Lifestyle was the second most dormant career anchor, with 20% of responses (see Figure 4.9).
A comparison of primary dominant career anchors reveals that the primary dominant anchors for age groups 22-27, 28-33 and 34-38 are respectively entrepreneurship/creativity (EC) at 67%, entrepreneurship/creativity (EC) at 30% and technical/functional competence (TF) at 30% (see Figure 4.10). This reveals that individuals in the 22-27 and 28-33 age categories had the same primary career anchor, although the intensity of response was higher in the former age group. The age 34-38 group stands alone, with technical/functional competence as a top priority.
When comparisons were drawn between the secondary dominant career anchors, it was found that age 22-27 valued service (SV) at (25%); 28-33 valued lifestyle (LS) at 30%, while age 34-38 valued challenge (CH) at 40% as a secondary career priority (see Figure 4.11). Each age group had different secondary career anchors, implying that they each have different career priorities.
Comparison of dormant career anchors for all age groups revealed that stability/security (SE) was the least important anchor for age 22-27 with 33% of respondents. For age 28-33, there were two anchors that were equally dormant namely, security/stability (SE) at (30%) and managerial competence (GM), also at (30%). Finally, the most dormant career anchor for millennials aged 34-38 was service (SV) at 40% response rate (see Figure 4.12).

This reveals that stability/security (SE) was a shared dormant career anchor, with age groups 22-27 and 28-33 holding it as dormant. Neither group shared a dormant anchor with age group 34-38.
Gender Variable Results

Figure 4.13: Female Dominant Career Anchors Across all Ages

Comparison of career anchors for female shows that the dominant anchor for age 22-27 group was entrepreneurship and creativity (EC) at with 50% of respondents. Age 28-33 females did not have any dominant anchor, with equal percentages (20%) valuing technical competence, managerial competence, autonomy/independence, entrepreneurship/creativity and service equally. In the age 34-38 group, entrepreneurship and creativity was the most dominant anchor with 50% of responses.
Figure 4.14: Male Dominant Career Anchors Across all Ages

Comparison of male dominant age group 22-27, 83% of them value entrepreneurship and creativity (EC). 60% of 28-33 year old males also value entrepreneurship/creativity, while an equal share of 34-38 year olds males’ value technical competence and service (40% each).

Figure 4.15: Dominant work experience for 1-3 years of work experience
Comparison of dominant work experience for individuals with 1-3 years of work experience revealed that 100% of respondents (1 person) for the 34-38 year age group valued lifestyle (LS). Entrepreneurship/creativity was the dominant anchor for millennials in both 28-33 (40%) and 22-27 (73%) age groups.

Figure 4.16: Dominant work experience for 4-6 years of work experience

The most dominant career anchors for individuals with 4-6 years of work experience was service at 100% each for ages 22-27 and 34-38. Age 28-33 had dominant anchors of entrepreneurship and creativity at 40% response rate.
Figure 4.17: Dominant work experience for 7-9 years of work experience

The dominant career anchor for individuals with 7-9 years of experience was service (50%) and technical competence (50%). All individuals with this amount for work experience were in the 34-38 age group.

Figure 4.18: Dominant work experience for 10-12 years of work experience

Individuals with 10-12 years’ work experience were all between the ages of 34-38 years old. Dominant anchors were entrepreneurship/creativity (EC) and technical competence (TF) with 33% of respondents.
Comparison of dominant career anchors for Bachelor’s degree holders revealed that for the 22-27 age group, entrepreneurship/creativity (EC) was the most dominant anchor at 67%. For 28-33 age group entrepreneurship/creativity (EC) was also dominant with 37.5% of responses. Finally, for those with Bachelor’s degrees between the ages of 34-38 years, the dominant career anchor was technical competence (TF) with 34% of responses.
The most dominant career anchor for 28-33 year olds with master’s degree was both entrepreneurship/creativity (EC) and service (SV) with 50% of respondents each. For the age 34-38 category, there was an equal balance between security/stability (SE), entrepreneurship/creativity (EC) and service (SV) with 33.3% each.

As for the PhD holders, there was only 1 individual from the sample who had a PhD. This individual had technical/functional competence (TF) as a primary career anchor.
### Table 4.8: Summary grid of millennial career anchors over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>22-27</th>
<th>28-33</th>
<th>34-38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>TF, GM, AU, EC, SV</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>TF, SV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SV, TF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>EC, TF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EC, SV</td>
<td>EC, SV, SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 4.8 above, there are several ways in which the intra-generational differences between millennials affect their career priorities. The grid above highlights that while from a distance, all millennials may appear to have roughly the same career goals and intentions, there are several nuances between the groups as discussed below:

**Discussion of results**

**Age**

Overall, results by age revealed that the age 22-27 age bracket is not significantly influenced by other features such as gender, career stage and education level. Results showed that this group tended to more or less, maintain the same career anchor (entrepreneurship/creativity) as other intra-generational features developed. The age 28-33 age group however, saw many changes as their interests were particularly divergent depending on whether the subject was male or female. The most significant differences in career anchors was seen amongst individuals between the
ages of 34-38, who appeared to have the most diverse interests. This group showed the most variation, with changes in each demographic feature making a significant difference in the career anchor cited. It is therefore valid to conclude that for this age group, differences in demographic factors played a significant role in the career priorities of these individuals.

**Gender**

In the early years, male and female millennials appear to have the same interests, with the data finding that they both prioritize entrepreneurship (age 22-27). However, differences start to emerge as they get older. While male millennials appear to maintain their interest in entrepreneurship/creativity, females in the 28-33 category begin to develop other career interests ranging from technical competence, managerial competence, autonomy/independence, service as well as entrepreneurship/creativity. In their later years, female millennials return to their interest in entrepreneurship/creativity, while male millennials begin to develop career anchors of technical competence and service.

During the early millennials years (age 22-27) it appears that males and females have the same interests, thus contradicting the statements made by Armenian, Deslipp, Duffin, Meludie, Niaman & Sawatsky, 2012; Fernandes, Hyde, Ives, Fleischer, Evoy & Marrum, 2012; and Liden, 2015, suggesting that millennials exhibit gender differences. However, as they grow older, the differences between male and female millennials begin to appear, ending with completely different career anchors/priorities by the time they reach age 34-38. Furthermore, the suggestion that women primarily show interest in service and altruism is false, as results found that both groups cite this as a career priority, only at different ages.
Career Stage

Results found that millennials with 1-3 years of work experience had career anchors of entrepreneurship/creativity and lifestyle. This means that during the early years of ones working experience, they place value on creating new ventures and exploiting creative ideas, as well as finding work-life balance (Schein, 2006). Individuals in the with 4-6 years of work experience had a different set of anchors as they begin to place value on service/dedication to a cause.

In later years (7-9 years’ work experience), millennials appear to retain their interest in service and gain more interest in gaining technical competence, which continues even into later years of work experience (i.e. 10-12 years).

Although the studies suggested that millennials all have a premature ambition to be promoted and advance quickly in an organization (Karugo, 2017; Tubey, Kurgat & Rotich, 2015; Kamau, Njau & Wanyagi, 2014), this proves not to be the case. One would therefore expect millennials to place value on managerial competence, as this is the career anchor that addresses one’s desire for management roles that help them climb the organizational ladder (Schein, 2006). Conversely however, millennials show less interest in their personal advancement, and more interest in the advancement of societal causes as they gain more work experience.

Education level

Results showed that millennials with a bachelor’s degree place value on entrepreneurship/creativity at ages 22-27 and 28-33. Upon reaching age 34-38, their interest in technical competence gains leverage. For those with master’s degree qualifications, their interest in entrepreneurship remains, while they develop an interest in service around age 28-33. At age 34-
38, those with master’s degree qualifications develop several interests, including the need for security/stability. This is the first instance where the career anchor of security/stability has presented itself, implying that it is most commonly sought after by individuals with high academic qualifications, at a later stage of being a millennial.

The trend as it pertains to education level appears to be that interest in technical career development increases in direct proportion to the increase in academic advancement. This is only to be expected as individuals tend to pursue education for the reason of improving technical skills.

4.2 Limitations of the study

The main challenge experienced in this study was the slow speed of responses. Despite the shortening of the questionnaire to reduce respondent fatigue and increase likelihood of a quick response rate, many respondents still took a long time to return questionnaires, with many of them, 9 to be exact, having to be excluded from the research due to incompleteness.

The researchers lack of familiarity with the research in general also posed a challenge while conducting this study.

4.3 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the findings obtained from the research, regarding the career anchors of millennials, and the differences/similarities between them. The results indicate that millennials are both similar and different in what they consider to be career priorities. Primarily, differences between the age 22-27 and 34-38 age group, reveal that severe changes occur as millennials get
older. Results also found significant differences between male and female millennials. The limitations of the study were also discussed in this chapter.
5.0 Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the findings throughout this study. The discussions, conclusions and recommendations provided are relevant to the objectives set at the onset of the research. The chapter also suggests areas of further study.

5.1 Summary of Findings

The findings of this report reveal the significance of examining intra-generational differences amongst millennials, and their knock-on effect on the career priorities that individual from each respective demographic might have. Below are the major findings of the study:

Age

On the variable of age, it was found that there are, expectedly, significant differences between the age groups of individuals between age 22-27 and age 34-38. The key difference is that the former group of millennials appear to place more value on entrepreneurship, while the latter place more value on technical competence. This therefore implies that older millennials are more career orientated in the conventional sense of focusing on acquiring technical skills and abilities. Younger millennials, in contrast, are more creative and innovating. Millennials between ages 28-33 generally show more resemblance to their younger counterparts.
Gender

The variable of gender revealed that there are significant differences between millennials who are male and female during later years. The differences between male and female millennials start to present themselves at age 28-33, with females starting to gain more interest in career advancement through gaining technical skills, attaining higher positions at work, autonomy and taking work that is of benefit to society. The interest in career advancement for males occurs at a later age 34-38. This implies that female millennials generally gain more career related interests at an earlier age.

Career Stage

Millennial differences on the basis of career stage revealed that individuals with 1-3 years of work experience were primarily interested in entrepreneurial pursuits. Individuals with 4-6 years of work experience showed interest primarily in engaging in socially-conscious work. A shift towards more technically based career priorities occurs amongst millennials with 7-9 and 10-12 years, as they begin to strive for technical based competencies. This result reveals that for the majority of millennials, they do not develop a career-oriented focus until they have gained a significant amount of work experience in their field. Initially at the onset of their careers, their interests are non-organizational. But over time, millennials begin to show a strong interest in gaining skills that can serve to benefit organizations.

Education level

Results based on the education level of millennials revealed that millennials with a bachelor’s degree tend to place value on entrepreneurship/creativity between the ages of 22-33. This implies that the vast number of individuals with this qualification seek to explore and exploit more
creative avenues to make profit. However, a shift occurs with millennials hold master’s degree qualifications, as they develop an interest in serving society, as well as gaining stability and security. PhD holders were expectedly found to hold technical competence in high regard.

5.2 Recommendations

For millennials in the age 22-27 category, it was discovered that they have a dominant interest in creativity and entrepreneurship. It could therefore be recommended to employers for this ability is developed and directed by involving these individuals in organizational activities that involve innovating thinking (e.g. marketing campaigns, marketing materials etc.).

The recommended activities for this group would thus be inclusion into marketing-based activities in the workplace that enable the use of these skills. The marketing department of the organization should be responsible and proactive about having these younger millennials on their side. Activities should take place several times a year to ensure the use of their innovative skills is well exercised.

Millennials between age 28-33 were found to have a broad range of career anchors. The lack of a consistent career priorities reveals that this group of millennials are in the process of identifying or even re-orienting their career priorities. It could therefore be recommended that mentors be assigned to millennials in this age category, to assist them in developing career clarity that will allow the organization to retain them while also developing their talents. Persons responsible for assigning mentors would be the line managers (supervisors) of each department. This mentoring activity should be an ongoing activity in the organization for individuals of a certain age. Performance appraisals and management can used as a form of monitoring and evaluation.
For millennials aged 34-38, their interest in technical competence was dominant. Organizations should therefore provide several training opportunities to ensure they are in a state of continuous growth and learning. Opportunities for sponsored accreditation programs should also be facilitated often. Companies should also ensure that this group engages in professional networking to expand the knowledge of the individual as well as keep abreast of latest developments in their field that organizations can learn about. Line managers, along with the HR department must be involved in ensuring continuous learning. Performance management should be used to monitor the growth and competence development of this group.

From a gender perspective, results found that male and female millennials have different career anchors, with female career anchors becoming more diverse and varied over time. It would therefore be recommended that companies become more vigilant when handling employees of different genders, allowing them to capture the differences between groups, and create employee development plans that accommodate these interests in their work life. This can be achieved through performance management programs, which are revised quarterly to ensure they are kept up to date with the development of the individual. Both line managers, and HR managers would be responsible for this activity.

The division of millennials along the lines of career experience and educational level revealed that the degree of interest in technical competence begins to grow as millennials gain more work experience, and acquire more technical qualifications. It should therefore be suggested that organizations direct the larger sum of funds and attention of those who show interest in technical growth that is also beneficial to the organization. This ensures that the organization does not spend copious amounts of time on motivating this group as they already have clarity over their desired career goals.
5.2.1 Implications for research, policy, practice and education

While this study has added to the body of research available on Kenyan millennials, there is still much information to be gained from further segmenting millennials into different sub groups. As demonstrated in the summary of results, millennials might have some similarities, but there are also several significant differences between them which require further investigation. It is thus recommended that more research is undergone to identify further differences within the cohort along the lines of variables such as geographic location, marital status and even ethnic orientation, to name a few. Fundamentally, the field of research should focus more energy of identifying the differences in this group and their correlations, to demystify their organizational behavior, as well as to prepare for generations to come.

The implications of this research on education reveal that there is a necessity for more courses that develop the entrepreneurial skills of younger millennials in particular. While higher learning institutions already offer such courses, there is a need perhaps, for such courses to be available as training options within an organization, that are able to connect entrepreneurship to organizational goals. This is necessary to ensure that millennials are able to put their entrepreneurial capabilities in alignment with the strategies of the organization.

In terms of practice, organizations with large numbers of millennials, of which the majority comprise, must begin to focus on individual millennial traits, rather than viewing them as a homogenous collective. This would require companies to perform testing (such as the career orientation survey in this report) to categorize millennials accordingly. This will assist in capturing the essence of what each individual employee requires from the company, and
determine how organizations can strategically collaborate with them. Changes in recruitment and selection criteria and performance management will therefore be necessary.

### 5.3 Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to examine the effect of intra-generational differences on the career anchors of millennials working at TCIL. The research has explored the topic through the formation of relevant objectives and research questions to address this topic. The literature available of the topic was also discussed to aid in the formation of a conceptual framework for the study. This assisted with the development of the research methodology to investigate the topic, using the head office of TCIL as the company of choice. The results and findings of the study were then calculated and tabulated.

Generally speaking, the results have revealed that differences in age, gender and career stage, primarily affect the career anchors and priorities of millennials. However, it must be said that while it was expected to find intra-generational differences in career goals, the key value of this study is in the fact that it identifies how exactly these differences present themselves. The results found not only provide an explanation of the intra-generational behavior, but also demonstrate that although nuances between millennials may be minimal, they are significant and crucial to understanding the individuals in the cohort.

Ultimately, it appears that in order for organizations to benefit from having millennials as employees, they must develop clarity regarding the differences in millennial employees. This is necessary in order to be strategically precise regarding the positions they place each employee, and their expectations from them. It is not recommended for organizations to have blanket expectations from millennials, as this is likely to yield frustration from both millennials and the
organizations, as expectations will not be met. Organization must thus shift their perception and practices regarding millennials, becoming more collaborative with them by leveraging their pre-existing interests and matching them with organizational needs accordingly.

In conclusion, there is much to gain from segmenting a generational cohort such as millennials, as the intra-generational differences between them are significant. In order to effectively manage the cohort, organizations must reconsider their one-size-fits-all approach that only makes sense of millennials collectively. A more targeted approach must be adopted that examines them internally, and captures the differences between them such that their skills and abilities can be used with strategic precision.
REFERENCES


Hosie, R. (2017, May 2). The millennial divide: How a generation can be split into two very


APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

23 July, 2018

Dear Respondent,

RE: INTRA-GENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CAREER ANCHORS OF KENYAN MILLENNIALS: A CASE STUDY OF TWIGA CHEMICALS

I am an undergraduate student at the Management University of Africa pursuing a degree in Bachelors of Management and Leadership. I am currently undertaking research on the above-named topic, in partial fulfillment of my undergraduate project. My study seeks to examine the different career goals of millennials working at Twiga, to determine how different working millennials are from one another, and the varied goals that we each have for ourselves.

I hereby request your assistance in filling the short questionnaire attached, as this will facilitate in completion of my project. All the information contained shall be treated with utmost confidentiality, and ensures your anonymity. Nonetheless, you are free to decide whether or not to participate in this study.

I look forward to your feedback, and would be honored to present my findings to your organization. Please feel free to contact me with any questions on the email provided below.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Tabayi
s.tabayi@yahoo.com
APPENDIX II: RESEARCH STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION 1 & 2: Intra-generational factors and differences

Please circle the appropriate answer

1. What age group do you fall under?

Age 22-27 Age 28-33 Age 34-38

2. What is your gender?

Female Male

3. What is your highest level of educational qualifications?

High school Certificate Higher Diploma

Bachelor’s Degree Master’s Degree PHD

4. How many years of work experience do you have in your chosen career?

1-3 years 4-6 years 7-9 years 10-12 years 13-15 years

SECTION 2: Career Anchor questions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I value gaining competence over earning a high salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success for me, can only be attained through being highly competent either technically/functionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather leave my organization than to be asked to perform an assignment that goes beyond my area of expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical/functional competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I value job stability over having freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I primarily gain fulfillment from achieving employment security rather than technical competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would take a permanent position that’s boring, over a temporary position that is engaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stability/Security Questions
### Question

(Please tick appropriate column- ONLY ONE RESPONSE PER QUESTION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would not stay in an organization that made it too difficult to focus on personal and family matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value having work-life balance over making a lot of money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining social and family relations is more important to me important than advancing my career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lifestyle Questions:

Challenge Questions:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Please tick appropriate column- ONLY ONE RESPONSE PER QUESTION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather have a highly challenging and engaging job over a well-paid job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather than a high challenging job rather than a high-level position and title (that does not necessarily pay well)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather be challenged but mediocre at what I do, rather than bored but highly skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Please tick appropriate column- ONLY ONE RESPONSE PER QUESTION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the world a better place through my professional work is more important than achieving a high-level position in my area of expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would choose to leave my organization if it prevented me from serving others in society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My career can only be successful if I contribute to improving the welfare of society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service/dedication to a cause Questions
Entrepreneurship/Creativity Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Please tick appropriate column- ONLY ONE RESPONSE PER QUESTION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is more important to me to have my own fully functioning business, than to achieve a high-level position in someone else’s business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to feel successful, I must create or build something that is entirely my own idea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above everything, I want to start and run my own business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autonomy and Independence Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Please tick appropriate column- ONLY ONE RESPONSE PER QUESTION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am most satisfied at work when I can select my own tasks, procedures and schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thrive on the freedom to do work without supervision. This freedom is more important than attaining job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would take a 10% salary cut if it gave me more free time during the week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please tick appropriate column- ONLY ONE RESPONSE PER QUESTION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain the most fulfillment from effectively managing and delegating to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will <em>only</em> view myself as a success if I become a general manager in some company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am striving to one day be in charge of an organization, and making decisions that affect large numbers of people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Managerial Competence Questions

Thank you!
APPENDIX III: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

SARAH TABAYI - BMI/8/00204/2/2014

This letter serves to introduce the above named who is a Bachelor of Management and Leadership student and is interested in carrying out research on the Examining intra-generational differences in the career goals of Kenyan millennials: A case study of millennials working in Twiga Chemical Industries Limited.

Any assistance accorded to her in pursuit of this study will be greatly appreciated.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. John Chelagat

DEAN, SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP