

University of Groningen

Daily manifestations of career adaptability

Zacher, Hannes

Published in:
Journal of Vocational Behavior

DOI:
[10.1016/j.jvb.2015.09.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.09.003)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2015

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Zacher, H. (2015). Daily manifestations of career adaptability: Relationships with job and career outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 91(1), 76-86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.09.003>

Copyright


Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.



Daily manifestations of career adaptability: Relationships with job and career outcomes☆



Hannes Zacher

Department of Psychology, University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712TS Groningen, the Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 24 July 2015

Received in revised form 5 September 2015

Accepted 6 September 2015

Available online 9 September 2015

Keywords:

Career adaptability

Career success

Diary study

Job satisfaction

Performance

ABSTRACT

Most research on career adaptability has examined the construct as an individual differences variable and neglected that it may vary within an individual over a short period of time. In two daily diary studies, the author investigated the relationships of career adaptability and its four dimensions (concern, control, curiosity, and confidence) to their daily manifestations as well as daily job and career outcomes. Both Study 1 ($N = 53$) and Study 2 ($N = 234$) demonstrated substantial within-person variability in employees' behavioral expressions of career adaptability across five work days. Results further showed that daily career adaptability and daily confidence positively predicted daily task and career performance, as well as daily job and career satisfaction. Daily control positively predicted daily task performance, as well as daily job and career satisfaction. Daily concern positively predicted daily career performance and satisfaction, and daily curiosity positively predicted daily career satisfaction.

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Over the past decades, career patterns have become increasingly diverse, and successful career development is now, to a great extent, dependent on individuals' initiative and their ability to adapt (Biemann, Zacher, & Feldman, 2012; Hirschi, Herrmann, & Keller, 2015; Raabe, Frese, & Beehr, 2007). Vocational psychologists introduced the concept of career adaptability as a psychosocial resource that can help individuals to effectively manage work- and career-related demands and changes (Super & Knasel, 1981). Career adaptability is a higher-order construct consisting of four dimensions: concern (i.e., preparing for future career tasks), control (i.e., taking responsibility for development), curiosity (i.e., exploring possible future selves and opportunities), and confidence (i.e., believing in one's ability to solve problems and to succeed; Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). Several recent studies have shown that career adaptability and its dimensions relate positively to important work and career outcomes, including job and career satisfaction (Chan & Mai, 2015; Zacher, 2014a; Zacher & Griffin, 2015), job search success (Guan et al., 2013; Koen, Klehe, Van Vianen, Zikic, & Nauta, 2010), salary (Guan, Zhou, Ye, Jiang, & Zhou, 2015), and others' rating of job performance (Ohme & Zacher, 2015).

Most extant research has focused on differences between individuals in career adaptability, with the exception of a few longitudinal studies that additionally investigated within-person changes in career adaptability over longer time periods, such as several months (Guan et al., 2013; Hirschi, 2009; Negru-Subtirica, Pop, & Crocetti, 2015; Zacher, 2014b). However, researchers in the field of vocational behavior have so far neglected the possibility that career adaptability might also manifest behaviorally on a daily basis, and that these manifestations may vary intra-individually over short periods of time. In a related line of inquiry, personality researchers have recently begun to explore daily expressions of the Big Five characteristics and their associations with daily work

☆ I thank Magda Chichifoi, Corine Lentink, and Thomas Verton for their help with data collection.

Corresponding author at: Department of Psychology, University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712TS Groningen, the Netherlands.

E-mail address: h.zacher@rug.nl.

motivation and behavior (Judge, Simon, Hurst, & Kelley, 2014). The present research explored the extent to which daily behavioral manifestations of employees' career adaptability and career adaptability dimensions fluctuate across one work week, and to examine how these daily manifestations relate to employees' reports of their daily task and career performance, as well as their daily job and career satisfaction. Task performance has been defined as employee behavior that contributes to organizational goals by supporting the production of goods or the provision of services (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Career performance refers to behaviors that facilitate employees' career advancement, such as developing new skills and seeking out opportunities (Welbourne, Johnson, & Erez, 1998). Job satisfaction is defined as an attitude that includes affective and cognitive job evaluations (Brief & Weiss, 2002). Finally, career satisfaction is a subjective indicator of career success that entails employees' evaluations of their career progress (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990).

From a theoretical perspective, biological factors (e.g., genes) and relatively stable inter-individual difference characteristics ("traits") interact with environmental factors (e.g., job demands) in triggering dynamic manifestations of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors ("states"; Mischel & Shoda, 1995). The sociogenomic model of personality suggests that states are directly influenced by biological factors, traits, and the environment (Roberts & Jackson, 2008). In contrast, only biological factors and states can influence traits directly; the environment may influence traits indirectly, through biological factors and states, over longer periods of time (Roberts & Jackson, 2008). This implies that dynamic variation in states across days exists because situational factors, and possibly other states, enhance or constrain the expression of biological factors and traits. For instance, an employee may not be able to express her generally high levels of career adaptability equally well every day due to fluctuations in daily job demands or daily energy. These assumptions are consistent with career construction theory, which argues that both dispositional and contextual factors influence career adaptability (Savickas, 2013). Moreover, even if inter-individual differences in career adaptability are positively associated with inter-individual differences in performance, the effects of daily manifestations of career adaptability on daily performance could be enhanced or mitigated by other daily person-related states and situational factors. It is therefore important to analyze variation in career adaptability and job and career outcomes at both the between- and within-person levels. In the present research, I investigate stable inter-individual differences in career adaptability as predictors at the between-person level in addition to dynamic daily manifestations of career adaptability as predictors at the within-person level, to compare their effects on daily job and career outcomes.

2. Development of hypotheses

2.1. Daily manifestations of career adaptability and daily job and career outcomes

According to career construction theory (Savickas, 2013), individuals with high levels of career adaptability possess greater competence and more psychosocial resources that enable them to adapt to and manage work- and career-related demands and changes. Successful adaptation, in turn, should positively impact their task and career performance, as well as their job and career satisfaction. Empirical research has provided support for these assumptions at the between-person level (Chan & Mai, 2015; Ohme & Zacher, 2015; Zacher, 2014a). At the within-person level, employees may not behaviorally express their career adaptability to the same extent every day, because their daily internal states (e.g., affect, motivation) or daily external circumstances (e.g., task requirements, situational constraints) can facilitate or hinder certain expressions (Mischel & Shoda, 1995; Roberts & Jackson, 2008). I propose that on days on which an employee shows more behavioral manifestations of career adaptability, his or her task and career performance, as well as job and career satisfaction, will be higher than on days in which the same employee shows less behavioral manifestations of career adaptability. The rationale for this assumption is consistent with theorizing on the between-person level. Specifically, showing more behaviors indicative of high levels of career adaptability on a given day should allow an employee to better adapt to and more effectively manage his or her daily work and career demands (Savickas, 1997). This, in turn, should result in higher levels of job and career outcomes on that particular day. In contrast, on days on which an employee is not able or willing or does not have opportunities to show behaviors indicative of high career adaptability (due to internal or external factors), he or she should struggle more with daily work and career demands which, in turn, should result in lower daily job and career outcomes.

Hypothesis 1. Daily career adaptability relates positively to (a) daily task performance, (b) daily career performance, (c) daily job satisfaction, and (d) daily career satisfaction.

2.1. Daily career adaptability dimensions and daily job and career outcomes

Taking a more differentiated perspective, I further expected differential effects of daily manifestations of the four career adaptability dimensions on daily job and career outcomes. Daily control involves behaviors such as making independent decisions, taking responsibility for one's actions, and doing what is best for oneself; daily confidence entails behaviors such as performing tasks efficiently, taking care to do things well, learning new skills, overcoming obstacles, and solving problems (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). Both sets of behaviors are likely to associate positively with daily task and career performance, as well as daily job and career satisfaction, because they are conceptually related to high levels of task motivation, goal self-concordance, and goal-setting behavior (Erez & Judge, 2001; Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005). Empirical research has shown that individual difference characteristics closely related to control and confidence – self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, internal locus of control, and emotional stability (cf. Hirschi et al., 2015; Öncel, 2014; Zacher, 2014a) – are associated positively with task and career performance, as well as job and career satisfaction (Debusscher, Hofmans, & De Fruyt, 2015; Judge & Bono, 2001; Zacher, 2014a).

Hypothesis 2. Daily control relates positively to (a) daily task performance, (b) daily career performance, (c) daily job satisfaction, and (d) daily career satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3. Daily confidence relates positively to (a) daily task performance, (b) daily career performance, (c) daily job satisfaction, and (d) daily career satisfaction.

Daily concern involves behaviors such as thinking about one's future career, preparing for the future, and planning the achievement of future career goals; daily curiosity entails behaviors such as exploring one's surroundings, looking for opportunities that allow personal growth, investigating different options before making a choice, observing different ways of doing things, and probing deeply into one's questions (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). Previous research found concern to relate positively to future time perspective (Öncel, 2014; Zacher, 2014b), satisfaction with career opportunities (Coetzee & Stoltz, 2015), and self-rated career performance (Zacher, 2014a). Curiosity has been shown to relate positively to proactive personality (Öncel, 2014) and proactive skill development and networking behavior (Taber & Blankemeyer, 2015), and relate negatively to perceived career entrenchment (Zacher, Ambiel, & Porto Noronha, 2015). Moreover, concern and curiosity relate positively to career exploration behaviors (Li et al., 2015) and to behaviors that facilitate the development of professional competencies (Guo et al., 2014). Consistent with career construction theory (Savickas, 2013) and previous empirical research on concerns and curiosity, I argue that preparing for future career tasks and exploring possible future selves and career opportunities should improve employees' evaluations of their daily career success in the form of self-rated career performance and satisfaction. In contrast, daily concern and curiosity should be less likely than daily control and confidence to contribute to daily task performance and job satisfaction, which require a stronger focus on momentary work demands and resources.

Hypothesis 4. Daily concern relates positively to (a) daily career performance and (b) daily career satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5. Daily curiosity relates positively to (a) daily career performance and (b) daily career satisfaction.

3. Method

3.1. Participants and procedure

I conducted two quantitative daily diary studies to test the hypotheses. Study 1 examined only relationships between career adaptability and task performance, whereas Study 2 examined relationships between career adaptability and all job and career outcomes.

3.1.1. Study 1

Participants were 53 employees working for a university in the Netherlands. Of the participants, 41 (77.4%) were female and 12 (22.6%) were male. Employees' ages ranged from 22 to 62 years, with a mean age of 36.33 years ($SD = 12.93$). The majority of participants held a university degree (62.3%). Participants' job tenure ranged from a few months to 22 years, with a mean job tenure of 4.06 years ($SD = 4.66$). Twenty-nine participants (54.7%) were administrative employees (i.e., job descriptions included library officer, study coordinator, secretary, and personnel department employee), and 24 participants (45.3%) were academic employees (e.g., lecturer, postdoctoral researcher, and PhD candidate; note that PhD candidates are considered full-time employees in the Netherlands).

Participants were recruited in person by walking into offices and inviting employees to participate in a daily diary study (e.g., Beal, 2015). Ninety-three employees initially signed up for the study. They received an e-mail on the day following their recruitment with a link to a baseline survey that included measures of career adaptability as well as demographic and employment characteristics. In the following week beginning on Monday, employees received an e-mail every day in the afternoon with a link to a daily survey on daily career adaptability and daily task performance to be completed at the end of their work day. In total, 53 participants (response rate of 60%) completed the baseline survey and at least two daily surveys, with a total of 201 completed daily surveys (3.79 daily surveys on average per employee).

3.1.2. Study 2

Participants were 234 employees from various jobs and occupations in the United States. Of the participants, 129 (55.1%) were female and 105 (44.9%) were male. Employees' ages ranged from 24 to 64 years, with a mean age of 44.60 years ($SD = 10.26$). Most participants held at least an undergraduate degree (70.5%). Job tenure ranged from a few months to 40 years, with a mean job tenure of 10.64 years ($SD = 8.02$). Participants' job descriptions included accountant, administrative assistant, business analyst, customer service clerk, engineer, hair stylist, IT manager, lawyer, nurse, pharmacist, and teacher. On a 7-point job status scale ranging from 1 (entry level) to 7 (executive level), all levels were represented ($M = 4.38$, $SD = 1.40$).

Participants were recruited with the help of a professional survey panel provider (ClearVoice Research). A baseline survey which included measures of career adaptability, as well as demographic and employment characteristics, was completed by 300 employees. Across one work week (Monday through Friday), these employees received an e-mail every day in the afternoon with a link to a daily survey to be completed at the end of the work day, which included measures of daily career adaptability and daily job and career outcomes. In total, 234 participants (response rate of 78%) completed the baseline survey and at least two daily surveys, with a total of 945 completed daily surveys (4.04 daily surveys on average per employee).

3.2. Measures

3.2.1. Career adaptability

Career adaptability and its four dimensions (concern, control, curiosity, and confidence) were measured in the baseline surveys with the Dutch (Study 1) and the English (Study 2) versions of the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale (CAAS; Savickas & Porfeli, 2012; van Vianen, Klehe, Koen, & Dries, 2012). The CAAS was developed based on career construction theory (Savickas, 1997) and has 24 items (6 items for each of the four dimensions). Example items are “Thinking about what my future will be like” (concern), “Making decisions by myself” (control), “Exploring my surroundings” (curiosity), and “Overcoming obstacles” (confidence). Participants first read the instructions provided by the scale authors (“Different people use different strengths to build their careers. No one is good at everything, each of us emphasizes some strengths more than others. Please rate how strongly you have developed each of the following abilities”). Participants provided their answers on 5-point scales ranging from 1 (not strong) to 5 (strongest). Career adaptability or its dimensions were included as predictors at the between-person level to compare their effects with the effects of daily career adaptability or its dimensions.

I adapted the CAAS to measure daily behavioral manifestations of career adaptability. In each daily survey, participants were asked to indicate to what extent they had engaged in the specific behaviors on that day. The wording of the 24 career adaptability items was changed to past tense and the word “today” was added such that the items referred to the past work day, for example “Today I thought about what my future will be like” (concern), “Today I made decisions by myself” (control), “Today I explored my surroundings” (curiosity), and “Today I overcame obstacles” (confidence). Participants rated the extent to which they had engaged in each of the behaviors on 5-point scales ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often).

3.2.2. Task and career performance

Daily task and career performance were measured in each daily survey with two sets of four items adapted from the role-based performance scale by Welbourne et al. (1998). An example item for task performance is “Quantity of work output,” and an example item for career performance is “Obtaining personal career goals.” Every day, participants were asked to consider how their supervisor would rate their performance on that day using these items, and to indicate these ratings on 5-point scales ranging from 1 (needs much improvement) to 5 (excellent). Providing some support for the validity of these self-report scales, Zacher, Jimmieson, and Winter (2012) reported a moderate and positive relationship ($r = .42$) between self- and coworker ratings of performance using Welbourne et al.’s (1998) items. Employees were asked to rate their performance from the perspective of their supervisor instead of from their own perspective to minimize the likelihood of self-report bias (Schoorman & Mayer, 2008). Schoorman and Mayer (2008) demonstrated that such a “referent-shift” instruction resulted in a higher correspondence between employee ratings and actual supervisor ratings of performance as compared to instructing employees to rate their performance from their own perspective.

3.2.3. Job and career satisfaction

Daily job and career satisfaction were measured in each daily survey using two sets of five items adapted from Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger (1998) and Greenhaus et al. (1990), respectively. An example item for daily job satisfaction is “Today I felt fairly well satisfied with my job” and an example item for daily career satisfaction is “Today I was satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career.” Participants provided their answers on 5-point scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

3.2.4. Demographic and employment characteristics

In the baseline surveys, participants indicated their age (in years), gender (1 = male, 2 = female), highest level of education (ranging from 1 = middle school to 4 = university degree in Study 1, and from 1 = some high school to 6 = graduate university degree in Study 2), job tenure (in years), job type (only Study 1: 1 = academic, 2 = administrative), and job status (only Study 2: ranging from 1 = entry level to 7 = executive level). Due to the relatively small sample size in Study 1, I only controlled for these characteristics in Study 2 (note that the pattern of results at the within-person level in Study 1 did not change when these variables were controlled).

3.3. Statistical analyses

As data collected in daily diary studies has a multilevel structure (i.e., daily survey entries nested within employees), I used hierarchical linear modeling software to run a series of multilevel regression analyses (Hofmann, Griffin, & Gavin, 2000). For each outcome variable, Model 1 included career adaptability and daily career adaptability as predictors at the between- and within-person levels, respectively. Again for each outcome, Model 2 included career adaptability dimensions and their daily manifestations as predictors at the between- and within-person levels, respectively. The between-person predictors were centered at the grand (or sample) mean, and the within-person variables were centered at each participant’s mean.

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive statistics, correlations, and variance components

Descriptive statistics and correlations at the between- and within-person levels appear in Table 1 (Study 1) and Table 2 (Study 2). Table 1 shows that career adaptability, control, and confidence, as well as their daily manifestations, correlated positively with daily task performance at the between- and within-person levels in Study 1. Table 2 shows that career adaptability and all of its dimensions

Table 1
Descriptive statistics and correlations (Study 1).

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
<i>Between-person variables</i>																		
1. Age	36.33	12.93	–															
2. Gender	1.77	0.42	–.08	–														
3. Education	3.32	0.96	–.53**	–.10	–													
4. Job tenure	4.06	4.66	.77**	–.02	–.49**	–												
5. Job type	1.55	0.50	.70**	.05	–.65**	.51**	–											
6. Career adaptability	3.15	0.53	.01	.06	–.06	–.05	.20	(.91)										
7. Concern	2.68	0.68	–.39**	.11	.13	–.34*	–.12	.68**	(.85)									
8. Control	3.33	0.67	.17	.05	–.17	.14	.34*	.77**	.25	(.82)								
9. Curiosity	3.05	0.69	–.09	.00	.13	–.09	.16	.81**	.54**	.46**	(.80)							
10. Confidence	3.53	0.74	.32*	.02	–.25	.12	.37**	.81**	.32*	.64**	.47**	(.88)						
<i>Within-person variables</i>																		
11. Daily career adaptability	2.55	0.54	.08	–.10	.11	–.05	.12	.42**	.31*	.18	.38**	.42**	(.90)	.72**	.46**	.74**	.47**	.14**
12. Daily concern	1.63	0.83	–.22	–.14	.30*	–.30*	–.13	.29*	.34*	–.03	.34*	.23	.85**	(.94)	.07	.48**	–.01	–.16
13. Daily control	3.51	0.62	.36**	.04	–.21	.27	.30*	.41**	.13	.39**	.19	.53**	.62**	.25	(.79)	.07	.19**	.35**
14. Daily curiosity	1.93	0.81	–.13	–.15	.25	–.23	–.05	.24	.20	.06	.38**	.10	.85**	.81**	.27	(.86)	.08	–.16*
15. Daily confidence	3.14	0.70	.33*	–.06	–.10	.21	.35*	.43**	.30*	.22	.26	.52**	.80**	.50**	.55**	.50**	(.79)	.45**
16. Daily task performance	3.60	0.84	.48**	–.23	–.35*	.26	.49**	.37**	.12	.30*	.20	.50**	.43**	.17	.53**	.15	.56**	(.92)

Note. Variables 1–10 were assessed in the baseline survey, and variables 11–16 were assessed in the daily surveys. For gender, 1 = male and 2 = female. For job type, 1 = academic, 2 = administrative. Correlations above the diagonal represent within-person (level 1) relationships of person-mean centered variables ($N = 201$), and correlations below the diagonal represent between-person (level 2) relationships of between-person variables and aggregated daily variables ($N = 53$). Reliability estimates (α), where available, are shown in parentheses along the diagonal.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

correlated positively with the daily job and career outcomes at the between- and within-person levels in Study 2; only the relationships between concern and job satisfaction were weaker (and non-significant at the between-person level).

Table 3 presents the multilevel variance components and the proportions of between- and within-person variance in the daily variables. In Study 1, 34% of the variance in daily career adaptability (and between 44 and 53% of the variance in the daily career adaptability dimensions) resided at the within-person level, and 36% of the variance in daily task performance resided at the within-person level. In Study 2, 30% of the variance in daily career adaptability (and between 31 and 43% of the variance in the daily career adaptability dimensions) resided at the within-person level, and the share of within-person variance in the daily job and career outcomes ranged from 37 to 47%. Overall, these findings suggest that daily career adaptability and its dimensions fluctuated considerably across five work days, and that there were substantial shares of within-person variability in the daily job and career outcome variables that could potentially be explained by daily manifestations of career adaptability.

4.2. Hypothesis tests

Table 4 shows the results of the multilevel analyses predicting daily task performance (Study 1), and Table 5 shows the results predicting all four daily job and career outcomes (Study 2). According to Hypothesis 1a, daily career adaptability relates positively to daily task performance. In Study 1, career adaptability positively predicted daily task performance at the between-person level ($\gamma = .51, p = .005$), but not at the within-person level ($\gamma = .21, p = .101$; Table 4). In Study 2, career adaptability positively predicted daily task performance both at the between-person level ($\gamma = .26, p = .005$) and at the within-person level ($\gamma = .40, p < .001$; Table 5). Thus, Hypothesis 1a was supported by the findings of Study 2, but not by those of Study 1.

Hypotheses 1b, 1c, and 1d state that daily career adaptability relates positively to daily career performance, job satisfaction, and career satisfaction, respectively. Results of Study 2 provided support for these hypotheses (Table 5). Specifically, daily career adaptability positively predicted daily career performance ($\gamma = .58$), job satisfaction ($\gamma = .39$), and career satisfaction ($\gamma = .70$; all $ps < .001$). At the between-person level, career adaptability positively predicted only daily career performance ($\gamma = .11, p = .048$), but not daily job and career satisfaction.

Consistent with Hypotheses 2a, 2c, and 2d, daily control positively predicted daily task performance in Study 1 ($\gamma = .35, p < .001$) and Study 2 ($\gamma = .20, p < .001$), and daily job satisfaction ($\gamma = .21, p < .001$) and daily career satisfaction ($\gamma = .12, p = .008$) in Study 2, respectively. In contrast, Hypothesis 2b was not supported, as daily control did not significantly predict daily career performance in Study 2. Furthermore, control positively predicted daily task performance (but not the other outcomes) at the between-person level in Study 2 ($\gamma = .18, p = .011$), whereas it did not have a significant effect in Study 1.

Hypotheses 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d were supported by positive effects of daily confidence on daily task performance in Study 1 ($\gamma = .44$) and Study 2 ($\gamma = .22$), and on daily career performance ($\gamma = .25$), daily job satisfaction ($\gamma = .26$), and daily career satisfaction ($\gamma =$

Table 2
Descriptive statistics and correlations (Study 2).

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
<i>Between-person variables</i>																					
1. Age	44.60	10.26	–																		
2. Gender	1.55	0.50	.05	–																	
3. Education	4.18	1.25	–.01	–.04	–																
4. Job tenure	10.64	8.02	.42**	–.01	–.09	–															
5. Job status	4.38	1.40	.14*	–.08	.07	.31**	–														
6. Career adaptability	3.60	0.72	–.01	.02	.05	.05	.26**	(.96)													
7. Concern	3.37	0.85	–.16*	.03	.09	.00	.24**	.82**	(.88)												
8. Control	3.72	0.82	.12	–.02	–.06	.11	.23**	.86**	.53**	(.90)											
9. Curiosity	3.50	0.85	–.09	.04	.13*	–.03	.21**	.90**	.67**	.70**	(.91)										
10. Confidence	3.79	0.81	.08	.03	.01	.09	.23**	.90**	.62**	.77**	.75**	(.93)									
<i>Within-person variables</i>																					
11. Daily career adaptability	3.49	0.68	–.04	.06	.05	–.01	.24**	.60**	.59**	.42**	.57**	.50**	(.95)	.70**	.76**	.83**	.73**	.35**	.35**	.31**	.48**
12. Daily concern	3.05	0.94	–.19**	.05	.08	–.12	.12	.45**	.58**	.21**	.48**	.30**	.86**	(.91)	.33**	.47**	.27**	.16**	.26**	.10**	.34**
13. Daily control	3.90	0.71	.23**	.06	–.03	.11	.27**	.56**	.38**	.56**	.46**	.54**	.78**	.43**	(.89)	.49**	.50**	.33**	.22**	.31**	.35**
14. Daily curiosity	3.26	0.90	–.16*	.08	.06	–.07	.18**	.50**	.52**	.30**	.53**	.38**	.93**	.86**	.55**	(.92)	.49**	.25**	.26**	.22**	.40**
15. Daily confidence	3.74	0.72	.08	.02	.03	.10	.30**	.59**	.51**	.47**	.51**	.56**	.88**	.57**	.83**	.71**	(.83)	.33**	.30**	.33**	.38**
16. Daily task performance	4.02	0.74	.26**	.14*	–.02	.12	.16*	.52**	.34**	.52**	.41**	.54**	.49**	.19**	.68**	.29**	.67**	(.89)	.40**	.22**	.20**
17. Daily career performance	3.42	0.87	–.03	.04	.03	.01	.33**	.44**	.40**	.34**	.41**	.38**	.67**	.55**	.49**	.63**	.66**	.55**	(.90)	.18**	.33**
18. Daily job satisfaction	3.53	0.74	.17**	–.05	–.06	.08	.24**	.27**	.12	.31**	.19**	.33**	.35**	.05	.56**	.21**	.52**	.54**	.43**	(.74)	.45**
19. Daily career satisfaction	3.64	0.84	.00	–.07	–.06	.05	.32**	.40**	.36**	.33**	.36**	.36**	.66**	.49**	.58**	.59**	.65**	.46**	.73**	.61**	(.94)

Note. Variables 1–10 were assessed in the baseline survey, and variables 11–19 were assessed in the daily surveys. For gender, 1 = male and 2 = female. Correlations above the diagonal represent within-person (level 1) relationships of person-mean centered variables ($N = 945$), and correlations below the diagonal represent between-person (level 2) relationships of between-person variables and aggregated daily variables ($N = 234$). Reliability estimates (α), where available, are shown in parentheses along the diagonal.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

Table 3

Variance components and proportions of between- and within-person variance in the daily variables.

	Null model τ_{00}	Null model σ^2	Proportion of between-person variance	Proportion of within-person variance
<i>Study 1 (N = 53 participants provided 201 daily survey responses)</i>				
Daily career adaptability	.19	.10	.66	.34
Daily concern	.33	.37	.47	.53
Daily control	.22	.17	.56	.44
Daily curiosity	.33	.33	.50	.50
Daily confidence	.26	.22	.54	.46
Daily task performance	.45	.25	.64	.36
<i>Study 2 (N = 234 participants provided 945 daily survey responses)</i>				
Daily career adaptability	.33	.14	.70	.30
Daily concern	.60	.28	.69	.31
Daily control	.29	.22	.57	.43
Daily curiosity	.54	.28	.66	.34
Daily confidence	.31	.21	.60	.40
Daily task performance	.33	.23	.58	.42
Daily career performance	.49	.29	.63	.37
Daily job satisfaction	.29	.26	.53	.47
Daily career satisfaction	.45	.26	.63	.37

Note. τ_{00} = between-person variance component, σ^2 = within-person variance component. The proportion of between-person variance is computed as $\tau_{00} / (\tau_{00} + \sigma^2)$, and the proportion of within-person variance is computed as $1 - (\tau_{00} / [\tau_{00} + \sigma^2])$.

.22) in Study 2, respectively (all $ps < .001$). At the between-person level, confidence positively predicted daily task performance in Study 1 ($\gamma = .53, p = .002$) and Study 2 ($\gamma = .24, p < .001$), and daily job satisfaction in Study 2 ($\gamma = .22, p = .008$).

According to Hypotheses 4a and 4b, daily concern relates positively to daily career performance and satisfaction. Table 5 shows that daily concern positively predicted both career outcomes (both $\gamma s = .17, ps < .001$), but not daily task performance and job satisfaction. Thus, findings of Study 2 provided support for Hypotheses 4a and 4b. Moreover, concern positively predicted daily career performance ($\gamma = .14, p = .049$) and, marginally, daily career satisfaction ($\gamma = .13, p = .081$) at the between-person level.

According to Hypotheses 5a and 5b, daily curiosity relates positively to daily career performance and career satisfaction, respectively. As shown in Table 5, daily curiosity positively predicted daily career satisfaction ($\gamma = .16, p < .001$), but not the other outcomes. Thus, Hypothesis 5b was supported, whereas Hypothesis 5a was not supported. Note that daily curiosity had a weakly negative effect on daily task performance in Study 1 ($\gamma = -.14, p = .039$), which was not replicated in Study 2.

Table 4

Results of hierarchical linear modeling analyses predicting daily task performance (Study 1).

	Daily task performance	
	Model 1 $\gamma(SE)$	Model 2 $\gamma(SE)$
Intercept	3.58 (.09)**	3.58 (.09)**
<i>Between-person predictor(s)</i>		
Career adaptability	.51 (.17)**	
Concern		-.04 (.16)
Control		-.03 (.18)
Curiosity		-.02 (.17)
Confidence		.53 (.16)**
<i>Within-person predictor(s)</i>		
Daily career adaptability	.21 (.13)	
Daily concern		-.08 (.06)
Daily control		.35 (.09)**
Daily curiosity		-.14 (.07)*
Daily confidence		.44 (.07)**
τ_{00}	.38	.36
σ^2	.25	.18
Pseudo R^2	.10	.23

Note. $N = 53$ participants provided 201 daily survey responses. Unstandardized multilevel modeling coefficients (γ) with standard errors (SE) are shown. τ_{00} = between-person variance component, σ^2 = within-person variance component. Pseudo R^2 = proportion of variance explained in dependent variable by predictors at both the between- and within-person levels; calculated as $([\text{null model } \tau_{00} + \text{null model } \sigma^2] - [\text{model } \tau_{00} + \text{model } \sigma^2]) / (\text{null model } \tau_{00} + \text{null model } \sigma^2)$.

* $p < .05$.** $p < .01$.

Table 5
Results of hierarchical linear modeling analyses predicting daily job and career outcomes (Study 2).

	Daily task performance		Daily career performance		Daily job satisfaction		Daily career satisfaction	
	Model 1 γ (SE)	Model 2 γ (SE)	Model 1 γ (SE)	Model 2 γ (SE)	Model 1 γ (SE)	Model 2 γ (SE)	Model 1 γ (SE)	Model 2 γ (SE)
Intercept	4.02 (.03)**	4.03 (.03)**	3.44 (.04)**	3.44 (.04)**	3.53 (.04)**	3.53 (.04)**	3.64 (.03)**	3.65 (.04)**
<i>Between-person predictors</i>								
Age	.02 (.00)**	.01 (.00)**	-.00 (.00)	-.00 (.01)	.01 (.00)**	.01 (.00)	.00 (.00)	.00 (.00)
Gender	.11 (.07)	.15 (.07)*	.03 (.07)	.06 (.09)	-.10 (.07)	-.06 (.07)	-.13 (.07)	-.09 (.09)
Education	-.02 (.03)	-.00 (.03)	-.01 (.03)	-.02 (.04)	-.05 (.03)	-.03 (.03)	-.06 (.03)*	-.07 (.04)
Job tenure	.00 (.00)	-.00 (.00)	-.00 (.00)	-.01 (.01)	-.00 (.01)	-.01 (.01)	-.00 (.00)	-.00 (.01)
Job status	-.02 (.03)	.00 (.03)	.11 (.03)**	.14 (.03)**	.06 (.03)*	.08 (.03)**	.09 (.03)**	.12 (.03)**
Career adaptability	.26 (.05)**		.11 (.06)*		.01 (.06)		.01 (.05)	
Concern		.04 (.06)		.14 (.07)*		-.08 (.06)		.13 (.07)
Control		.18 (.07)*		.02 (.09)		.11 (.08)		.01 (.09)
Curiosity		-.01 (.07)		.14 (.09)		-.06 (.08)		.12 (.09)
Confidence		.24 (.07)**		.08 (.10)		.22 (.08)**		.08 (.10)
<i>Within-person predictor(s)</i>								
Daily career adaptability	.40 (.04)**		.58 (.04)**		.39 (.04)**		.70 (.04)**	
Daily concern		.02 (.04)		.17 (.04)**		-.04 (.04)		.17 (.04)**
Daily control		.20 (.04)**		.04 (.05)		.21 (.05)**		.12 (.04)**
Daily curiosity		.03 (.04)		.06 (.05)		.03 (.04)		.16 (.04)**
Daily confidence		.22 (.05)**		.25 (.05)**		.26 (.05)**		.22 (.05)**
τ_{00}	.19	.20	.25	.38	.24	.25	.23	.37
σ^2	.21	.20	.25	.25	.24	.23	.20	.20
Pseudo R^2	.29	.28	.36	.19	.14	.13	.29	.20

Note. $N = 234$ participants provided 945 daily survey responses. Unstandardized multilevel modeling coefficients (γ) with standard errors (SE) are shown. τ_{00} = between-person variance component, σ^2 = within-person variance component. Pseudo R^2 = proportion of variance explained in dependent variable by predictors at both the between- and within-person levels; calculated as $([\text{null model } \tau_{00} + \text{null model } \sigma^2] - [\text{model } \tau_{00} + \text{model } \sigma^2]) / (\text{null model } \tau_{00} + \text{null model } \sigma^2)$.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

5. Discussion

5.1. Summary and interpretation of results

Consistent with expectations based on career construction theory (Savickas, 1997, 2013), daily career adaptability positively predicted daily task and career performance, as well as daily job and career satisfaction in Study 2. The trend of the effect of daily career adaptability on daily task performance in Study 1 was in the expected direction but, probably due to the relatively small sample size and associated issues with statistical power, did not reach conventional levels of significance. Career construction theory suggests that individuals with high levels of career adaptability possess greater competence and more psychosocial resources to adapt to and manage work- and career-related demands (Savickas, 1997). Higher adaptation and successful management of demands should, in turn, enhance employees' job and career outcomes.

The analyses of effects of the four daily career adaptability dimensions provided a more differentiated perspective. Specifically, results showed that daily control positively predicted daily task performance, as well as job and career satisfaction, but not daily career performance. Daily confidence positively predicted all four job and career outcomes. Thus, on days on which employees showed more behaviors associated with control and confidence (e.g., making independent decisions, solving problems; Savickas & Porfeli, 2012), their perceived task performance, as well as their job and career satisfaction were higher than on days on which they did not express behaviors associated with control and confidence. A potential explanation for these findings is that daily control and confidence behaviors are conceptually related to task motivation, self-concordance, and goal-setting behavior (Erez & Judge, 2001; Judge et al., 2005), and they are related to characteristics such as self-efficacy and internal locus of control that contribute to effective task performance, as well as job and career satisfaction (cf. Hirschi et al., 2015; Öncel, 2014; Zacher, 2014a).

Confidence and, in Study 2, control positively predicted daily task performance at the between-person level, suggesting that employees with high confidence and control show on average higher daily task performance than employees with low confidence and control. Only confidence positively predicted daily job satisfaction, and confidence and control did not have significant effects on daily career performance and satisfaction at the between-person level. While researchers have suggested that relationships may differ at the between- and within-person levels of analysis (Dalal, Bhawe, & Fiset, 2014), there is no straightforward explanation for these non-significant findings. It may be possible that the direction and strength of the between-person relationships depend on third variables. For instance, psychosocial resources associated with high control, such as making independent decisions (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012), may be generally more important for career outcomes in jobs and occupations that provide high autonomy. Future research using multilevel research designs is needed to examine possible explanations.

As hypothesized, daily concern positively predicted daily career performance and satisfaction, whereas daily curiosity only positively predicted daily career satisfaction. Thus, consistent with previous research at the between-person level (Coetzee & Stoltz,

2015; Zacher, 2014a), daily behaviors associated with concern and curiosity, such as preparing for future career tasks and exploring career options (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012), appear to enhance employees' daily evaluations of their career development. Contrary to expectations, daily curiosity did not predict daily career performance. Furthermore, daily curiosity had a weakly negative effect on daily task performance in Study 1, which was not replicated in Study 2. A potential explanation for a negative effect of behavioral manifestations of curiosity, such as exploring one's surroundings and looking for opportunities (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012), may be that they detract from effective daily task performance in certain job and occupational contexts. Research on ego depletion suggests that all behaviors draw on the same pool of limited psychological resources; if individuals spend effort on collecting and analyzing career-related information, their daily task performance may suffer (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998). Future research is needed to investigate the potential boundary conditions of these effects. At the between-person level, only concern positively predicted daily career performance. This finding is consistent with the long-term focus of concern, which makes it more relevant for career development and success rather than short-term goal achievement (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012).

Two additional findings are noteworthy. First, descriptive statistics showed that, overall, daily manifestations of concern and curiosity were less frequently shown by employees in both studies than daily manifestations of control and confidence. This may indicate that employees had fewer opportunities in their daily work to show behaviors associated with concern and curiosity compared to behaviors associated with control and confidence. Future research could examine daily events and job characteristics that facilitate (e.g., autonomy) or constrain (e.g., time pressure) employees' ability to express career adaptability dimensions. Second, results showed that between 30 and 50% of the variance in daily manifestations of career adaptability resided at the within-person level, whereas 50 to 70% of the variance could potentially be explained by inter-individual difference characteristics. This finding suggests that research on both inter-individual differences and intra-individual variability in career adaptability is important (cf. Dalal et al., 2014). Research on inter-individual differences in career adaptability enables a better understanding of the relatively stable person-related and contextual factors that result in some people having higher levels of career adaptability than other people, and why people with high career adaptability may be more successful in their careers than people with low career adaptability. Research on intra-individual variability in daily manifestations of career adaptability can provide information on more dynamic person-related and contextual factors that explain why an employee displays more behaviors indicative of career adaptability on one day and less on another day, and why employees may be more successful on days on which they are able, motivated, or have the opportunity to behaviorally express their career adaptability.

Research designs exploring intra-individual variability may take different forms, ranging from diary studies that investigate daily manifestations of career adaptability to longitudinal studies that investigate antecedents and outcomes of change in career adaptability over longer time periods (e.g., Guan et al., 2013; Hirschi, 2009; Negru-Subtirica et al., 2015; Zacher, 2014b). Future research could combine both types of studies by conducting "measurement burst" studies (Sliwinski, Almeida, Smyth, & Stawski, 2009). These studies allow linking short-term variability in a construct with longer-term changes in the same construct. For instance, it may be possible that the career adaptability of employees who have more daily opportunities to express their career adaptability will develop more positively over longer time periods than the career adaptability of employees who are not able to express their career adaptability on a daily basis.

5.2. Limitations and future research

The studies reported in this article have a number of limitations. First, self-reports of task and career performance may be susceptible to biases, for instance employees' tendency to present themselves more favorable to others than is justified by their actual performance. I took a number of steps in this study to minimize such concerns. Participation was anonymous and employees were aware that their data would be used for research purposes only. Moreover, employees were asked to rate their performance from the perspective of their supervisors, which may reduce self-report bias and increase the likelihood that self-reports correspond more strongly to supervisory ratings of performance (Schoorman & Mayer, 2008). Using self-reports of performance is also less problematic when they are included in within-person designs, because these designs aim to explain variation from each employee's average daily performance, and self-report bias would be expected to influence all daily ratings of an employee in a similar way. Nevertheless, future research should collect actual supervisor ratings of daily performance.

Second, the relatively small sample size of Study 1 did not allow the inclusion of potentially important control variables and may have limited statistical power to detect small effect sizes. However, Study 2, which used a much larger sample and additional control variables, largely replicated the findings of Study 1. Finally, future research is needed to examine daily employee states (e.g., positive affect) as well as daily work events and job characteristics (e.g., time pressure, autonomy) as potential boundary conditions of within-person relationships between daily manifestations of career adaptability and daily job and career outcomes.

5.3. Practical implications

Explaining within-person variability in job and career outcomes is not only theoretically, but also practically important (Dalal et al., 2014). Results of this study showed that daily behavioral manifestations of career adaptability and some its dimensions positively predicted daily task and career performance, as well as daily job and career satisfaction. Thus, organizations interested in increasing these outcomes should not only develop employees' career adaptability in the long term, but also facilitate its daily expressions. Previous research showed that employees' future temporal focus positively predicted changes in career adaptability and its dimensions over a time period of six months (Zacher, 2014b). In contrast, predictors of short-term variability in behavioral manifestations of career

adaptability have not yet been investigated. It may be possible that daily job resources such as high autonomy and social support enhance daily behavioral expressions of career adaptability.

References

- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1252–1265. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1252>.
- Beal, D. J. (2015). ESM 2.0: State of the art and future potential of experience sampling methods in organizational research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2, 383–407. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111335>.
- Biemann, T., Zacher, H., & Feldman, D. C. (2012). Career patterns: A twenty-year panel study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81, 159–170. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.06.003>.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 279–307. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135156>.
- Chan, S. H. J., & Mai, X. (2015). The relation of career adaptability to satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 89, 130–139. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.05.005>.
- Coetzee, M., & Stoltz, E. (2015). Employees' satisfaction with retention factors: Exploring the role of career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 89, 83–91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.04.012>.
- Dalal, R. S., Bhawe, D. P., & Fiset, J. (2014). Within-person variability in job performance: A theoretical review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 40, 1396–1436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206314532691>.
- Debusscher, J., Hofmans, J., & De Fruyt, F. (2015). The effect of state core self-evaluations on task performance, organizational citizenship behaviour, and counterproductive work behaviour. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2015.1063486>.
- Erez, A., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations to goal setting, motivation, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1270–1279. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1270>.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 64–86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256352>.
- Guan, Y., Deng, H., Sun, J., Wang, Y., Cai, Z., Ye, L., ... Li, Y. (2013). Career adaptability, job search self-efficacy and outcomes: A three-wave investigation among Chinese university graduates. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83, 561–570. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.09.003>.
- Guan, Y., Zhou, W., Ye, L., Jiang, P., & Zhou, Y. (2015). Perceived organizational career management and career adaptability as predictors of success and turnover intention among Chinese employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 88, 230–237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.04.002>.
- Guo, Y., Guan, Y., Yang, X., Xu, J., Zhou, X., She, Z., ... Fu, M. (2014). Career adaptability, calling and the professional competence of social work students in China: A career construction perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85, 394–402. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.09.001>.
- Hirschi, A. (2009). Career adaptability development in adolescence: Multiple predictors and effect on sense of power and life satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 145–155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.01.002>.
- Hirschi, A., Herrmann, A., & Keller, A. C. (2015). Career adaptivity, adaptability, and adapting: A conceptual and empirical investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 87, 1–10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.11.008>.
- Hofmann, D. A., Griffin, M. A., & Gavin, M. B. (2000). The application of hierarchical linear modeling to organizational research. In K. Klein, & S. W. J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations* (pp. 423–468). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 80–92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80>.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life satisfaction: The role of self-concordance and goal attainment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 257–268. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.257>.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 17–34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.17>.
- Judge, T. A., Simon, L. S., Hurst, C., & Kelley, K. (2014). What I experienced yesterday is who I am today: Relationship of work motivations and behaviors to within-individual variation in the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 199–221. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0034485>.
- Koen, J., Klehe, U.-C., Van Vianen, A. E. M., Zikic, J., & Nauta, A. (2010). Job-search strategies and reemployment quality: The impact of career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 126–139. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.02.004>.
- Li, Y., Guan, Y., Wang, F., Zhou, X., Guo, K., Jiang, P., ... Fang, Z. (2015). Big-five personality and BIS/BAS traits as predictors of career exploration: The mediation role of career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 89, 39–45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.04.006>.
- Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system theory of personality: Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. *Psychological Review*, 102, 246–268. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.2.246>.
- Negru-Subtrica, O., Pop, E. I., & Crocetti, E. (2015). Developmental trajectories and reciprocal associations between career adaptability and vocational identity: A three-wave longitudinal study with adolescents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 88, 131–142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.03.004>.
- Ohme, M., & Zacher, H. (2015). Job performance ratings: The relative importance of mental ability, conscientiousness, and career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 87, 161–170. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.01.003>.
- Öncel, L. (2014). Career adapt-abilities scale: Convergent validity of subscale scores. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85, 13–17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.03.006>.
- Raabe, B., Frese, M., & Behr, T. A. (2007). Action regulation theory and career self-management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70, 297–311. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.10.005>.
- Roberts, B. W., & Jackson, J. J. (2008). Sociogenomic personality psychology. *Journal of Personality*, 76, 1523–1544. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00530.x>
- Savickas, M. L. (1997). Career adaptability: An integrative construct for life-span, life-space theory. *Career Development Quarterly*, 45, 247–259. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.1997.tb00469.x>.
- Savickas, M. L. (2013). Career construction theory and practice. In R. W. Lent, & S. D. Brown (Eds.), *Career development and counselling: Putting theory and research into work* (pp. 147–183) (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Savickas, M. L., & Porfeli, E. J. (2012). Career adapt-abilities scale: Construction, reliability, and measurement equivalence across 13 countries. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80, 661–673. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.011>.
- Schoorman, F. D., & Mayer, R. C. (2008). The value of common perspectives in self-reported appraisals: You get what you ask for. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11, 148–159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1094428107307168>.
- Sliwinski, M. J., Almeida, D. M., Smyth, J., & Stawski, R. S. (2009). Intraindividual change and variability in daily stress processes: Findings from two measurement-burst diary studies. *Psychology and Aging*, 24, 828–840. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017925>.
- Super, D. E., & Knasel, E. G. (1981). Career development in adulthood: Some theoretical problems and a possible solution. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 9, 194–201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03069888108258214>.
- Taber, B. J., & Blankemeyer, M. (2015). Future work self and career adaptability in the prediction of proactive career behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 86, 20–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.10.005>.

- van Vianen, A. E. M., Klehe, U. -C., Koen, J., & Dries, N. (2012). Career adapt-abilities scale—Netherlands form: Psychometric properties and relationships to ability, personality, and regulatory focus. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *80*, 716–724. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.002>.
- Welbourne, T. M., Johnson, D. E., & Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale: Validity analysis of a theory-based measure. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*, 540–555. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256941>.
- Zacher, H. (2014a). Career adaptability predicts subjective career success above and beyond personality traits and core self-evaluations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *84*, 21–30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.10.002>.
- Zacher, H. (2014b). Individual difference predictors of change in career adaptability over time. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *84*, 188–198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.01.001>.
- Zacher, H., & Griffin, B. (2015). Older workers' age as a moderator of the relationship between career adaptability and job satisfaction. *Work, Aging and Retirement*, *1*, 227–236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/workar/wau009>.
- Zacher, H., Ambiel, R. A. M., & Porto Noronha, A. P. (2015). Career adaptability and career entrenchment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *88*, 164–173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.03.006>.
- Zacher, H., Jimmieson, N. L., & Winter, G. (2012). Eldercare demands, mental health, and work performance: The moderating role of satisfaction with eldercare tasks. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *17*, 52–64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025154>.