Running head: DUTCH CAAS

van Vianen, A., Klehe, U., 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 (3), 716-724.

Annelies E.M. van Vianen

University of Amsterdam, Department of Work and Organizational Psychology

Roetersstraat 15, 1018 WB, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Tel: (+3120) 525-6856

Fax: (+3120) 639-0531

e-mail: a.e.m.vanvianen@uva.nl

Ute-Christine Klehe

Justus Liebig Universität Gießen, Department of Work and Organizational Psychology

Otto Behaghel Strasse 10F, Giessen, Germany

Tel: (+49641) 99-26-220

Fax: (+49641) 99-26-229

e-mail: Ute-Christine.Klehe@psychol.uni-giessen.de

Jessie Koen

University of Amsterdam, Department of Work and Organizational Psychology

Roetersstraat 15, 1018 WB, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Tel: (+3120) 525-6444

Fax: (+3120) 639-0531

e-mail: J.Koen@uva.nl

Nicky Dries

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Research Centre of Organisation Studies

Naamsestraat 69, 3000 Leuven, Belgium

Tel: (+3216) 326868

Fax: (+3116) 326732

e-mail: Nicky.Dries@econ.kuleuven.be

Abstract

The CAAS consists of four scales, each with six items, which measure concern, control, curiosity, and confidence as psychosocial resources for managing occupational transitions, developmental tasks, and work traumas. Internal consistency estimates for the subscale and total scores ranged from satisfactory to excellent. The factor structure was quite similar to the one computed for the combined data from 13 countries. The Dutch CAAS Form is identical to the International Form. The convergent validity of the Dutch CAAS was established with relating the CAAS subscales to self-esteem, Big Five personality measures, and regulatory focus. Relations between the subscales and these stable personality factors were largely as predicted. The discriminant validity of the Dutch CAAS was established by relating the CAAS scores to general mental ability; no significant relationship between career adaptability and general mental ability was found.

Introduction

As in other European countries, people in the Netherlands are no longer certain of their job or function due to organizational changes as instigated by technological advances, business without borders, and most recently a worldwide economic crisis. Although the Dutch social security system provides unemployed people with sufficient financial support to compensate for loss of income, job insecurity and job loss are among the most traumatic work-related life events, causing uncertainty and worries about the future (Klehe, Zikic, Van Vianen, & De Pater, 2011). Concurrently, students who are in the process of composing their curriculum or are about to enter the labor market are facing a rapidly changing job market. The link between receiving specific vocational training and finding a corresponding job is weakened. Young adults thus face great uncertainties, many of them having to adjust their hopes and aspirations early on in their career.

Career transitions such as from school to work or from one job to another (Klehe et al., 2011) trigger a person's career adaptability, especially in times of high environmental uncertainty. Career adaptability is a psychosocial construct that denotes an individual's resources for coping with current and anticipated tasks, transitions, and traumas in occupational roles (Savickas, 1997). These resources, which support people's self-regulation strategies, are captured in four conceptual factors: concern (oriented to and involved in preparing for the future), control (self-discipline as shown by being conscientious and responsible in making decisions), curiosity (exploring circumstances and seeking information about opportunities), and confidence (perceived ability to solve problems and overcoming obstacles) (see Savickas & Porfeli, this issue).

Individual differences in adaptability, and its causes, correlates, and consequences, are important to study. To date, theory development and research regarding human flexibility and adaptability has been relatively scarce. Instead, research has been primarily focused on the fit

between individuals and their environment, portraying both people and organizations as static entities (Savickas, Nota, Rossier, Dauwalder, Duarte, Guichard, Soresi, Van Esbroeck, & Van Vianen, 2009). This traditional approach towards vocational choice and careers no longer holds because work environments will rapidly change and people should anticipate and prepare themselves for these changes. Therefore, research is needed that examines the dispositions, resources, attitudes, and behaviors that help people to adapt in their careers.

As a first step into this new research agenda, an international team of career researchers (see Savickas & Porfeli, this issue) developed a theoretical framework of career adaptability and constructed a career adaptability measure, the international form of the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale (CAAS). The present article reports the development of the Dutch version of this measure and reports its psychometric properties, including item statistics and internal consistency estimates. In addition, we compare the factor structure of the Dutch CAAS to the multi-dimensional, hierarchical measurement model of the CAAS-International (Savickas & Porfeli, this issue). We further examine its validity for use in the Netherlands by relating the CAAS to personality measures that are expected to correlate with specific CAAS subscales (convergent validity) or not (discriminant validity).

As argued by Savickas and Porfeli (this issue), there is a wide range of variables available for examining convergent validity of the four factors of career adaptability. We decided to link adaptability, which is a psychosocial construct, to stable personality traits that seem conceptually or empirically associated with specific subscales of the CAAS. Specifically, to establish the *convergent* validity (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955), we linked the CAAS to personality measures that have been found to be predictive for people's work-related behaviors and strategies and thus could provide a nomological network and support for the meaning of the four CAAS factors, such as self-esteem, Big Five personality traits, and regulatory focus. To establish the *discriminant* validity of the Dutch CAAS we compared

the CAAS subscales to a stable person factor that should not correlate with adaptability, namely general mental ability.

Convergent Validity

The convergent validity of a measure is established when it correlates with other validated measures that should be conceptually and theoretically linked to the measure of interest. We, specifically, expected that career adaptability would relate to relatively stable personality traits that direct people's cognitions, affective states, and behaviors, and that are important for their work and career outcomes.

Self-esteem

Self-esteem concerns the overall value that people place on oneself as a person (Harter, 1990). Self-esteem has been treated as a relatively stable personality trait (e.g., Roy, Neale, & Kendler, 1995) or as a state that is associated with people's positive experiences and perceived successes (e.g., Gentile, Twenge, & Campbell, 2010). Furthermore, recent research has evidenced that self-esteem is also a psychosocial construct in that it is influenced by the cultural context. People's self-esteem is higher in cultures that places importance on self-liking, the so-called cultures of self-worth. Gentile et al. (2010), for example, showed that an increase in self-esteem among US adolescents and young adults was associated with a cultural emphasis on self-worth rather than academic competence. However, despite this cultural influence, large individual differences in self-esteem exist within cultures.

Self-esteem is positively related to life satisfaction (e.g., Diener & Diener, 1995), happiness and enhanced initiative, and people with high self-esteem are less vulnerable to stress (Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger, & Vohs, 2003). In particular, people high on self-esteem more likely adopt more effective coping strategies in the face of stress than do people with low self-esteem (Ganster & Schaubroek, 1995). Hence, self-esteem seems conceptually related to the confidence and curiosity subscales of adaptability. In addition, self-esteem is

strongly associated with locus of control (people's belief that they can control events that affect them), and both self-esteem and locus of control are part of the higher-order construct of core-self evaluations representing the fundamental evaluations that people make about themselves and their functioning in their environment (Judge, Van Vianen, & De Pater, 2004). Finally, people with high self-esteem more often engage in various forms of exploration and planning, such as career planning (Creed, Patton, & Bartrum, 2004; Creed, Patton, & Prideaux, 2007), and financial planning (Neymotin, 2010). Altogether, we expected that self-esteem would be positively related to all four constructs of adaptability (*Hypotheses 1*).

Big Five personality traits

In predicting the influence of personality on work and career-related behaviors, the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality is the most validated and most widely accepted taxonomy of traits, encompassing extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience (e.g., McCrae & Costa, 1987).

Extraversion mainly refers to sociability; extraverts prefer the company of others, are outgoing and dominant. In addition, extraverts tend to be more active, and less introspective and self-preoccupied than introverts (e.g., Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999). Based on these characteristics, we expected that extraverts would display more control (*Hypothesis 2a*), curiosity (*Hypothesis 2b*), and confidence (*Hypothesis 2c*), than introverts, whereas – given their lower introspectiveness – they would show lower levels of concern (*Hypotheses 2d*).

Agreeableness is characterized by cooperation and likeability. Agreeable persons trust others, are caring, good-natured and gentle. The agreeableness personality factor primarily refers to people's interpersonal behavior (e.g., McCrea & Costa, 1992). Therefore, we did not

hypothesize specific relationships between agreeableness and the subscales of career adaptability.

Conscientiousness refers to self-control, need for achievement, and persistence. Conscientious people are hardworking, responsible, and organized (Judge et al., 1999). Conscientiousness promotes effective job seeking behavior (Wanberg, Watt, & Rumsey, 1996), and predicts performance and success at work (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Moreover, conscientiousness is positively related to future planning in general (Prenda & Lachman, 2001) and career planning in particular (Rogers, Creed, & Glendon, 2008). Further, higher levels of conscientiousness seem associated with higher confidence (Schaefer, Williams, Goodie, & Campbell, 2004; Pulford & Sohal, 2006). Hence, we hypothesized that conscientiousness would be positively related to the concern (*Hypotheses 3a*), control (*Hypotheses 3b*), and confidence (*Hypotheses 3c*) constructs of adaptability in particular.

Neuroticism is characterized by instability, personal insecurity and depression, thus low emotional stability. People high in neuroticism tend to show a lack of positive psychological adjustment (Judge et al., 1999). Neuroticism is conceived of as the opposite of control (Muñiz, García-Cueto, & Lozano, 2005), and people high in neuroticism appraise stressful events as a threat rather than challenge (e.g. Gallagher, 1990). We, therefore, expected that neuroticism would be negatively related to the control and confidence constructs of adaptability in particular (*Hypotheses 4a and 4b, respectively*).

Openness to experience refers to unconventionality, imaginativeness, intellectual curiosity, and flexibility (e.g., McCrea & Costa, 1992). Hence, openness is conceptually related to curiosity (e.g. Le Pine, Colquitt, & Erez, 2000). Prior research has shown that people who were high in openness were more involved in future planning (Prenda & Lachman, 2001) and career planning (Rogers et al., 2008) than those who were less open to new experiences, suggesting a positive relationship between openness and the concern

subscale of adaptability. Furthermore, openness was found to be positively associated with students' skill confidence (Rottinghaus, Lindley, Green, & Borgen, 2002). Hence, we expected that openness would be positively related to the concern (*Hypotheses 4a*), curiosity (*Hypotheses 4b*), and confidence (*Hypotheses 4c*) subscales of adaptability.

Regulatory focus

Career adaptability involves the general competencies and specific behaviors necessary for anticipating and adapting to changing conditions. Hence, people should not only have a clear perception of their current situation but also reflect on their future. Consequently, when studying the nomological network of the career adaptability scale, one would expect meaningful relations to how people approach possible futures in general.

Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997) identifies two kinds of independent self-regulatory foci: a promotion focus and a prevention focus. Individuals can be high or low in both promotion and prevention or high in one and low in the other. People high in promotion set goals in terms of aspirations and accomplishments; they focus on the presence or absence of positive future outcomes (e.g., getting high study grades or finding a suitable job). People high in prevention set goals in terms of responsibilities and safety; they focus on the presence or absence of negative outcomes (possible study failure or not finding a job). The hopes and aspirations associated with a promotion focus function like setting maximal goals, whereas the duties and obligations associated with a prevention orientation tend to result in setting minimal goals, the bare necessities or the least a person could comfortably tolerate (Idson, Liberman, & Higgins, 2000). People with a strong promotion focus prefer eager approach strategies of goal pursuit; they try to attain a desired end state by showing behaviors that could make the desired outcome happen, such as considering more alternatives, maximizing gains, and being creative, enthusiastic, and riskier. We, therefore, expected that high as compared to low promotion focused individuals will involve more in behaviors such as

reflecting on positive prospective outcomes and exploring one's options to attain these prospective outcomes. Furthermore, they will feel confident that they will succeed. Hence, we expected that promotion focus would be positively related to the concern (*Hypotheses 5a*), curiosity (*Hypotheses 5b*), and confidence (*Hypotheses 5c*) subscales of adaptability.

In contrast, prevention focused people prefer vigilant avoidance strategies; they involve in behaviors that prevent an undesired outcome from happening (Higgins, 2005; Higgins & Freitas, 2007). They consider fewer alternatives, minimize losses, are less likely to change (Liberman, Idson, Camacho, & Higgins, 1999), and are more cautious. All in all, prevention focused people are less optimistic, have more difficulties with making decisions, and seem less confident about attaining their goals. Based on these prior studies, we particularly expected that prevention focus would be negatively related to the control (*Hypotheses 6a*), curiosity (*Hypotheses 6b*), and confidence (*Hypotheses 6c*) subscales of adaptability.

Discriminant validity

For establishing discriminant validity (Campbell, 1960), we investigated the relationship between the CAAS subscales and a measure that we expected not to relate to the CAAS construct, namely general mental ability.

General Mental Ability

To date, there is neither theoretical rationale nor empirical evidence to assume that people's general mental ability (GMA) would influence their adaptability. For example, although people's GMA is a strong predictor of learning, self-regulatory behaviors and attitudes such as setting goals, persistence, effort, and self-efficacy account for an additional amount of variance in learning (Sitzmann & Ely, 2011). This finding indicates that GMA and self-regulation processes operate independently. In addition, Rabin, Fogel, and Nutter-Upham (2011) found that college students' GMA was not significantly related to self-regulatory

behaviors such as self-monitoring (keeping track of one's own behavior), planning and organizing (the ability to manage current and future oriented task demands), initiating (the ability to begin a task and to develop problem-solving strategies), and task-monitoring (keeping track of one's problem-solving success or failure). Altogether, we expected no relationship between the CAAS subscales and general mental ability.

Methods

Participants

Participants were university students in the Netherlands (N = 465, 74 % females). Mean age was 20.77 years (*SD* = 5.12) and approximately 95% was Caucasian. As part of a course requirement, they participated in several computer test sessions during a period of three weeks. The data of this study was collected at different points in time with several days between the CAAS measure, personality measures, and mental ability test. All participants gave their permission to use their data for research and their responses were made anonymous.

Measures

We measured the Dutch CAAS, self-esteem, the Big Five personality traits, promotion and prevention focus, and general mental ability.

Dutch Career Adapt-Abilities Inventory. The CAAS-International Form 2.0 contains 24 items that combine to form a total score which indicates career adaptability (for the items see Savickas & Porfeli, this issue). Participants responded to each item employing a scale from 1 (not strong) to 5 (strongest). The 24 items are divided equally into four subscales that measure the adapt-ability resources of concern, control, curiosity, and confidence in Dutch. Belgian and Dutch researchers translated the English version of the CAAS into Dutch and conducted several small pilots to test the translated version and, where necessary, further improved the wording of the items. The Dutch item translation is presented in the appendix.

The Dutch item descriptive statistics and loadings from the confirmatory factor model appear in Table 1. The total score for the CAAS-International has a reported reliability of .92, which is higher than for the subscale scores of concern (.83), control (.74), curiosity (.79) and confidence (.85) (Savickas & Porfeli, this issue). The total score for the Dutch CAAS has a reliability of .89, which is higher than for the subscale scores of concern (.84), control (.72), curiosity (.72) and confidence (.75). The reliabilities of the subscales for the Dutch sample appear in Table 2. The reliabilities are generally similar for this sample relative to the total international sample.

Self-esteem was measured with Rosenberg's (1965) 10-item scale which measures feelings of global self-esteem. On a 5-point Likert scale, participants indicated how strongly they (dis)agree with statements such as: "I feel that I have a number of good qualities". The internal consistency of the scale was excellent (α = .90).

Extraversion, ***agreeableness***, ***conscientiousness***, ***neuroticism***, and ***openness to experience*** were measured with the Dutch 5-Factor Personality Test (Elshout & Akkerman, 1975). Each scale consisted of 14 items that were measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*good*). The internal consistencies were .85 for extraversion, .80 for agreeableness, .77 for conscientiousness, .85 for neuroticism, and .80 for openness to experience.

Promotion focus and ***prevention focus*** were measured with Lockwood, Jordon and Kunda's (2002) regulatory focus measure. Both scales consisted of 9 items. On a 9-point Likert scale, participants indicated how strongly they (dis)agree with statements such as: "I typically focus on the success I hope to achieve in the future" (promotion focus), and "In general, I am focused on preventing negative events in my life" (prevention focus). The internal consistencies were .80 for promotion, and .83 for prevention.

General mental ability was measured with Raven's Standard Progressive Matrices (Raven, Raven, & Court, 2000), which is a non-verbal test consisting of 60 items (divided into 5 sets of 12 items) designed to measure the ability to form comparisons, to reason by analogy, and to organize spatial information into related wholes. It has been established as one of the purest measures of general intelligence (Jensen, 1998).

Results

The Dutch CAAS item means and standard deviations suggest that the typical response was in the range of *strong to very strong*. Skewness and kurtosis values for the 24 Dutch CAAS items ranged from (-.74 to -.25) and (-.57 to 1.14) respectively, suggesting that the items conform to the assumptions of confirmatory factor analysis for this sample. Scale means and standard deviations for all study measures, and correlations among these measures appear in Table 2. Skewness and kurtosis values for the four Dutch CAAS subscales ranged from (-.47 to -.27) and (.12 to .78) respectively, suggesting that the subscales conform to the assumptions of correlation-based statistics for this sample. Correlations among the adaptability scales were significant ($p < .01$) and ranged from .30 to .58 (see Table 2). Furthermore, the four subscales correlated from .70 to .82 to the adaptability total score.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) showed that data for the Dutch CAAS fit the theoretical model very well. The fit indices were RMSEA = 0.068 and SRMR =0.07, which conform satisfactory to established joint fit criteria (Hu & Bentler, 1999). They are slightly lower than the fit indices for the CAAS-International model which were RMSEA = 0.053 and SRMR = 0.039 (Savickas and Porfeli, this issue Table 2, row M1b). The standardized loadings (see Table 1) suggest that all items are strong indicators of the second-order constructs, which are in turn strong indicators of the third-order adaptability construct.

Comparison of the Dutch CAAS factor model to international factor model

Comparing the Dutch CAAS hierarchical factor model to the model for the CAAS-International indicated that the loadings of first-order items on the second-order factors of adaptability were very similar. The most notable differences were for curiosity #5 (Probing deeply into questions I have), confidence #1 (Performing tasks efficiently), confidence #5 (Overcoming obstacles), and confidence #6 (Solving problems), showing a weaker loading in the Dutch data. Of the second-order constructs, control showed the greatest difference in loading between the Dutch (.69) and international samples (.86), with the Dutch sample showing a weaker loading. The loadings of the other three CAAS subscales were quite similar for the Dutch and international samples. The Dutch mean scores were somewhat lower with regard to concern, curiosity, and confidence as compared to the international mean scores (ΔM = .22, .14, and .18, respectively). The mean scores for control were comparable (3.88 and 3.93, respectively).

Convergent and Discriminant Validities

The *convergent* validity was examined by relating the adaptability measure to self-esteem, the Big Five personality traits and regulatory focus. As can be seen in Table 2, significant correlations were found between the four adaptability subscales and most of these personality measures. We proposed that self-esteem would be positively related to all adaptability subscales (*Hypothesis 1*). All correlations ($p < .01$) between self-esteem and the adaptability subscales were positive and significant, with the lowest correlation with concern ($r = .17$), and the highest with control ($r = .52$). The correlation between self-esteem and the total Dutch CAAS scale was .38 ($p < .01$).

We also related the CAAS scales to Big Five personality measures. As predicted (*Hypotheses 2a-2c*), significant positive correlations were found between extraversion and the CAAS subscales of control ($r = .38$, $p < .01$), curiosity ($r = .25$, $p < .01$), and confidence

(r = .24, p < .01). However, in contrast to *Hypothesis 2d*, extraversion was positively rather than negatively correlated to the concern subscale (r = .18, p < .01). We did not expect any specific correlations between agreeableness and the four CAAS subscales. Yet, significant and positive correlations were found, but these correlations were relatively small in size (ranging from .16 to .18). We hypothesized that conscientiousness would be positively related to concern, control, and confidence (*Hypothesis 3a – 3c*). The correlations with these subscales were indeed significant and positive, but the correlation with the control scale was rather small (r = .12, p < .01). The correlations with the other two subscales were .39 and .38, respectively. We did not predict but nevertheless found a positive correlation between conscientiousness and curiosity (r = .23, p < .01).

As predicted (*Hypothesis 4a*), neuroticism was negatively related to control (r = - .40, p < .01). The proposed negative correlation with confidence (*Hypothesis 4b*) was significant but small (r = -.13, p < .01). We proposed (*Hypotheses 4a-4c*) and found positive correlations between openness and concern (r = .22, p < .01), curiosity (r = .41, p < .01), and confidence (r = .35, p < .01). Unexpectedly, we also found a significant positive correlation between openness and control (r = .26, p < .01). Finally, all Big Five measures were significantly correlated with the total Dutch CAAS scale, with correlations ranging from -.18 (neuroticism) to .39 (openness).

We proposed (*Hypotheses 5a-5c*) and found positive correlations between promotion focus and concern (r = .47, p < .01), curiosity (r = .31, p < .01), and confidence (r = .29, p < .01). However, a positive, albeit weaker, correlation was also found with control (r = .16, p < .01). Promotion focus correlated .41 (p < .01) with the total Dutch CAAS scale. As predicted *(Hypotheses 6a and 6c),* prevention focus was negatively related to control (r = -.40, p < .01) and confidence (r = -.20, p < .01). Contrary to *Hypothesis 6b,* no significant negative

relationship was found with curiosity (r = -.08, *ns*). Prevention focus was negatively related to the total Dutch CAAS scale (r = -.21, $p < .01$).

In order to estimate the unique relationships between the adaptability subscales and the convergent measures, we performed five regression analyses, with each of the four adaptability subscales and the total Dutch adaptability scale as dependent variables, and the eight personality measures as the independent variables (see Table 3). The Big Five traits and regulatory focuses could explain 33% of the variance in concern (R^2 = .33, F (8, 439) = 26.58, p = .00), 37% of the variance in control (R^2 = .37, F (8, 439) = 32.43, p = .00), 26% of the variance in curiosity (R^2 = .26, F (8, 439) = 18.82, p = .00), 31% of the variance in confidence (R^2 = .31, F (8, 439) = 24.53, p = .00), and 41% of the variance in the total adaptability measure (R^2 = .41, F (8, 439) = 38.59, p = .00). Concern was significantly related to conscientiousness (β = .28, p = .00), neuroticism (β = .11, p = .03), and promotion focus (β = .39, p = .00); control was significantly related to self-esteem (β = .29, p = .00), extraversion (β = .20, p = .00), neuroticism (β = -.17, p = .00), and openness (β = .09, p = .02); curiosity correlated significantly with conscientiousness (β = .11, p = .02), openness (β = .31, p = .00), and promotion focus (β = .17, p = .00); confidence was significantly related to conscientiousness (β = .30, p = .00), openness (β = .19, p = .00), promotion focus (β = .17, p = .00), and prevention focus (β = -.17, p = .01), and adaptability significantly related to all personality factors except agreeableness and neuroticism (all $p < .01$; self-esteem: β = .16; extraversion: β = .12; conscientiousness: β = .25; openness: β = .20; promotion focus: β = .28; and prevention focus: β = - .13). This pattern of unique significant relationships largely confirms the convergent validity of the adaptability measure.

We examined the *discriminant* validity of the adaptability measure by investigating its relationship with general mental ability. The correlations between general mental ability and

the four adaptability constructs were mostly nonsignificant and low (mean r = .05), which support discriminant validity.

Discussion

In this study, we aimed to examine the psychometric properties, and the convergent and discriminant validity of the Dutch Career Adapt-Abilities Scale. Our results showed that the total scale and four subscales of the Dutch CAAS each demonstrate sufficient to good internal consistency estimates and a coherent multidimensional, hierarchical structure that fits the theoretical model and linguistic explication of career adaptability resources. Moreover, the Dutch CAAS performs quite similarly to the CAAS-International in terms of psychometric characteristics and factor structure. However, the items of the confidence subscale could be further improved because some item loadings were weaker as compared to the international ones.

We proposed several relationships between the CAAS subscales and personality measures, most of which were confirmed. Strikingly, both conscientiousness and promotion focus were positively related to the total adaptability measure and three of the subscales (except control). In addition, openness was positively related to adaptability and three subscales (except concern). These findings suggest that people who are organized, achievement oriented, imaginative, and focused on their hopes and aspirations tend to rate themselves higher in terms of career-related self-regulative resources. Yet, we should note that the mean correlation between these personality constructs and career adaptability is relatively modest (mean r = .26), which indicate that people's career adaptive resources do not fully stem from stable personality traits. Rather, as argued by Savickas and Porfeli (this issue), these resources reside as the intersection of person-in-environment.

Career adaptability was also related to self-esteem, extraversion, and prevention focus, but these relationships were relatively weak and concerned some but not all subscales.

Self-esteem primarily correlated with the control subscale that includes items such as "Counting on myself", and "Sticking up for my beliefs", which refer to self reliance and taking the self as the core initiator of one's actions. However, the overall modest correlations between self-esteem and the career adaptability measures may also point to the psychosocial character of this construct. As can be seen in Table 2, participants' self-esteem scores were on average high as compared to those of the Big Five personality constructs. Hence, the self-esteem ratings may reflect sensitivity to cultural influences or a temporary state rather than a stable personality trait.

Extraversion was primarily associated with control, which is in line with research that showed that extraverts are more likely to be optimistic (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Contrary to our expectations, extraversion did not correlate negatively with concern. As is also the case for agreeableness, extraversion may affect interpersonal behaviors mostly. Extraverts like to be the center of social activities, prefer the company of other people, and foster positive interactions. In times of career transitions, extraverts may be particularly skilled in seeking and utilizing support from others (e.g., Swickert, Rosentreter, Hittner, & Mushrush, 2002), thus providing themselves with the social resources that are needed when coping with the uncertainties and stress that are associated with career transitions.

Prevention focus was negatively related to adaptability and the confidence measure. Moreover, study participants with a strong prevention focus showed lower self-esteem (r = -.56 p = .00) and were higher on neuroticism (r = .53 p = .00), and both these personality measures were strongly associated with the control subscale. Hence, people with a prevention focus tend to have lower control and confidence resources. They are particularly concerned about the possible negative outcomes of their actions which may impair their confidence that obstacles can be defeated.

We did not expect a relationship between career adaptability and general mental ability. Our results support this contention. We should note, however, that due to the use of a university student sample, mental ability was restricted in range which may have lowered the chance of finding significant and substantial correlations. Therefore, future studies testing the relationship between career adaptability and general mental ability should comprise participants from a broader range of educational backgrounds. Furthermore, future studies should not only include students but also other samples, such as employees who are experiencing a job transition due to job loss. These studies could establish whether our current findings can be generalized to other subjects and situations.

Another potential limitation of the current study involves the possibility of common method variance. However, single-source data is typically used for establishing convergent and discriminant validities, particularly when people's personality traits are linked to their attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Gati, Gadassi, Saka, Hadadi, Ansenberg, Freidmann, & Asulin-Peretz, 2011). Moreover, common method bias was less of a problem because we obtained our data from multiple time periods. Yet, the validity of the Dutch CAAS should be further tested with relating the CAAS to more independent and objective criteria such as people's actual job search behaviors and decisions.

All in all, we believe that the Dutch CAAS can be further improved, but also that its current form can be used to measure students' adaptability resources.

References

Baumeister, R.F., Campbell, J.D., Krueger, J.I., & Vohs, K.D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 4,* 1-44.

Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44,* 1-26.

Campbell, D. T. (1960). Recommendations for APA test standards regarding construct, trait, or discriminant validity. *American Psychologist, 15*, 546-553.

Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *NEO-PI-R professional manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Creed, P. A., Patton, W., & Bartrum, D. (2004). Internal and external barriers, cognitive style, and the career development variables of focus and indecision. *Journal of Career Development, 30,* 277–294.

Creed, P.A., Patton, W., & Prideaux, L. (2007). Predicting change over time in career planning and career exploration for high school students. *Journal of Adolescence, 30,* 377–392.

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*, 281-302.

Diener, E., & Diener, M. (1995). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68,* 653–663.

Elshout. J.J., & Akkerman, A.E. (1975). *Vijf Persoonlijkheids-faktoren test 5PFT*. Berkhout BV. Nijmegen.

Gallagher, D. J. (1990). Extraversion, neuroticism and appraisal of stressful academic events. *Personality and Individual Differences, 10,* 1053-1057.

Gati, I., Gadassi, R., Saka, N., Hadadi, Y, Ansenberg, N., Freidmann, R., & Asulin-Peretz, L. (2011). Emotional and personality-related aspects of career decision-making difficulties: Facets of career indecisiveness. *Journal of Career Assessment 19,* 3-20.

Gentile, B., Twenge, J.M., & Campbell, W.K. (2010). Birth cohort differences in self-esteem, 1988-2008: A cross-temporal meta-analysis. *Review of General Psychology, 14,* 261-268.

Harter S. (1990). Causes, correlates, and the functional role of global self-worth: A life span perspective. In R.J. Sternberg & J. Kolligan Jr. (Eds.), *Competence considered* (pp. 67-97). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Higgins, E.T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist, 52,* 1280-1300.

Higgins, E. T. (2005). Value from regulatory fit. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14,* 209 – 213.

Hu, L.-t., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.

Liberman, N., Idson, L. C., Camacho, C. J., & Higgins, E. T. (1999). Promotion and prevention choices between stability and change. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 77*, 1135-1145.

Higgins, E. T., & Freitas, A. L. (2007). Regulatory fit: Its nature and consequences. In T. A. Judge & C. Ostroff (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational fit.* Mahweh, NJ: Erlbaum.

Idson, L. C., Liberman, N., & Higgins, E. T. (2000). Distinguishing gains from nonlosses and losses from nongains: A regulatory focus perspective on hedonic intensity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 252-274.

Jensen. A. R. (1998a). *The g factor: The science of mental ability*. London: Praeger.

Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J, & Barrick, M. R. (1999). The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology, 52,* 621-652.

Judge, T.A., Van Vianen, A.E.M., & De Pater, I.E. (2004). Emotional stability, core self-evaluations, and job outcomes: A review of the evidence and an agenda for future research. *Human Performance, 17,* 325–346.

Klehe, U.C., Zikic, J., Van Vianen, A.E.M., De Pater, I. (2011). Career adaptability, turnover and loyalty during organizational downsizing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79,* 217-229.

Le Pine, J. A., Colquitt, J. A., & Erez, A. Adaptability to changing task contexts: Effects of general cognitive ability, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. *Personnel Psychology, 53*, 563-593.

Lockwood, P., Jordon, C.H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*, 854–64.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1987). Validation of the Five-Factor Model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 81–90.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1992). Discriminant validity of the NEO-PIR facet scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52,* 229-237.

Muñiz, J., Garcia-Cueto, E., & Lozano, L.M. (2005). Item format and the psychometric properties of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*, 61-69.

Neymotin, F. (2010). Linking self-esteem with the tendency to engage in financial planning *Journal of Economic Psychology, 31,* 996-1007.

Prenda, K. M., & Lachman, M. E. (2001). Planning for the future: A life management strategy for increasing control and life satisfaction in adulthood. *Psychology and Aging, 16,* 206-216.

Pulford, B. D., & Sohal, H. (2006). The influence of personality on HE students' confidence in their academic abilities. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41,* 1409-1419.

Rabin, L.A., Fogel, J., & Nutter-Upham, K.E. (2011). Academic procrastination in college students: The role of self-reported executive function. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology, 33,* 344-357.

Raven, J., Raven, J.C., & Court. J.H. (2000). *Standard Progressive Matrices: Raven manual: Section 3*. Oxford Psychologists Press.

Rogers, M. E., Creed, P. A., & Glendon, A. I. (2008). The role of personality in adolescent career planning and exploration: A social cognitive perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73,* 132-142.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton University Press. Princeton. NJ.

Rottinghaus, P.J., Lindley, L.D., Green, M.A., & Borgen, F.H. (2002). Educational aspirations: The contribution of personality, self-efficacy, and interests. *Journal of Vocational Behavior 61,* 1–19.

Roy, M.A., Neale, M.C., & Kendler, K.S. (1995). The genetic epidemiology of self-esteem. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 166,* 813-820.

Savickas, M. L. (1997). Adaptability: An integrative construct for life-span, life-space theory. *Career Development Quarterly, 45*, 247-259.

Savickas, M. L., Nota, L., Rossier, J., Dauwalder, J. P., Duarte, M. E., Guichard, J., Soresi, S., Van Esbroeck, R. & van Vianen, A. E. M. (2009). Life designing: A paradigm for career construction in the 21st century. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*, 239-250.

Schaefer, P. S., Williams C. C., Goodie, A. S., & Campbell, W. K. (2004). Overconfidence and the Big Five. *Journal of Research in Personality, 38,* 473-480.

Sitzmann, T., & Ely, K. (2011). A meta-analysis of self-regulated learning in work-related training and educational attainment: What we know and where we need to go. *Psychological Bulletin, 137,* 421-442.

Swickert, R.J., Rosentreter, C.J., Hittner, J.B., & Mushrush, J.E. (2002). Extraversion, social support processes, and stress. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32,* 877-891.

Wanberg, C.R., Watt, J.D., & Rumsey, D.J. (1996). Individuals without jobs: An empirical study of job-seeking behavior and reemployment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81,* 76-87.

Table 1.

Dutch CAAS: Items, Descriptive Statistics, and Standardized Loadings

Construct		Item (First-Order Indicators)	Mean	SD	Loading
Concern	1.	Thinking about what my future will be like	3.56	1.00	0.67
	2.	Realizing that today's choices shape my future	3.61	0.91	0.67
	3.	Preparing for the future	3.46	0.82	0.77
	4.	Becoming aware of the educational and career choices that I must make	3.78	0.82	0.68
	5.	Planning how to achieve my goals	3.30	0.90	0.68
	6.	Concerned about my career	3.69	0.83	0.65
Control	1.	Keeping upbeat	3.84	0.89	0.52
	2.	Making decisions by myself	3.97	0.76	0.60
	3.	Taking responsibility for my actions	4.01	0.66	0.54
	4.	Sticking up for my beliefs	3.93	0.83	0.55
	5.	Counting on myself	3.93	0.76	0.70
	6.	Doing what's right for me	3.60	0.75	0.48
Curiosity	1.	Exploring my surroundings	3.88	0.72	0.52
	2.	Looking for opportunities to grow as a person	3.77	0.80	0.66
	3.	Investigating options before making a choice	3.65	0.85	0.58
	4.	Observing different ways of doing things	3.76	0.71	0.59
	5.	Probing deeply into questions I have	3.96	0.82	0.43
	6.	Becoming curious about new opportunities	3.97	0.72	0.54
Confidence	1.	Performing tasks efficiently	3.53	0.85	0.48
	2.	Taking care to do things well	3.85	0.61	0.68
	3.	Learning new skills	3.91	0.65	0.64
	4.	Working up to my ability	3.68	0.80	0.62
	5.	Overcoming obstacles	3.71	0.70	0.63
	6.	Solving problems	3.83	0.64	0.56
Construct		**Construct (Second-Order Indicators)**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Loading**
Adaptability	1.	Concern	3.57	0.66	0.71
	2.	Control	3.88	0.51	0.69
	3.	Curiosity	3.83	0.50	0.88
	4.	Confidence	3.75	0.48	0.93

*Note: All of the loadings are statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.01$

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations of the Study Variables

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Gender[1]	-	-	-															
2. Age	20.77	5.12	-.01	-														
Adaptability																		
3. Concern	3.57	0.66	.19	.09	(.84)													
4. Control	3.88	0.51	-.06	.05	.30	(.73)												
5. Curiosity	3.83	0.50	.04	.11	.52	.45	(.72)											
6. Confidence	3.75	0.48	.05	.17	.55	.50	.58	(.76)										
7. Adaptability	3.76	0.42	.08	.13	.80	.70	.81	.82	(.89)									
Validity measures																		
8. Self-esteem	5.34	0.97	-.09	.07	**.17**	**.52**	**.23**	**.29**	.38	(.90)								
9. Extraversion	4.49	0.84	.20	-.03	**.18**[2]	**.38**	**.25**	**.24**	.33	.34	(.85)							
10. Agreeableness	5.15	0.65	.17	-.03	.16	.18	.16	.18	.22	.23	.34	(.80)						
11. Conscientiousness	4.52	0.70	.20	.15	**.39**	**.12**	**.**23	**.38**	.37	.08	.05	.21	(.77)					
12. Neuroticism	3.25	0.85	.19	.00	**-.**01	**-.40**	**-.**06	**-.13**	-.18	-.48	-.19	-.34	-.04	(.85)				
13. Openness	4.59	0.73	-.04	.18	**.22**	**.**26	**.41**	**.35**	.39	.24	.21	.01	.18	-.12	(.80)			
14. Promotion focus	6.52	1.05	.11	-.01	**.47**	**.**16	**.31**	**.29**	.41	.16	.21	.13	.23	.02	.25	(.80)		
15. Prevention focus	4.87	1.40	.05	-.14	**-.**02	**-.40**	**-.08**	**-.20**	-.21	-.56	-.22	-.12	-.01	.53	-.13	.20	(.83)	
16. Cognitive ability	14.47	8.42	-.09	.05	.02	.09	.06	.09	.08	.01	-.11	-.02	-.02	-.05	.07	-.07	-.11	-

Correlations > .12 are significant ($p < .01$). N = 465. [1]male = 0, female = 1. Bold numbers are hypothesized relationships. Reliabilities are on the diagonal; [2]a negative relationship was hypothesized.

Table 3

Regression Analyses

	Concern	Control	Curiosity	Confidence	Adaptability
Self-esteem	.05	.29**	.09	.09	.16**
Extraversion	.03	.20**	.08	.09	.12*
Agreeableness	.04	-.05	.09	.05	.04
Conscientiousness	.28**	.07	.11*	.30**	.25**
Neuroticism	.11*	-.17**	.10	.08	.04
Openness	.06	.09*	.31**	.19**	.20**
Promotion focus	.39**	.08	.17**	.17**	.28**
Prevention focus	-.10	-.10	-.05	-.17**	-.13**
R^2	.33	.37	.26	.31	.41
F	26.58**	32.43**	18.82**	24.53**	38.59**

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

Appendix

Dutch CAAS: Constructs and Items

Construct		**Items**
Concern	1.	Nadenken over hoe mijn toekomst eruit zal zien
	2.	Realiseren dat de keuzes die ik nu maak, mijn toekomst bepalen
	3.	Me voorbereiden op de toekomst
	4.	Bewust worden van de opleiding- en beroepskeuzes die ik moet maken
	5.	Plannen hoe ik mijn doelen ga bereiken
	6.	Bewust bezig zijn met mijn (studie)loopbaan
Control	1.	Optimistisch blijven
	2.	Zelf beslissingen nemen
	3.	Verantwoordelijkheid nemen voor mijn daden
	4.	Opkomen voor mijn eigen mening
	5.	Op mezelf rekenen
	6.	Doen wat het beste is voor mij
Curiosity	1.	Mijn omgeving verkennen
	2.	Op zoek gaan naar kansen voor persoonlijke ontwikkeling
	3.	Verschillende mogelijkheden onderzoeken voordat ik een keuze maak
	4.	Verschillende manieren zien om dingen te doen
	5.	Diep nadenken over vragen waar ik mee zit
	6.	Nieuwsgierig zijn naar nieuwe mogelijkheden
Confidence	1.	Taken efficiënt (snel en goed) uitvoeren
	2.	Er voor zorgen de dingen goed te doen
	3.	Nieuwe vaardigheden leren
	4.	Naar beste vermogen werken
	5.	Hindernissen overwinnen
	6.	Problemen oplossen