IDENTIFYING PERCEPTUAL FACTORS AFFECT INTRINSIC CAREER SUCCESS BY DELPHI METHOD

Mohsen Jajarmizadeh[1] --- Hojat Moshtaghian Abarghooi[2]†

[1]Department of Management, Payame Noor University Shiraz, Iran

[2] Human Resource Management, Payame Noor University Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

Models are essential to scientific thinking and practical problem solving. The lack of any theoretical model of intrinsic career success, and the importance of intrinsic career success in new career paradigm, the purpose of this research was to design the model of perceptual factors affecting intrinsic career success in service firms in the province of Fars. Initially in the literature study, perceptual factors were considered. Then through the Delphi process using expert opinion in four steps, the most important factors in research population were identified. Finally with consensus of experts, after the fourth round of the Delphi, seven important factors were selected and on the base of theoretical foundations, the model was designed. Conclusions of this study can be tested by date surveying and Structural equation modeling services organizations in Fars province.

© 2015 AESS Publications. All Rights Reserved.

Keywords: Intrinsic career success, Perception, Model building, Delphi method.

Contribution/ Originality

This study is one of very few studies which have investigated the role of perception on intrinsic career success. The paper's primary contribution is that learning climate, organizational support, career path, intrinsic motivation, person organization fit, career self efficacy and organizational self esteem are most important perceptual factors that reinforce intrinsic career success.

1. INTRODUCTION

Success is a key outcome in careers research. Subjective success represents an individual's self-evaluation of her or his success. Research suggests that subjective success is related to broader criteria of success and may include criteria such as relationships, balance, enjoyment, and

recognition [1]. In the past, organizations were described as hierarchical structures in static environments, thus jobs were predictable and safe. Nowadays, organizations and environments are quite dynamic and careers are unpredictable and multi directional [1-3]. Schein separate concept of job in two branches, internal and external. In new paradigm intrinsic career has overcome extrinsic career [4]. External job is defined as opportunities and constraints that exist in a career or organization that is in accordance with organizational definition of success, and intrinsic career involves the person's career developments over time and how the person understands it [2, 5, 6]. The emergence of the knowledge based economy followed by a range of new challenges for theory and research of career. A key challenge is emphasizing on growing importance of subjective career and related outcomes. Considering the importance of perception in subjective career success, the purpose of this research is to answer the question that in personnel of Fars service companies what are the most important perceptual factors affecting subjective career success?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Scientists, utilize models to predict and control the world. In fact, most of knowledge in social and behavioral science is based on statistical models. The model can be defined as an abstraction of reality that is designed to simplify and organize our view of reality [7]. Model is a structure for the theory and should be able to help predict events. It should create the relationship between the theory and the collection and analysis of information. Models embody certain aspects of the real world that are related with the object under investigation, clear significant relationships among these aspects and finally, provide the possibility of testing theories regarding the nature of relationships [8]. The first step in modeling is to identifying related variables. In this study, for identifying the perceptual factors, Delphi method was used.

In contemporary studies, career success has received considerable interest as the important outcome of the individual's career experiences [9, 10]. Career success is defined as the positive psychological or work-related outcomes or achievements one accumulates as a result of work experiences [11]. In other studies, career success is also described as positive outcomes of a person's career experiences [3, 5, 10]. A conceptual distinction between objective and subjective measures of career success has frequently been made [9]. Objective success mostly relates to observable attainments such as salary, salary growth and hierarchical status [9]. On the other hand, subjective success may be defined as the individual's personal and internal apprehension and evaluation of career across any aspects that are important to that individual [12]. Subjective career success takes the internal perspective using a person's own preferences in the career experience [9]. Even though objective career criteria have dominated career research for several decades, but recently, subjective criteria have been increasingly discussed [10]. As the modern career context emphasizes mobility and unpredictability, subjective career success has been a construct of considerable interest to career scholars. Through critical analysis, Arnold and Cohen [5] identified two broad strands of career research [9]. According to their argument, one strand concerns the ways of construing career success and the other concerns predictors of the success. The current study falls within the latter strand. In this research to identify perceptual factors, related articles, dissertations and research projects, were studied. Considering literature of career success although

in behavioral and personality factors affecting career success, extensive researches is don, but in regards perceptual factors, there is no comprehensive research. So research plan does not underlie a particular theory of career success. So with identifying perceptual factors affecting career success and their relations, the model of perceptual factors affect subjective career success has been suggested. As regards to this literature, 15 perceptual factors that affect subjective career success were identified that are as follow: Perceived job security [13-15], Wage perception [15, 16], Perceived career path [13, 16-19] Organization's reputation [16], Organizational support [17, 20-24], learning climate [25], Career self-efficacy [3, 15, 16, 20, 21, 26-30], Leader member exchange [16, 21, 31], Person organization fit [16, 22, 23, 32, 33], Work centrality [23], Protean career attitude [11, 12, 34, 35] , boundary less career Orientation [9], Perceived organizational trust [31], Organizational based self-esteem [28, 36-38], Organizational justice [39].

3. MATERIAL AND METHODS

In qualitative approach has no theory related to the study or researchers have been reluctant to limit their work to the existing theories. Thus, the qualitative approach could be used to build a new theory or explain new patterns in data [40]. In such studies that are mainly exploratory and seek to build conceptual models and theoretical frameworks, often the final results are not known [41]. By reviewing literature we found that although a career success is investigated in historical, philosophical or ideological point of view, but in researches that have examined the factors affecting career success, there is no macro and holistic point of view [6]. For this reason, the quantitative approach in this study, may neglect some factors. Therefore, for identifying factors, a qualitative approach was used; that lacked a predetermined framework, theory or model [37, 42]. To do this, firstly by reviewing literature, a comprehensive understanding of antecedents of subjective career success was obtained. And the results were completed using the Delphi method with experts' opinions. Results of reviewing literature are shown in table 1.Then, through a Delphi process in four stages, seven factors were selected and finally using theoretical foundations, the related model was developed.

3.1. Delphi Method

In this study, Delphi method was used to identify the most important factors. Delphi is a systematic method that is used to extract opinions from a group of experts on a topic or question [43]. The validity and reliability of Delphi findings comes from combining expert judgments. In addition, the anonymity of Delphi participants allows them to interact, rethink, and compare their thoughts in a "non-threatening forum", without being influenced by each other's opinion [44]. The Delphi technique is designed as a group communication process that aims at conducting detailed examinations and discussions of a specific issue for the purpose of goal setting, policy investigation, or predicting the occurrence of future events [45].

The Delphi technique is well suited as a means and method for consensus-building by using a series of questionnaires to collect data from a panel of selected subjects [46]. Other notable characteristics inherent with using the Delphi technique are the ability to provide anonymity to respondents, a controlled feedback process, and the suitability of a variety of statistical analysis

techniques to interpret the data [47]. The required condition for the application of Delphi are as fallow: the need for opinions and judgment of experts, the need for a broad consensus of the group in achieving results, the complex, large and interdisciplinary problems or incomplete knowledge, the availability of experienced and skilled professionals, the need for anonymity of data collection, lack of time constraints and the lack of other effective methods [48, 49]. High flexibility of approach, applied in different areas, using different communication approaches, usability in a wide geographic area, no need for training interviewers, and providing an open discussion to identify and understand the underlying issue of are the advantages of Delphi [50].

3.2. Formation and Composition of the Panel

Choose experts for Delphi, unlike some quantitative surveys will not be done based on randomized sampling; Because Delphi is a mechanism for group decision-making, and requires qualified professionals who have a deep understanding and knowledge in the subject, selection of group members usually done through non-probability sampling. One of the techniques used in the fields judgmental sampling. This approach assumes that the researcher's knowledge about the selection of group members are acceptable [48]. The number of panel is an important thing that must be noted on the formation of group. Like any other type of sampling, sample size depends on factors such as access to people, the time required and the cost of data collection. In Delphi method, building consensus among panel as the purpose of this method with increase in number of panel becomes more difficult. Although the number of panel in previous studies have ranged from 10 to 1685 people, but when there is heterogeneity among group members, about 10 to 20 members is recommended [51]. In this research in selection of Delphi panel, expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of human resource management and organizational behavior, their back ground on related topics, their articles and writings, have been considered. And through judgmental sampling, the selection of 24 experts was done, whose characteristics are indicated:

Table-1. Characteristics of Delphi panel

Type of experience	Number of people	Average of experience
Faculty member in Shiraz universities in human resource management, organizational behavior and psychology	18	10 years
Senior director of human resources management linked to the target population	4	15 years
Senior specialist from companies working in the field of human resource management	2	11 years

After selecting the panel, design of the questionnaire and the necessary coordination, four round of Delphi was performed. Table 2 shows the distribution and collection date of questionnaires in each round.

Table-2. The four round of Delphi

Round	The mean number of follow-up	Return of questionnaires		Distributions the questioners	
		Number of Return	Last date of return	The number of panel	Distribution Date
First	9 times	24	2013/1/5	30	2012/12/10 to 2012/12/20
Second	4 times	24	2013/1/28	24	2013/1/9 to 2013/1/19
Third	3 times	24	2013/4/6	24	2013/1/29 to 2013/2/8
Fourth	3 times	24	2013/4/19	24	2013/4/9 to 2013/4/14

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. The First Round of the Delphi

With literature studies, 15 factors were identified that directly or indirectly had an impact on subjective career success. These factors were used in the questionnaire of first round that have been described in Table 3.

Table-3. Factors affecting subjective career success extracted from the literature

row	Variable
1	Perception of career security
2	Perception of the right sand benefits
3	Perceived career path
4	Perceived corporate reputation
5	Perceived organizational support
6	Perceived learning climate
7	Career self-efficacy
8	Perception of the relationship with the supervisor
9	Person-organization fit
10	Work centrality
11	Protean Career Attitudes
12	Boundary less career orientation
13	Perceived organizational trust
14	Organizational based self esteem
15	Perceived organizational justice

In the first round, the list of perceptual factors was given to the panel members to determine their importance in influencing subjective career success. The results of first round showed that from 34 factors, learning climate with average of 4.62 and trust with average of 2.66, had the highest and lowest scores respectively. Moreover, at the end of the first round questionnaire was placed an open ended question for collecting the experts' opinions about other factors affecting subjective career success, resulting in identification of other 15 perceptual factors. These 19 factors were used in the questionnaire of second round, which have been mentioned in Table 4.

Table-4. Perceptual factors used in the second round of the Delphi

row	Perceptual factor
1	Optimism
2	Role clarity
3	Change acceptance
4	Perceived organizational participation
5	Perception of the potential growth of employability
6	Perception of a lack of gender discrimination
7	Perceived ethical behavior
8	Perceived spirituality at work
9	Perceived stress at work
10	Perceived conflict
11	Intrinsic motivation at work
12	Career resilience
13	Perceived discretion at work
14	Public service motivation
15	Perception of overall success in life.
16	Perceived social capital at work
17	Perception of occupational prestige
18	Perceived meritocracy
19	Perceived family support

4.2. The Second Round of Delphi

In the second round, viewpoints of panel in relation to the impact of perceptual factors introduced in the first round were evaluated. Results indicate that intrinsic motivation at work with score of 4.56 and ethical behavior with score of 3.38 had the highest and lowest scores respectively.

Due to lack of normal distribution of data, non-parametric Friedman test, was used to compare mean values with criterion, and the factors that have mean scores equal to 4 or higher were accepted and others factors were excluded.

4.2.1. Friedman Test

The Friedman test is the non-parametric alternative to the one-way ANOVA with repeated measures. It is used to test for differences between groups when the dependent variable being measured is ordinal. The following Friedman test was used to determine whether perceptual factors rating medians are higher that criterion (4) or not.

And rating mean and rating mean of criterion were calculated through this formula:

$$F_R = \frac{12}{rc(c+1)} \sum_{j=1}^{c} R_j^2 - 3r(c+1)$$

R2.j=square of the total of the ranks for group

c = number of groups

r = number of blocks

And if rating mean was higher than rating mean of criterion, factor was accepted. Results of first and second rounds are described in table 5.

Table-5. significance test of comparison between mean score of panel view and criterion score in the first and second rounds

row	Perceptual factor	Numerical mean	Rating mean	Rating mean of criteria	Chi-square	Degree of freedom	Significance	Acceptance **
1	Job security	3.22	1.20	1.79	13.11	1	0	
2	learning climate	4.33	1.67	1.33	4	1	0.046	**
3	Organizational support	4.41	1.71	1.29	8.33	1	0.004	**
4	Career path	4.37	1.69	1.31	6.23	1	0.013	**
5	Corporate reputation	3.20	1.19	1.81	13.23	1	0	
6	Organizational justice	3.70	1.38	1.63	2.57	1	0.109	
7	Organizational participation	3.50	1.27	1.73	8.06	1	0.005	
8	Role clarity	3.33	1.27	1.73	7.11	1	0.008	
9	Stress at work	3.25	1.23	1.77	9.94	1	0.002	
10	Conflict at work	2.70	1.17	1.83	16	1	0	
11	Protean career attitude	3.55	1.33	1.67	6.4	1	0.011	
12	Family support	3.95	1.13	1.88	18	1	0	
13	Occupational prestige	3.2	1.25	1.75	8	1	0.005	
14	Meritocracy	4.45	1.73	1.27	8.06	1	0.005	**
15	Lack of gender discrimination	2.87	1.15	1.85	17	1	0	
16	Intrinsic motivation at work	4.62	1.81	1.19	11.84	1	0.001	**
17	Person-organization fit	4.37	1.73	1.27	7.11	1	0.008	**
18	Career self efficacy	4.12	1.56	1.44	0.82	1	0.366	**
19	Work centrality	3.12	1.15	1.85	17	1	0	
20	Wage and salary	3.50	1.27	1.73	9.3	1	0.02	
21	Boundary less career orientation	3.54	1.33	1.67	6.4	1	0.011	
22	Optimism	3.79	1.44	1.56	10	1	0.317	
23	Change acceptance	3.58	1.31	1.69	6.23	1	0.013	
24	Growth of employability	3.50	1.31	1.69	5.40	1	0.020	
25	Career resiliency	3.54	1.33	1.67	4.57	1	0.033	
26	Overall success in life.	3.70	1.38	1.63	2.57	1	0.109	
27	Organizational based self esteem	4.50	1.75	1.25	12	1	0.001	**
28	Social capital at work	3.54	1.35	1.65	2.88	1	0.090	
29	Relationship with the supervisor	3.66	1.4	1.6	1.92	1	0.166	
30	Organizational Trust	2.66	1.17	1.83	12.8	1	0	
31	Public service motivation	4.33	1.69	1.31	5.4	1	0.020	**
32	Spirituality at work	3.58	1.38	1.63	3	1	0.083	
33	appropriateness of authority & responsibility	3.79	1.44	1.56	0.69	1	0.405	
34	Ethical behavior	3.12	1.17	1.83	14.22	1	0	

4.3. The Third Round of the Delphi

In the third round, viewpoints of panel on the factors that their importance in the first and second rounds were high and very high, re-evaluated. For this purpose, the mean score and the score of each of the nine factors introduced in the last period sent to the panel and they were asked, according to the group idea, correct their previous opinions if necessary . The results showed that the mean score of factors at this stage, varied from 4.25, corresponding to career self efficacy to 3.58, corresponding to the perceived meritocracy. The results of the Friedman test showed that, at this stage, the mean score of all factors, except meritocracy and public service motivation are more than 4. So, all factors except meritocracy and the public service motivation were accepted. (table 6)

4.4. The Fourth Round of the Delphi

In the fourth round, the views of members on factors that their importances were high and very high in third round were reassessed. The results showed that the mean scores ranged from 4.27 for career path to 4.25 for career self efficacy. Also Friedman test showed that the mean scores for all factors have more than 4 and have significant differences with the criterion. (table 7)

Table-6. Significance test of difference between mean scores of panel view and criteria in the third round

row	Perceptual factor	Numerical mean	Rating mean	Rating mean of criteria	Chi-square	Degree of freedom	Significance	Acceptance **
1	Perceived learning climate	4.50	1.75	1.25	9	1	0.003	**
2	Perceived organizational support	4.50	1.75	1.25	10.28	1	0.001	**
3	Perceived career path	4.37	1.69	1.31	7.36	1	0.007	**
4	Perceived meritocracy	3.62	1.19	1.81	13.23	1	0.000	-
5	Intrinsic motivation at work	4.46	1.73	1.27	8.06	1	0.005	**
6	Person-organization fit	4.45	1.73	1.27	8.06	1	0.005	**
7	Career self efficacy	4.25	1.63	1.38	2.57	1	0.109	**
8	Organizational self esteem	4.37	1.69	1.31	9	1	0.003	**
9	Public service motivation	3.52	1.16	1.90	16.23	1	0.000	-

Table-7. Significance test of difference between mean scores of panel view and criteria in the fourth round

row	Perceptual factor	Numerical mean	Rating mean	Rating mean of criteria	Chi-square	Degree of freedom	Significance	Acceptance **
1	Perceived learning climate	4.33	1.67	1.33	5.33	1	0.021	**
2	Perceived organizational support	4.37	1.69	1.31	9	1	0.003	**
3	Perceived career path	4.70	1.85	1.15	17	1	0.000	**
4	Intrinsic motivation at work	4.50	1.75	1.25	12	1	0.001	**
5	Person organization fit	4.54	1.77	1.23	13	1	0.000	**
6	Career self efficacy	4.25	1.63	1.38	6	1	0.014	**
7	Organizational based self esteem	4.41	1.71	1.29	10	1	0.002	**

4.5. Consensus of Experts

The consensus of experts is in an effort to reach agreement on the reviewed issue and sometimes tries to identify the differences. Consensus doesn't mean finding the right answer, but is merely agreement of the participants in a particular subject [52]. Smith provides a measure to make decisions about the agreement or further rounds of Delphi. This measure reflects the strong consensus among group members that is determined based on Kendall's coefficient of concordance. Kendall's W is a non-parametric statistic that be used for assessing agreement among panel members. Kendall's coefficient ranges from zero (no agreement) to one (complete agreement).

Suppose that object i is given the rank ri,j by judge number j, where there are in total n objects and m judges. Then the total rank given to object i is:

$$R_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{i,j},$$

And the mean value of these total ranks is

$$\bar{R} = \frac{1}{2}m(n+1).$$

The sum of squared deviations, S, is defined as

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (R_i - \bar{R})^2,$$

And then Kendall's W is defined as fallow:

$$W = \frac{12S}{m^2(n^3 - n)}.$$

Kendall's coefficient of concordance shows that people who have arranged a number of categories based on their importance, have the same criteria to judge the importance of each of the items and in this respect they agree with each other. In the absence of such consensus, be constant or negligible growth in two consecutive rounds, proves that consensus is not increased, and the survey should be stopped [53]. The results showed that Kendall's coefficient in Stage III was 0.511 and in stage IV was 0.546 that only has increased0.035 that means sufficient number of rounds.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1. The Most Important Factors

In general, using the experts opinions in Delphi, seven perceptual factors were identified that they are: (1) perceived organizational support, (2) person organization fit, (3) perceived career path, (4) perceived learning climate, (5) intrinsic motivation at work, (6) career self efficacy (7) organizational based self-esteem. The following, are briefly described:

- Perceived organizational support

Organizational support theory holds that the formation of POS is encouraged by employees' tendency to assign the organization humanlike characteristics. Eisenberger, et al. [8] noted that actions taken by agents of the organization are often viewed as indications of the organization's intent, rather than being attributed solely to agents' personal motives. Perceived organizational support would be valued by employees for meeting socio emotional needs, providing an indication of the organization's readiness to reward increased work effort, and indicating the organization's inclination to provide aid when needed to carry out one's job effectively. A meta-analysis by Eisenberger, et al. [8] suggested three major work-experience antecedents of POS: organizational rewards and working conditions, support received from supervisors, and procedural

justice [8].

- Person-organization Fit

Person's behavior is a common function of the relationship between person and environment. When there is satisfaction in this relationship, productivity, creativity and stability increases [54]. Person-organization Fit represents compatibility of personality, attitudes and values of individuals with organizational values, goals, structures, processes and culture [54, 55].

- Perceived career path

Extended integration, structural reconstitution and miniaturization, which severely restricted the opportunity for hierarchical promotion, often leads to the perception of plateau in career path. In addition lack of intrinsic motivation, job stress and burnout are other causes of career plateau [56]. Experts such as Barber Elizabeth [56] speak of two factors , plateau factor and stagnation factor cause career plateau . Situational Career plateau simply is lack of promotional opportunities. It means the labor has reached the hierarchical level that have any hope for increasing salaries and benefits, position, title, authority and their social status.

- Perceived learning climate

The concept of organizational learning climate is a type of organizational culture that integrates with organizational learning. According to Chris and Donald Schön [57], organizational learning climate is organizational phenomena that "support the acquisition of information, the distribution and sharing of learning, and that reinforce and support continuous learning and its application to organizational improvement". Thus, organizational learning climate is under constant construction, "moving along an infinite continuum towards a harmonious learning environment". By extension, the goal of organizational learning culture is an exchange of valuable knowledge leading to innovation, improved performance, and sustained competitiveness [58].

- Intrinsic Career Motivation

Internal motivation based on positive values that person experiences directly from his duties. These positive experiences cause a person to enjoy his work, be involved with it and take energy from it Thomas and Tymon [59]. These feelings lead to self-management and self-actualization in a job [60]. Today, career literature focuses on career self-management, while in the past mostly focused on organizational practices including training, job rotation, job enrichment, job ladders and organizational planned advancements [61]. In today's chaotic environment, organizations are not able to offer regular programs for employee's advancements. Thus career self-management behavior is one of the most important roles that has been delegated to individual. Also intrinsic motivation at work is an important predictor of career self-management behavior [60].

- Career Self Efficacy

Self-efficacy beliefs influence how people feel, think, motivate themselves, and behave [62]. In Bandura's model of social learning he describes self-efficacy as a cognitive structure created by the cumulative learning experiences in a person's life. These experiences can lead an individual to develop the belief or expectation that they can or cannot successfully perform a specific task or activity. People who have high self-efficacy are more likely to attempt and successfully execute tasks, whereas those with low self-efficacy find it difficult to achieve them because they are often fighting self doubt [63].

- Organization-based self esteem

Organization-based self-esteem refers to the question of the extent to which a person believes himself to provide a valuable contribution to the organization, i.e. the company the person is working for. A high organization-based self-esteem means that in his own opinion, a person adequately fulfills the tasks assigned to him. He experiences himself as important and effective with regard to organization-related goals. The bases for the development of a positive OBSE are diverse. In addition to structural aspects of the workplace and feedback by others in one's own

social environment, one's own assessment of performance constitutes a third source of a positive OBSE [64].

5.2. The Conceptual Model

Conceptual framework is the basis or outline of the research is based on it. This framework, is the network of relationships between variable, have been identified based on the results of the interviews, observations and literature review. In this study, based on results of Delphi, and theoretical literature of classification of the perceptual factors, conceptual model was developed, which is shown in Figure 1. Richard Lee [65] have detailed arguments concerning potential factors affecting the perception of the person [65], that part of their views has been considered in this study. In formation process of perception, two sources were involved. One source refers to all external stimuli that encounters the perceiver and creates objective information for him; the second source refers to all the data associated with a perceiver's mind that is stored in a mind. Thus, perception can be considered as a combination of objective data and subjective performance of perceiver, including screening, review and processing. This distinction can be understood as a basis for classification of perceptual factors. First category is external stimuli, and the second is person features, which affect the perceiver mental functions. The stimulants of first category includes all factors that originate from verbal or physical behavior of other persons, the content or the environment .The second group refers to all factors that cover needs, values, expectations, standards and aspirations of perceiver and impact on the method of perceptual screening, reviewing and processing on the mind. Although these two categories of perceptual factors interact, but often perceptual factors with external stimulus affect perceptual factors with internal stimulus And have temporal priority towards it Richard Lee [65]. Accordingly, we can classify the perceptual factors of Delphi, as follows and formulate perceptual factors affecting subjective career success in figure 1.

Table-8. Classification of identified perceptual factors based on the origin of perception

perceptual factors with external stimulus	perceptual factors with internal stimulus
Perceived organizational support	Intrinsic career motivation
Perceived career path	Career self efficacy
Perceived learning climate	Person-organization fit
	Organizational based self esteem

Based on the above classification, the conceptual model can be depicted as follows.

Figure-1. Conceptual model

As Figure 1 suggests, organizational support, career path and learning climate, as perceptual factors of external origin, not only have positive impact on subjective career success, but with effect on intrinsic motivation at work, career self-efficacy, person-organization fit and self-esteem, impact indirectly on it. Division of perceptual factors as mentioned above helps enterprise policy makers to priorities their policies in order to promote subjective career success. However, planning in order to reinforce perceptual factors with internal origin, due to differences in people and difficulty of internal changes, require long planning and enterprise-wide changes, but perceptual factors with external origin are transparent and programmable that can be included in human resource planning. When employees feel that their organizations are supportive, ensure their career advancement and feel that they can improve their skills with learning initiatives, follow job duties with more career self-efficacy, focus on the common points with organization, make broad their participation, become committed to their organization and with self-management behaviors facilitate their career success. Also in relation to perceptual factors with internal origin, with enrichment of jobs, delegating responsibilities to staff and empowerment and matching the organizational needs with skills of employees, staff will flourish in their careers.

The theoretical model proposed in this study by filling the theoretical gap in this area and by providing practical solutions can result in career success of personnel. Also perceptual factors that have external origins, it is necessary that in human resource planning considered a high priority, because of impacts on other factors plays a major role in the career success of employees. Results of this study will provide guidelines for successful transition from the traditional career paradigm to the modern career paradigm, with an emphasis on knowledge workers. Considering that objective consequences of job are costly, and organizational resources are limited, in new employment paradigm, strengthen the self-control behaviors in staff is required. Implementation of research findings and the proposed model, by strengthening the role of the individual, and focus on the perceptions and reducing expectations from the organization, can overcome the limitations of enterprise, and reinforce participation and deployment of staff capacity. Given the importance of perception in career success, it must be considered that in many corporate events, not reality itself, but the perception of it, affects mind of personnel and strengthen or weaken the morale of employees. In this context, it is necessary that custodians of human resources with surveying thoughts and perceptions provide fertile ground for corporate planning. Because many organizational policies due to the lack of acceptance and understanding in staff, fail in action. The effects of perceptual factors identified in this study should validate on an experimental basis in the service firms of Fars Province. Thus, it is possible that by examining theoretical foundations of research and relationships between variables, design the path or structural equation model and test the proposed relationships with statistical methods. Measurement of introduced perceptual factors and career success in the service firms helps human resources planners to identify strengths and weaknesses in relation to the enablers of career success. In addition, examine the impact of demographic factors, including age, marital status, education and …on career success, will provide useful information for decision making in human resources management. On limitation of this study is the lack of a theoretical foundation for the model. As mentioned above, the researchers

conducted in this area usually examine one or two factors affecting career success. However, research findings could be a first step to build a theory.

REFERENCES

[1]   B. S. Wiese, A. M. Freund, and P. B. Baltes, "Subjective career success and emotional well-being: Longitudinal predictive power of selection, optimization, and compensation," *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* vol. 60, pp. 321-335, 2002.

[2]   Y. Baruch, "Career development in organizations and beyond: Balancing traditional and contemporary viewpoints," *Human Resource Management Review,* vol. 16, pp. 125-138, 2006.

[3]   A. E. Abele and D. Spurk, "The longitudinal impact of self-efficacy and career goals on objective and subjective career success," *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* vol. 74, pp. 53–62, 2009.

[4]   Fourie and V. Van, "Defining and measuring the construct career resilience," *Journal of Industrial Psychology,* vol. 24, pp. 52-59, 1998.

[5]   J. Arnold and L. Cohen, "The psychology of careers in industrial-organizational settings: A critical but appreciative analysis," *International Review of Industrial/Organizational Psychology,* vol. 23, pp. 1-44, 2008.

[6]   N. Dries, "The meaning of career success a closer inspection of historical, cultural, and ideological contexts," *Career Development International,* vol. 16, pp. 364-384, 2010.

[7]   A. Houman Heidar, *Understanding the scientific method In the behavioral sciences*. Tehran: The Study and Compiling Books of Social Sciences (Samt), 2011.

[8]   R. Eisenberger, F. Stinglhamber, L. Rhoades, J. R. Jones, and J. Aselage, "Perceived organizational support: Influences of collectivism and competitiveness. Manuscript, University of Delaware," 2002a.

[9]   M. B. Arthur, S. N. Khapova, and C. P. M. Wilderom, "Career success in boundary less career world," *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* vol. 26, pp. 177-202, 2005.

[10]   P. A. Heslin, "Conceptualizing and evaluating career success," *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* vol. 26, pp. 113–136, 2005.

[11]   S. E. Seibert and M. L. Kraimer, "The five-factor model of personality and career success," *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* vol. 58, pp. 1–21, 2001.

[12]   D. T. Hall and D. E. Chandler, "Psychological success: When the career is a calling," *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* vol. 26, pp. 155-176, 2005.

[13]   G. R. Nabi, "Situational characteristics and subjective career success: The mediating role of career-enhancing strategies," *International Journal of Manpower,* vol. 24, pp. 651-671, 2003.

[14]   N. Sidika Colakoglu, "The impact of career boundary lessens on subjective career success: The role of career competencies, career autonomy, and career insecurity," *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* vol. 79, pp. 47–59, 2001.

[15]   D. Nondlela Jeanette, "Factors involved in subjective career success of soldiers in the South African national defense force: An expletory study," Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Commerce in Industrial Psychology at Stellenbosch University, 2012.

[16]   Y.-F. Wanga, H. Jeou-Shyan, and C. Shu-Yun, "Factors influencing food and beverage employees' career success: A contextual perspective," *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* vol. 30, pp. 997-1007, 2011.

[17]   S. Aryee, Y. W. Chay, and H. H. Tan, "An examination of the antecedents of subjective career success among a managerial sample in Singapore," *Human Relations,* vol. 47, pp. 487-509, 1994.

[18]   V. Ans De and S. Nele, "Protean attitude and career success: The mediating role of self-management," *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* vol. 73, pp. 449–456, 2008.

[19]   B. H. Alberto Ismaael, K. L. Jauregui Machuca, R. Gest Neg, and P. Sao, "Internal labour market as factor in the career success," *Review of Business Management,* vol. 39, pp. 205-218, 2011.

[20]   T. W. H. Ng, L. T. Eby, K. L. Sorensen, and D. C. Feldman, "Predictors of objective and subjective career success. A meta-analysis," *Personnel Psychology,* vol. 58, pp. 367–408, 2005.

[21]   C. Kirchmeyer, "Determinants of managerial career success: Evidence andexplanation of male/female differences," *Journal of Management,* vol. 24, pp. 673-692, 1998.

[22]   Y. Chen, "Chinese knowledge employees' career values, perceived organizational support and career success," *IBusiness,* vol. 3, pp. 274-282, 2011.

[23]   R. Roziah Mohd, I. Maimunah, U. Jegak, and N. Sidek Mohd, "Career anchors aspirations and career success among managers in the Malaysian public sector," *Research Journal of International Studies,* vol. 9, pp. 21-35, 2009.

[24]   K. Ilias and T. Ioannis, *Subjective career success: The role of individual, structural and behavioural determinants, department of business administration*. Athens: Athens University of Economics & Business, 80 Patission Street, 2007.

[25]   C. Daniel Feldman and A. Barton Weitz, "Career plateaus reconsidered," *Journal of Management,* vol. 14, pp. 69-80, 1988.

[26]   M. Valcour and J. J. Ladge, "Family and career path characteristics as predictors of women's objective and subjective career success: Integrating traditional and protean career explanations," *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* vol. 73, pp. 300-309, 2008.

[27]   S. Riordan and L.-P. Joha, "Career success of women academics in South Africa," *South African Journal of Psychology,* vol. 141, pp. 125-130, 2011.

[28]   M. Kim Mone and S. Kim, "Relationships among self-efficacy, pay-for-performance perception, and pay satisfaction: A Korean examination," *Human Performance,* vol. 21, pp. 138-157, 2008.

[29]   R. Day and T. D. Allen, "The relationship between career motivation and self efficacy with protégé career success," *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* vol. 64, pp. 72-91, 2004.

[30]   M. C. Higgins, S. R. Dobrow, and D. Chandler, "Never quite good enough: The paradox of sticky developmental relationships for elite university graduates," *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* vol. 72, pp. 207–224, 2008.

[31]   H. Guohong, "Trust and career satisfaction: The role of LMX," *Career Development International,* vol. 15, pp. 437- 458, 1996.

[32]   W. Nor and W. Abdul, "Towards developing a theoretical framework on career success," *Asian Social Science,* vol. 7, pp. 62-70, 2011.

[33]   O. Zoharah, K. Steven Eric, M. Rahim Sail, and I. Ismi Arif, "Exploring career success of late bloomers from the TVET background," *Education Training,* vol. 53, pp. 603-624, 2011.

[34]   E. Mihaela, M. Jose Sallan, S. Pep, and F. Vicenc, "Examining the impact of protean and boundaryless career attitudes upon subjective career success," *Journal of Management & Organization,* vol. 17, pp. 459–473, 2011.

[35]   K. Zella, "Career self-management: Its nature, causes and consequences," *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* vol. 65, pp. 112–133, 2002.

[36]   G. A. Callanan, "What price career success," *Career Development International,* vol. 8, pp. 126-133, 2003.

[37]   D. K.-M. John and A. Timothy Judge, "Self-esteem and extrinsic career success: Test of a dynamic model," *Applied Psychology,* vol. 57, pp. 204–224, 2008.

[38]   C. Hui and C. Lee, "Moderating effects of organization-based self-esteem on the relationship between perception of organizational uncertainty and employee response," *Journal of Management,* vol. 26, pp. 215-232, 2000.

[39]   C. Koay Poh, "A study of determinants of the intrinsic career success," Master's Thesis, University Utara Malaysia, 2010.

[40]   J. Hussey and R. Hussey, *Business research*. London: Mac Millan, 1997.

[41]   P. Baumard and J. Ibert, *What approach with which data, in doing management research: Acomprehensive guide*. London: Sage, 2001.

[42]   M. Easterby Smith, R. Thorpe, and A. Lowe, *Management research*, 2nd ed. London: Sage, 2002.

[43]   C. Powell, "The Delphi technique: Myths and realities," *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* vol. 41, pp. 376-382, 2003.

[44]   L. E. Miller, "Determining what could/should be: The Delphi technique and its application," presented at the Paper Presented at the Meeting of the 2006 Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Columbus, Ohio, 2006.

[45]   B. Ludwig, "Predicting the future: Have you considered using the Delphi methodology," *Journal of Extension,* vol. 35, pp. 1-4, 1997.

[46]   S. J. Young and L. M. Jamieson, "Delivery methodology of the Delphi: A comparison of two approaches," *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration,* vol. 19, pp. 42-58, 2001.

[47]   D. C. Douglas, "A comparative study of the effectiveness of decision making processes which utilize the Delphi and leaderless group methodologies," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1983.

[48]   A. L. Harold, T. Murray, and H. Olaf, "The Delphi method techniques and applications. Turoff. ISBN: 0-201-04294-0,". 2002.

[49]   P. Windle, "Delphi technique: Assessing component needs," *J. Perianesth Nurs.,* vol. 19, pp. 46-7, 2004.

[50]   H. McKenna, F. Hasson, and M. Smith, "A Delphi survey of midwives and midwifery students to identify no midwifery duties," *Midwifery,* vol. 18, pp. 314-22, 2002.

[51]   Mashayekhi, F. Alinaghi, M. A. Momeni, and S. Alidousti, "Key factors affecting the use of information technology in government agencies - the application of the Delphi method," *Modarres Humanities,* vol. 9, pp. 191-231, 2005.

[52]   H. Kennedy, "Enhancing Delphi research: Methods and results," *J. Adv. Nurs.,* vol. 45, pp. 504-11, 2004.

[53]   S. Siegel and N. J. Castellan, *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioural sciences*, 2nd ed. Singapore: McGraw-Hill, 1988.

[54]   B. Vilela, J. A. Varela González, and P. Fernández Ferrín, "Person–organization fit, OCB and performance appraisal: Evidence from matched supervisor– salesperson data set in a Spanish context," *Industrial Marketing Management,* vol. 37, pp. 1005-1019, 2008.

[55]   S. A. Carless, "Person-job fit versus person-organization fit as predictors of organizational attraction and job acceptances intentions: A longitudinal study," *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* vol. 78, pp. 411-429, 2005.

[56]   H. Barber Elizabeth, "Plateauism in the work place." Available: http://www.indianr.Edu.Barber,html, 1992.

[57]   A. Chris and A. Donald Schön, *Organizational learning II: Theory, method and practice reading.* MA: Addison-Wesley, 1996.

[58]   C. M. Graham and F. M. Nafukho, "Employees'perceptiontowardthedimension of culture in enhancing organizational learning," *The Learning Organization,* vol. 14, pp. 281-292, 2007.

[59]   K. W. Thomas and W. G. J. Tymon, "Bridging the motivation gap in total quality," *Quality Management Journal,* vol. 4, pp. 80-96, 1997.

[60]   R. Narda Quigley, G. Walter, and J. Tymon, "Toward an integrated model of intrinsic motivation and career self-management," *Career Development International,* vol. 11, pp. 522-543, 2005.

[61]   M. S. Feldman, "Organizational routines as a source of continues change," *Organization Science,* vol. 11, pp. 611-629, 2000.

[62]   A. Bandura, "Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective," *Annual Review of Psychology,* vol. 52, pp. 1–26, 2001.

[63]   G. P. Latham and C. C. Pinder, "Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century," *Annual Review of Psychology,* vol. 56, pp. 485–516, 2005.

[64]   J. L. Pierce and D. G. Gardner, "Self-esteem within the organizational context: A review of the organization-based self-esteem literature," *Journal of Management,* vol. 30, pp. 591-622, 2004.

[65]   T. Richard Lee, "An investigation of the vantage-point effect on perception of individual behavior in an organization," Unpublished Thesis Submitted Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, College of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1994.