Revista Psicologia: Organizações & Trabalho (rPOT)
Psychology: Organizations and Work Journal
Revista Psicología: Organizaciones y Trabajo
ISSN 1984-6657 - https://doi.org/10.17652/rpot/2020.4.02

Validating the Career Adapt-Ability Scale in Mexico and Examining the Relative Importance of Career Adaptability and Employability in Career Success

Tee-Hwa Jasmine Low[1,*], Jesus Yeves[2],
Felisa Latorre[3], José Ramos[4]

[1] http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6467-7000 / University of Valencia, Spain
[2] http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1662-8359 / Universidad Adolfo Ibañez, Chile
[3] http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1692-2347 / Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Spain
[4] http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0821-214X / University of Valencia, Spain; Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Económicas (IVIE), Spain

Abstract

Employability and career adaptability are two related constructs that are considered significant factors in career success. Career adaptability is the readiness to cope with current and anticipated career-related tasks, transitions, and changes, whereas employability is the ability to retain or obtain a job in the labor market. This paper presents a Spanish translation of the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale (CAAS) and analyses the relative importance of career adaptability and employability in predicting career success (job performance and job satisfaction) in a sample of 160 young Mexican working adults. Our results supported the internal consistency and factor structure of CAAS. Relative weights and commonality analysis indicated that both constructs shared explained outcome variance, but they had different importance in predicting career outcomes. Thus, employability is still relevant despite the rising importance of career adaptability. Career adaptability should be included in employability programs, refining the two concepts into a more parsimonious measure.

Keywords: career adaptability, career adapt-abilities scale, employability, relative importance.

Validando a Escala de Capacidade de Adaptação à Carreira no México e Examinando a Importância Relativa da Adaptabilidade e Empregabilidade para o Sucesso na Carreira

Resumo

Empregabilidade e adaptabilidade na carreira são dois construtos relacionados que são considerados fatores significativos para o sucesso na carreira. Adaptabilidade de carreira é a disposição para lidar com tarefas, transições e mudanças atuais e previstas relacionadas à carreira, enquanto empregabilidade é a capacidade de manter ou obter um emprego no mercado de trabalho. Este artigo apresenta uma tradução para o espanhol da *Career Adapt-Abilities Scale* (CAAS) e analisa a importância relativa da adaptabilidade e empregabilidade na carreira de predizer o sucesso na carreira (desempenho e satisfação no trabalho) em uma amostra de 160 jovens trabalhadores adultos mexicanos. Nossos resultados apoiaram a consistência interna e a estrutura fatorial do CAAS. Pesos relativos e análise de semelhança indicaram que ambos os construtos compartilhavam a variância explicada dos resultados, mas tinham importância diferente na previsão dos resultados da carreira. Assim, a empregabilidade ainda é relevante, apesar da importância crescente da adaptabilidade à carreira. A adaptabilidade de carreira deve ser incluída nos programas de empregabilidade, refinando os dois conceitos em uma medida mais parcimoniosa.

Palavras-chave: adaptabilidade de carreira, escala de habilidades de adaptação de carreira, empregabilidade, importância relativa.

Validación de la Escala de Adaptabilidad de Carrera en México y Examen de la Importancia Relativa de la Adaptabilidad de Carrera y la Empleabilidad para el Éxito Profesional

Resumen

La empleabilidad y la adaptabilidad de carrera son dos constructos relacionados que se consideran factores importantes para el éxito profesional. La adaptabilidad de carrera es la disposición para hacer frente a las tareas, las transiciones y los cambios actuales y previstos relacionados con la carrera, mientras que la empleabilidad es la capacidad de conservar u obtener un empleo en el mercado laboral. Este artículo presenta una traducción al español de la *Career Adapt-Abilities Scale* (CAAS) y analiza la importancia relativa de la adaptabilidad de carrera y la empleabilidad para predecir el éxito profesional (desempeño y satisfacción laboral) en una muestra de 160 jóvenes adultos trabajadores mexicanos. Nuestros resultados respaldaron la consistencia interna y la estructura factorial de CAAS. Las ponderaciones relativas y el análisis de similitudes indicaron que ambos constructos compartían la varianza explicada de los resultados, pero tenían una importancia diferente en la predicción de los resultados profesionales. Por tanto, la empleabilidad sigue siendo relevante a pesar de la creciente importancia de la adaptabilidad de carrera. La adaptabilidad profesional debe incluirse en los programas de empleabilidad, refinando los dos conceptos en una medida más parsimoniosa.

Palabras clave: adaptabilidad de carrera, escala de adaptabilidad de carrera, empleabilidad, importancia relativa.

Submission: 12/05/2020
First Editorial Decision: 31/07/2020
Final version: 02/11/2020
Accepted: 02/11/2020

How to cite this article:
Low, T. H. J., Yeves, J., Latorre, F., & Ramos, J. (2020). Validating the Career Adapt-Ability Scale in Mexico and Examining the Relative Importance of Career Adaptability and Employability in Career Success. *Revista Psicologia: Organizações e Trabalho, 20*(4), 1177-1187. https://doi.org/10.17652/rpot/2020.4.02

The rapid pace of globalization, digitalization, and economic change in the 21st century has shifted the business landscape and the nature of work. Intensified global competition has also prompted businesses to stay relevant, responsive, and adaptive in the 21st century because it has brought pervasive organizational change and job insecurity (Bimrose et al., 2008). Individuals increasingly have to cope with uncertainty, new challenges, demands, and stress arising from transitions and changes at work. Career adaptability (Savickas, 2005), defined as the readiness to cope with current and anticipated career-related tasks, transitions, and changes, has thus gained prominence as one of the central constructs in career development. To date, studies have shown that career adaptability supports individuals in coping with unemployment-related stress (Konstam et al., 2015), adjusting to work environments (Stoltz et al., 2013), gaining quality employment (Koen et al., 2010), and enhancing job performance (Ohme & Zacher, 2015) and job satisfaction (Fiori et al., 2015; Santilli et al., 2014). Because readiness to cope with work/career-related challenges is important to individuals of all ages and across all life stages, many scholars have emphasized its relevance for career success (Hamtiaux et al., 2013; Zacher, 2014). Career success refers to the accomplishment of desirable work-related outcomes of one's work experience (Seibert, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001).

Prior to the heightened attention paid to career adaptability, the concept of employability was considered a key concept for career success and career self-management (Forrier & Sels, 2003a; Hall, 2002; Hogan et al., 2013; McQuaid & Lindsay, 2005). Generally, employability has been defined as the ability to retain or obtain a job in both the internal and external labor markets (Forrier & Sels, 2003b; Fugate et al., 2004; Hillage & Pollard, 1999). In this paper, we address employability from a psychosocial perspective, defined by Fugate et al. (2004) as "a form of work-specific active adaptability that enables workers to identify and realize career opportunities" (p. 16). A review of the literature indicates that employability, like career adaptability, can enhance job performance (Rosenberg et al., 2012; Van Der Heijde & Van Der Heijden, 2006) and job satisfaction (Barnett & Bradley, 2007; Gamboa et al., 2009; González-Romá et al., 2018; Van Der Heijde & Van Der Heijden, 2006).

The importance of employability for career success in the 20th century can be demonstrated through its inclusion at various policy levels, ranging from educational to international institutions (see McQuaid & Lindsay, 2005). Employability matters because organizations need people who are competent and flexible and have the relevant skills to maintain the organization's competitive advantage (van der Heijden, 2002). However, because the 20th and 21st century work contexts present different challenges and demands, the role of employability in career success in the 21st century is not yet fully understood in light of career adaptability. Therefore, this paper aims to examine the relative importance and the extent of shared commonality of employability and career adaptability in predicting two subjective career success indicators, job satisfaction (JS) and perceived job performance (JP). Subjective career success refers to individuals' perceptual evaluations of their career achievements in relation to their objectives and expectations (Ng et al., 2005; Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001). We are interested in subjective career success rather than objective career success (verifiable outcomes such as salary, promotion, etc.) mainly because of the diminishing career ladder and changing demands in the current world of work, which make subjective career success more relevant to individuals (Savickas, 2008; Shockley et al., 2016).

Examining the differential predictive importance of employability and career adaptability can allow us to understand which of the two concepts is more important in career success in the 21st century. This analysis can also indicate whether the concept of employability is still relevant, despite the growing attention paid to career adaptability. This understanding can lead both theory and practice to be more streamlined and effective in their efforts to further advance and make a difference in the field. For example, efforts can focus more on developing career adaptability if employability is found to be a minor or non-significant predictor of JP in the presence of career adaptability, and vice versa.

In addition, according to Hirschi (2012), employability and career adaptability are associated psychological and career identity resources. Hence, commonalities may exist between them. For instance, various studies have found correlations between career adaptability and various employability indicators (Cai et al., 2015; Öncel, 2014; Tolentino et al., 2014; Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010; Negru-Subtirica et al., 2015; Porfeli & Savickas, 2012). However, the degree of commonality is unclear and has yet to be examined. This study aims to fill this gap. Clarifying this matter might indicate possibilities for refining the two concepts into a single and more parsimonious concept and designing career development programs that enhance both career adaptability and employability simultaneously.

Knowledge about the relative importance and commonality of employability and career adaptability can be advantageous because most employability programs tend to build human capital through avenues such as on-the-job training, job-specific skills, and employability skills (IMF, The World Bank, ILO, & OECD, 2016; Kluve, 2014). This occurs because programs that focus on building human capital tend to be more tangible, measurable, and suitable for group-based learning. Because career adaptability resources can also be developed through a skills-and-knowledge approach and in group-based training (Koen et al., 2012), their inclusion in current employability training may develop individuals more holistically. The benefits are two-fold because, not only do individuals enhance their employability, but they also develop their career adaptability resources at the same time. Interventions that target both career adaptability and employability simultaneously can benefit both individuals and organizations because organizations need competent and adaptable employees in order to maintain their competitive advantage, and employees need to be able to change and adapt quickly.

In order to understand the differential predictive importance of employability and career adaptability and the amount of shared commonality, we will first establish the validity of the Spanish version of the Career Adapt-Ability Scale 2.0 (CAAS; Savickas & Porfeli, 2012) in Mexico. The CAAS has been validated in many languages and countries, and, to date, it has demonstrated excellent reliability (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). At the time this study was carried out, no published Spanish version of the CAAS was available; hence, this study was designed to examine the validity of a Spanish version of the CAAS with a Mexican sample. However, during this study, a validation of a Spanish version of the CAAS was published by Merino-Tejedor et al. (2016). We believe that this fact does not dilute the need to investigate the validity of the Spanish version of the CAAS in Mexico because career adaptability is a psychosocial construct. Therefore, the psychometric properties of the CAAS in Mexico still warrant investigation because contextual factors, such as social-economic differences, labor market contexts, and local language differences, can affect its validity. In addition, investigating the validity of the CAAS in Mexico also addresses a gap related to the accessibility of the scale in Hispanic-America, an underexplored region in career adaptability studies.

In sum, our research attempts to contribute to the career adaptability literature in four ways. First, it adds additional evidence supporting the reliability, validity, and utility of the CAAS across different cultural contexts. Second, by validating the CAAS in Mexico, we also address the gap related to the accessibility to the CAAS in Hispanic-America. Third, by understanding their differential predictive importance, we can understand whether the concept of employability is still relevant, despite the rising importance of career adaptability, or whether career adaptability is replacing the role of employability. Lastly, commonality analysis can indicate the shared commonality between the two concepts and whether a single and more parsimonious concept can be derived from them. From an applied perspective, clarifying the commonality between career adaptability and perceived employability offers the opportunity to design career development programs that enhance both career adaptability and employability simultaneously, thus saving costs for participants and institutions.

Career Adaptability

Career adaptability is a general adaptive resource that comprises a variety of attitudes, beliefs, and competencies grouped into four dimensions: concern, control, curiosity, and confidence (Savickas, 2013). According to Savickas and Porfeli (2012), concern refers to the ability to plan for future career developments, build a career vision, and prepare actions to achieve the vision. Control reflects individuals' decisiveness and the extent of intrapersonal influence on their situations. Curiosity refers to the tendency to broaden horizons and explore alternatives and opportunities regarding one's possible self and/or environment. Lastly, confidence implies belief in oneself and one's ability to overcome challenges and achieve goals. In short, career adaptability encompasses planning the future career, making decisions towards achieving the vision, exploring various career options, and having the confidence to overcome challenges to achieve career goals. These four resources are related to a regulatory focus (van Vianen et al., 2012), self-regulation (Creed et al., 2009; Merino-Tejedor et al., 2016), and stress coping (Stoltz et al., 2013). In a sense, career adaptability is a type of proactive coping resource (Klehe et al., 2012) that is future-oriented and involves the use of personal resources, goal setting, and vision realization to overcome challenges (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1997; Davis & Asliturk, 2011).

Career Adapt-Ability Scale (CAAS) and the Mexican Context

Career adaptability can be measured using the Career Adapt-Ability Scale (CAAS), which has been validated in many languages and countries and has demonstrated excellent reliability (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). Although a validated Spanish translation of the CAAS is available for use in Spain (Merino-Tejedor et al., 2016), its validity for use in other Spanish speaking countries, such as Mexico, needs to be addressed due to contextual factors such as socio-economic differences, labor market contexts, and local language differences. Here, we highlight some socio-economic and labor market context differences between Spain and Mexico.

Briefly, the Spanish labor market has been characterized by extreme market duality and wage rigidity, which have led to high levels of temporary employment/short-term contracts, especially among young entrants. This phenomenon was partially a result of high collective bargaining coverage in Spain (73.1%; Aguirregabiria & Alonso-Borrego, 2014; Peiró et al., 2012; Rocha Sánchez, 2012). The Mexican labor market, on the other hand, has a collective bargaining coverage of 9.9%, and it has been characterized by a large informal workforce (57% from 2015 data; Keese & Pascal, 2016). The informal sector refers to the part of an economy that is usually hidden, not taxed, and not monitored by the government (Andrews et al., 2011). Although there are no definitive measures of the informal economy for Spain, it has been estimated to represent approximately 19% to 22% of the workforce (Feld & Schneider, 2010). In addition, young Mexicans with more education have been found to have a higher chance of being unemployed (INEGI, 2018). In terms of labor statistics, Mexico has a labor force participation rate for the 25-54 year-old age group that is 14% lower than Spain's 87.0% (OECD, 2018), and youth unemployment that is 7% lower than Spain's 38.6% (ILO, 2018).

Psychosocial Model of Employability

Psychosocial employability, according to Fugate et al. (2004), is the synergistic combination of a variety of individual factors: personal adaptability, career identity, and human and social capital. According to Fugate et al. (2004), personal adaptability refers to the readiness and capacity to change personal factors, such as behaviors and thoughts, in response to environmental demands. Career identity refers to the way individuals define themselves in the career context. It is the driver of career motivations, values, interests, and decisions. Human capital refers to skills and knowledge such as education, training, and competencies. Social capital refers to the contribution of one's social network to gaining/maintaining employment. Like career adaptability, employability supports individuals in coping with job loss by taking responsibility for managing their career (Fugate et al., 2004; McArdle et al., 2007), and it is also a proactive coping resource. For example, more employable individuals tend to engage in job search activities (when unemployed) and obtain higher quality re-employment (Fugate et al., 2004).

Psychosocial Employability and Career Adaptability

Among these dimensions, personal adaptability is conceptually the most similar to the conceptualization of career adaptability because both refer to the capacity to adapt to environmental demands. Personal adaptability indicators, such as protean career attitudes, a boundary-less mindset, and a proactive personality, have been shown to correlate positively with career adaptability (Cai et al., 2015; Chan et al., 2015; Öncel, 2014; Tolentino et al., 2014). Among the various indicators, we use proactive personality to operationalize personal adaptability. Proactive personality refers to the predisposition to initiate actions to change one's environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993) because it entails taking actions to achieve the desired outcome, thus resonating with the concept of career adaptability. For example, proactive individuals tend to seek career opportunities and create a work environment that fits their vocational needs (Seibert et al., 1999), take responsibility for managing their career (Hall & Mirvis, 1995), seek information (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001), and set goals (Fugate et al., 2004). These characteristics are related to the career adaptability dimensions of concern (planning for future development, goal setting, and action planning), control (agency, autonomy), and curiosity (openness to exploring alternatives and opportunities). Taking action to change a situation also involves some degree of self-efficacy (confidence).

In addition to the willingness and ability to adapt, career adaptability entails forming a career identity, exploring the environment and possible selves, clarifying values, and seeking occupational information (Savickas, 2005). Studies have shown that career identity indicators such as vocational identity, identity

exploration, career goal decidedness, and career preparedness (comprising career decision making, career confidence, and career planning) are related to career adaptability (Hirschi, 2009; Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010; Negru-Subtirica et al., 2015; Porfeli & Savickas, 2012; Skorikov, 2007; Stringer et al., 2011).

With career adaptability rapidly gaining attention as the key factor in career success in the uncertain 21st century work environment, the roles of employability and career adaptability need to be better understood. Thus, this paper aims to (i) examine their relative importance in predicting two career success outcomes–job performance and job satisfaction, and (ii) understand the shared commonality between psychosocial employability and career adaptability in predicting career success outcomes. In doing so, this paper will also validate a Spanish version of the Career Adapt-Ability Scale (CAAS) in Mexico before conducting relative weights analysis and commonality analysis.

Methods

Participants, Data Collection Procedures and Ethical Considerations

Participants were 160 young Mexican working adults aged 20 to 35 years old (M = 28.60, SD = 3.73) from both public (68.1%) and private (31.9%) universities in Mexico City. The sample was 59.4% female. Among the participants, 60% had a university degree, and 40% had a post-graduate degree.

Data were collected in Mexico from an online platform between March and May of 2015. An email containing the purpose of the survey on graduates' transition into the labor market and the link to the online questionnaire was sent to university graduates of several universities. When respondents accessed the link to the questionnaire, they were first presented with information about the purpose of the study, and they were asked to indicate whether they gave their consent to participate in the study. If respondents chose not to give their consent, they were presented with a thank you message and could leave the survey. Only participants who gave their consent to participate in the study were presented with the questionnaire. The questionnaire included questions about graduates' first job, current job, personal factors (such as perceived employability, career adaptability), employment status, and various self-rated career success indicators. All participants were guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity.

Instruments

Job Satisfaction (JS). General job satisfaction was assessed using four items taken from the measures by Brayfied-Roth (1951). An example item was "Most days I am enthusiastic about my work". Participants marked their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale with response options ranging from (1) "very unsatisfied" to (5) "very satisfied". Scale reliability was .87.

Self-Rated Job Performance (JP). Five items were created to assess general job performance. The five items were conceptualized by using three self-rated job performance scales as a reference (Day & Allen, 2004; Fernandes & Awamleh, 2006; Miler, 2004) and adapting them to our study context. The five items were: "I achieve the objectives and goals I have to fulfill in a timely manner", "I take initiative in carrying out my work", "I actively participate in decision making related to my work", "I work without making mistakes", and "I accept the responsibilities assigned to me". Participants marked their level of agreement on a 10-point Likert scale with response options ranging from (1) "very low" to (10) "very high". Exploratory factor analysis using principal axis factoring supported a one-dimensional solution where one factor explained 41.77% of the variance. The item factor loadings were greater than .49. Scale reliability was .76.

Career Adapt-Abilities Scale (CAAS). Career adaptability was assessed through the CAAS-International 2.0 (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). It contains 24 items divided equally into four subscales that measure the adaptability resources of concern, control, curiosity, and confidence. When the data were collected, the Spanish version (Merino-Tejedor et al., 2016) of the scale was not yet available. Therefore, two individuals fluent in both Spanish and English translated the items into Spanish independently. Next, two organizational psychologists reviewed the translation and compared and modified the items to ensure cultural appropriateness and coherence with the original English version. Lastly, back translation took place to check whether the translated scales corresponded with the original scale (Van Widenfelt et al., 2005). When the Spanish Scale by Merino-Tejedor and colleagues (2016) was published, we compared it with our version and found no major differences in the translation; differences were mostly related to language style. Participants responded to each item using a Likert scale ranging from (1) not strong to (5) very strong. Scale reliabilities were .89 (concern), .89 (control), .91 (curiosity), .91 (confidence), and .96 for the overall CAAS. Appendix A presents the scale items in Spanish. Appendix B presents the scale items in our translated version compared to the translation by Merino-Tejedor and colleagues (2016).

Employability (EMP). Psychosocial employability (Fugate et al., 2004) was measured by combining two scales, the Proactive Personality scale as a proxy indicator for the personal adaptability dimension, and the Career Identity scales for the career identity dimension of the psychosocial employability model. These two indicators have been used previously to operationalize psychosocial employability, along with other proxy indicators for human and social capital (González-Romá et al., 2018; McArdle et al., 2007). We did not include indicators for human and social capital in this study because we are more focused on the personal adaptability and career identity dimensions, which are components that are lacking in most employability programs. In addition, these are the two dimensions where most of the similarities theoretically coincide as psychological and identity resources (Hirschi, 2012).

Hence, the employability scale comprised a total of nine items, five items from the Proactive Personality (PP) scale by Bateman and Crant (1993) and four items from the Career Identity (CI) scale by González-Romá et al. (2018). The correlation between the two scales was moderately strong at .56 ($p < .001$). An example item from the Proactive Personality scale was "Nothing is more exciting than seeing my ideas turn into reality", and an example item from the Career Identity scale was "I have a high motivation to develop the career I desire". Participants responded to each item using a Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.

Data Analysis Procedures

To ascertain the structure of the CAAS, we performed a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of the second-order factor model in Mplus Version 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). Because a 5-point Likert scale was used to measure the scale items, there were sufficient categories to consider the scale items as continuous measures (Rhemtulla et al., 2012). Therefore, we used a maximum likelihood estimator – MLMV-, which is robust to multivariate non-normality for the analysis (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). To assess model fit, we utilized multiple goodness-of-fit indices, namely, the comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), root mean

square error of approximation (RMSEA) and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). For CFI and TLI, values above .9 indicate a good fit, whereas values less than .06 indicate a good fit for RMSEA and SRMR (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

After ascertaining the validity of the CAAS, we estimated the variables' importance through relative weights analysis (RWA) and commonality analysis (CA). RWA is a technique for calculating the relative importance of correlated predictors. We conducted RWA using the R script developed by Tonidandel and LeBreton (2015) from the RWA-Web. RWA breaks down the total variance (R^2) predicted in a regression model into weights that reflect the proportional contribution of the various correlated predictor variables (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2015). In addition, RWA determines the significance of the relative weights by comparing the weights produced by the predictors to a randomly generated (i.e. meaningless) variable (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2015). This significance test allows us to gauge the practical utility of a variable, i.e. whether the predictor is meaningful or not. For example, a variable may explain a small portion of predictable variance and yet be a meaningful predictor if the weights of the other predictors in the model are not significant, or a variable may account for a large portion of variance but have little practical utility if its weight is not significant (see Cortina & Landis, 2009). CA, a different relative variable importance technique was conducted using the SPSS script developed by Nimon (2010). It estimates the relative importance of correlated variables by partitioning the regression effect into constituent, non-overlapping parts (Thompson, 2006). The partitioning process produces unique and common effects. Unique effects refer to the amount of variance unique to each predictor, whereas common effects refer to the amount of variance common to groups (two or more) of predictors. In our case, there is only one group – CAAS and EMP. The sum of the unique and common effects – the total effect- refers to the total variance in the outcome variable explained by the predictors (Nimon, 2010; Nimon & Oswald, 2013). Unlike RWA, CA allowed us to gauge how much of the variance predicting the outcomes was common to CAAS and EMP, thus indicating the amount of shared similarity.

Results

The descriptive statistics and correlations among the variables are presented in Table 1. All the study variables demonstrated sufficient reliability, with alphas ranging between .76 and .96, and univariate normality, with skewness and kurtosis within ± 2 (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). Skewness and kurtosis for the majority of the variables were below 1.0, except for the skewness of self-rated performance (-1.52), which is expected on self-rated performance measures. The CAAS items' means and standard deviations are shown in Table 2, revealing high career adaptability in this sample.

Factorial Validity of CAAS

In the multidimensional hierarchical CAAS model, the four subscales were first-order latent factors (concern, control, curiosity, and confidence), followed by a second-order general career adapt-ability factor. The multidimensional hierarchical model presented a marginally acceptable fit (χ^2 = 344.64, *df* = 248, RMSEA = .05, SRMR = .06, CFI = .89, TLI = .87). After adding the error covariances between item pairs 24-23 and 8-9, which were probably measurement errors due to overlap in the items' contents, the model fit improved (χ^2 = 317.28, *df* = 246, RMSEA = .04, SRMR = .06, CFI = .92, TLI = .91). Similar modifications were made in a previous CAAS validation (Merino-Tejedor et al., 2016). The standardized loadings (Table 2) suggested that most of the items were strong indicators of the first-order factors (ranging from .64 to .87), which were subsequently strong indicators of the second-order career adapt-ability construct (ranging from .79 to .92). Scale reliabilities were .89 (concern), .89 (control), .91 (curiosity), .91 (confidence), and .96 for the entire CAAS. Overall, the CFA shows that the data from the CAAS-Mexico fits the theoretical model well, and that a global score can be used to operationalize the construct of career adaptability.

Relative Importance Analysis

Before performing the relative importance analysis, we conducted linear regressions to ascertain the validity of the regression model. Table 3 presents the outcomes of the linear regression, RWA, and CA. The regression analysis indicated that the weighted linear combination of CAAS and EMP explained 16.8% of the variance (R^2 = .17) in JS and 18.5% of the variance (R^2 = .19) in JP. Regression results also indicated that EMP was a significant predictor of JS (p < .05) and JP (p = .047), whereas the CAAS was only a significant predictor of JP (p < .05). Although the effect of the CAAS on JS was not statistically significant (p = .69), it indicated a possible suppression or attenuation effect because higher CAAS scores predicted lower JS when EMP was considered (β = -.04).

Results of RWA revealed that EMP (RW = .14, CI = .05, .24) explained a statistically significant amount of variance in JS, but the CAAS did not (RW = .03, CI = -.01, .09). In addition, both EMP (RW = .08, CI = .01, .19) and CAAS (RW = .13, CI = .00, .21) explained a statistically significant amount of variance in JP. Both regression and RWA results indicated that CAAS was not a significant predictor of JS, although it was a predictor of JP. This result contrasts with the three-wave cross-lagged findings by Fiori et al., (2015). We reanalyzed the data through an additional regression analysis and found that CAAS predicted JS in the absence of EMP (β=.25, R^2=.25, $F_{(1,158)}$=10.77, p<.001). This additional analysis explained why our data contradicted the findings by Fiori et al., (2015). More importantly, based on the

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations between variables.

Variables	*M*	*SD*	Gender a	Edu a	Age	CAAS	EMP	JS	JP
Gender	-	-	--						
Edu	-	-	0.02 b	--					
Age	28.60	3.73	.01	.44**	--				
CAAS	4.33	.58	.01	-.04	.01	--			
EMP	4.24	.57	.02	-.04	.06	.67**	--		
JS	3.84	.98	.04	.04	.18*	.25**	.41**	--	
JP	8.79	.95	-.10	.13	.16*	.41**	.38**	.282**	--

Note. a Spearman Coefficient (for correlations between ordinal and continuous variables); b Cramer's V (for correlations between 2 ordinal variables)
* Significant at p < .05 ; ** Significant at p < .01.
Ordinal Variables are: Gender (0 = Female, 1 = Male), Education (1 = Vocational Training, 2 = University, 3 = Postgraduate)

Table 2
Standardized loadings, Means, and SD *of the items on the CAAS.*

Construct		Item (First-order Indicators)	Mean	*SD*	Loading*
Concern	1	Thinking about what my future will be like	4.19	.88	.66
	2	Realizing that today's choices shape my future	4.32	.81	.74
	3	Preparing for the future	4.24	.87	.82
	4	Becoming aware of the educational and career choices I have to make	4.22	.86	.80
	5	Planning how to achieve my goals	4.03	.98	.73
	6	Concerned about my career	4.15	.91	.78
Control	7	Staying upbeat	4.08	1.00	.64
	8	Making decisions by myself	4.43	.73	.81
	9	Taking responsibility for my actions	4.59	.65	.78
	10	Sticking up for my beliefs	4.45	.77	.82
	11	Counting on myself	4.38	.85	.78
	12	Doing what's right for me	4.51	.73	.78
Curiosity	13	Exploring my surroundings	4.29	.84	.76
	14	Looking for opportunities to grow as a person	4.35	.86	.69
	15	Investigating options before making a choice	4.33	.77	.82
	16	Observing different ways of doing things.	4.28	.83	.87
	17	Probing deeply into questions I have	4.14	.94	.85
	18	Becoming curious about new opportunities	4.34	.82	.79
Confidence	19	Performing tasks efficiently	4.39	.67	.76
	20	Taking care to do things well	4.44	.71	.70
	21	Learning new skills.	4.38	.76	.82
	22	Working to the best of my ability	4.41	.70	.82
	23	Overcoming obstacles	4.48	.78	.83
	24	Solving problems	4.51	.74	.79
Construct		Construct (second-order indicators)	Mean	SD	Loading*
Adaptability	1	Concern	4.19	.71	.79
	2	Control	4.41	.64	.92
	3	Curiosity	4.29	.70	.88
	4	Confidence	4.43	.60	.90
		Overall Career Adapt-Ability score	4.33	.58	--

Note. Factor loadings are statistically significant at p=.01

weights, RWA results indicated that EMP (RW=.14) was more important than CAAS (R =.03) in predicting JS. Lastly, results indicated that CAAS (RW=.10) was slightly more important than EMP (RW=.08) in predicting JP.

Commonality Analysis

In the case of commonality, results of the CA revealed that CAAS and EMP shared 37.4% of the variance in predicting JS. The breakdown of the effects (see Table 4) indicates that, in predicting JS, 62% of the total effect was unique to EMP. This result indicated that employability had a bigger predictive role in predicting JS. It also suggested that career adaptability resources that predict JS could be a 'subset' of employability.

The results of the CA also revealed that CAAS and EMP shared 66.39% when predicting JP. The breakdown of the effects (see Table 4) indicated that, when predicting JP, 22.30% of the total effect was unique to CAAS and 11.32% was unique to EMP. This result indicated that the resources common to both career adaptability and employability had a larger predictive role. Overall,

Table 3
Summary of Linear regression, Relative weights analysis, and Commonality Analysis

				Relative Weights Analysis			Commonality Analysis			
Predictor	*b*	β	*p*	RW	LCI; UCI	RS-RW%	Unique	Common	Total	% of R^2
Criterion = JS (R^2 = .17 ; F[2,157] = 15.83; p < .001)										
Intercept	0.95									
CAAS	-.07	-.04	.687	0.03	-0.01 ; 0.09	19.27	.00	.06	.06	.19
EMP	0.75	0.43	.000	0.14	0.05 ; 0.24	80.73	.10	.06	.17	.49
Criterion = JP (R^2= .19; F[2,157] = 17.76; p < .001)										
Intercept	5.46									
CAAS	0.45	0.27	.006	0.10	0.00 ; 0.21	55.49	.04	.12	0.16	0.48
EMP	0.33	0.2	.047	0.08	0.01 ; 0.19	44.51	.02	.12	0.14	0.42

Note. b=unstandardized regression weight, β =standardized regression weight, RW = raw relative weight (within rounding error raw weights will add up to R^2), LCI; UCI= lower-bound and upper-bound confidence intervals used to test the statistical significance of raw weight, RS-RW relative weight re-scaled as a percentage of predicted variance in the criterion variable attributed to each predictor (within rounding error re-scaled weights add up to 100 %), Unique = predictor's unique effect, Common = Σ predictor's common effects. Total = Unique + Common. % of R^2 = Total/ R^2

Table 4
Summary of commonality matrix.

Predictors	Criterion = JS		Criterion =JP	
	Commonality coefficient	% of Total	Commonality coefficient	% of Total
Unique to CAAS	.001	.513	.041	22.296
Unique to EMP	.104	61.996	.021	11.315
Common to CAAS--EMP	.063	37.491	.123	66.390
Total	.168	100.000	.185	100.000

the CA results indicated that, although CAAS and EMP had different roles in predicting JS and JP, there was a certain amount of overlap in the activation of resources.

Discussion

Advancements in technology and fluctuations in global economic situations have shifted the business landscape and nature of work and intensified global competition. To be successful in this environment, the literature posits that individuals need to be career adaptable. The growing attention paid to the concept of career adaptability prompted us to examine whether career adaptability is replacing employability as an important construct in career success in the 21st century. To achieve this goal, we first validated the instrument – the CAAS- in Mexico. Next, we examined the relative importance of career adaptability and employability in predicting the subjective career success indicators of job satisfaction and job performance, using relative weights analysis (RWA) and commonality analysis (CA).

Results of the CFA indicated that the overall scale and four subscales of the CAAS demonstrated good internal consistency and a coherent multidimensional hierarchical structure that fits the theoretical model of career adaptability. The regression and RWA results indicated that career adaptability does not contribute to the perception of JS in the presence of employability. The CA results further indicated that the shared resources common to both career adaptability and employability explained about 37.5% of the total R^2. The unique effects of career adaptability and employability explained about 0.51% and 62% of the total R^2, respectively. Moreover, the RWA results indicated that both career adaptability and employability contributed to the prediction of perceived JP, with career adaptability having a slightly larger role than employability. The shared commonality between the two concepts contributed 66.4% of the total R^2, whereas 22.3% and 11.3% of the total effect was unique to career adaptability and employability, respectively.

Theoretical Implications

First, results of the validation of the CAAS in Mexico provide evidence that the Mexican form has adequate psychometric properties and can be a valid tool for measuring career adaptability in the Mexican population. This validation, together with the Spanish validation by Merino-Tejedor et al. (2016), forms a basis for studying measurement invariance in the CAAS across Spain and Mexico. Establishing measurement invariance allows for meaningful cross-country comparison and can be a springboard for exploring factors that explain cross-cultural differences in career adaptability (Steinmetz et al., 2009; Van de Vijver & Tanzer, 2004; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000).

Second, this study sheds some light on the relevance of employability in career success in the current work context. For instance, this study found employability to be a better predictor of job satisfaction. In addition, the additional regression analysis prompted by the contradiction with existing evidence (Fiori et al., 2015; Santilli et al., 2014) reveals that career adaptability, in the absence of employability, predicts job satisfaction. This result suggests that the presence of employability could attenuate the role of career adaptability in subjective career success. Therefore, there is a need for research in this field to examine the role of career adaptability and employability together when predicting outcomes such as career success. In other words, the impact of each of the two constructs should be examined in the presence of the other or be controlled for. This can be important because the literature shows that scholars believe that employability still has an influence on subjective career success (De Cuyper et al., 2018; Kirves et al., 2011; Otterbach & Sousa-Poza, 2016). However, few studies have considered the influence of career adaptability or controlled for it.

Third, the results indicated that both career adaptability and employability contributed to the prediction of perceived job performance, with career adaptability having a slightly larger role than employability. In fact, the commonality between the two concepts contributed to 66.4% of the total R^2, which indicates that the two concepts are rather similar, and, hence, either of them alone may suffice to predict JP. This finding also suggests that employability may have a more dependable role in predicting subjective career success than career adaptability. Considering that career adaptability also has a role in predicting subjective career success, and that there is a commonality between career adaptability and psychosocial employability, this research highlights an opportunity to merge career adaptability and psychosocial employability into a single more parsimonious construct.

The proposed construct merger can be beneficial to both research and practice because psychosocial employability, to date, lacks a unified measurement scale. The 'merger' might be a possible solution for measuring the personal adaptability and career identity dimension with the Career Adapt-Ability Scale. This proposal is aligned with the proposition by Lo Presti and Pluviano (2016), who state that a solid definition of employability is needed for the contemporary work context. Arguing that individuals need to proactively cope with pervasive changes more than before, Lo Presti and Pluviano propose operationalizing employability with the following formula: Employability = Career Identity (or Self-Management) X Professional Development X Environment monitoring. This formula resonates with our proposal. For instance, environment monitoring X self-management corresponds with the conceptualization of career adaptability, especially with the concern and curiosity dimension. In addition, career identity X professional development corresponds with the notion of human and social capital.

Practical Implications

On the practical end, the merger into a single more parsimonious construct could mean that career practices and training can be more cost and time effective because both career adaptability and employability resources could be enhanced simultaneously. Such joint development activities can plausibly offer a more holistic development because they incorporate two additional types of career resources - psychological and career identity resources- in addition to the human capital-based employability development programs (ILO, 2018; OECD, 2018; Kluve, 2014). In fact, Harms and Brummel (2013) also advocate building employability by augmenting psychosocial resources, in

addition to education, on-the-job training, and job-specific skills (Kluve, 2014; McQuaid & Lindsay, 2005). Hence, merging the two concepts can plausibly develop individuals more holistically, i.e., develop human capital resources and psychological and career identity resources.

There are many practical benefits of merging the concept of career adaptability and employability. First, individuals can enhance their employability and career adaptability resources at the same time. This is advantageous for both individuals and organizations because organizations need competent employees to maintain the organization's competitive advantage. Moreover, employees can change and adapt quickly in a world of work characterized by constant and rapid changes. Second, these joint interventions would not only improve the quality of work-life, but they would also support young people in coping with unemployment, obtaining quality employment, and managing uncertainty and changes at work. Third, enhancing employability and career adaptability simultaneously could translate into cost/time effectiveness for both career practitioners and participants.

Future Studies

To further enrich the knowledge, future research should explore the relative importance and commonality using other indicators of employability, such as a protean career mindset (Hall, 1996), a boundary-less mindset, and career self-efficacy (McArdle et al., 2007). The psychosocial model of employability refers to a very broad base of psychological and career identity resources, and unlike career adaptability, definitive indicators or subscales for the model are lacking. In light of this, future research can consider exploring the relative importance and commonality with other operationalizations of employability, such as the dispositional approach or the labor market demands approach (Fugate & Kinicki, 2008; Rothwell, Herbert, & Rothwell, 2008; Van Der Heijde & Van Der Heijden, 2006).

Limitations

The findings and implications discussed above must be interpreted in light of the limitations of this study. First, it should be noted that the validation of the CAAS scale was conducted with a sample size of 160, collected throughout 2015. A general rule of thumb for the minimum sample size for CFA is 10 cases per parameter (Kline, 2011; Nunnally, 1967), which amounts to a minimum sample size of 240. However, the small sample size may not necessarily affect the meaningfulness of the validation. There is evidence suggesting that a 5 case parameter is sufficient, even for latent models (Bentler & Chou, 1987), and that a sample size of 100 – 150 can be considered sufficient for CFA (Muthén & Muthén, 2012; Sideridis et al., 2014; Wolf et al., 2013).

Second, this study involved single-source, self-report data, which exposes the results to a higher risk of common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). In addition, our results are specific to self-rated measures of job performance and may not reflect the various dimensions of job performance (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Viswesvaran et al., 2005). The inclusion of a multi-source/multi-rater measure of performance (such as supervisor performance appraisal) can plausibly enrich our knowledge in this field, either by strengthening our findings or by offering an alternative pattern. Hence, future studies should consider measuring supervisor-rated performance or performance measures such as organizational citizenship behavior.

Third, the measures were assessed at one time point, thus limiting any time-lagged or causal inferences from the data. For example, we cannot conclude that job performance or job satisfaction increased in response to employability and career adaptability, only that job performance and job satisfaction were higher when employability or career adaptability was high.

Despite the various limitations, we believe that our findings are still meaningful because existing studies have ascertained the relationship between the variables of interest (Fiori et al., 2015; Gamboa et al., 2009; Ohme & Zacher, 2015; Santilli et al., 2014), and this is an initial attempt to empirically explore the relative importance and commonality of the constructs.

Conclusions

In sum, our study contributes evidence for the reliability and validity of the CAAS and its usefulness across different cultural contexts. It presents initial evidence indicating that the concept of employability is still relevant, despite the rising importance of career adaptability. It also indicates an opportunity to derive a single and more parsimonious concept by combining employability with career adaptability. The study also reveals the need to examine the role of career adaptability and employability together when predicting career success outcomes, due to possible attenuation effects. It also highlights the opportunity to design employability programs that include career adaptability elements and can be advantageous for both the participants and the training organizations.

References

Aguirregabiria, V., & Alonso-Borrego, C. (2014). Labor Contracts and Flexibility: Evidence from a Labor Market Reform in Spain. *Economic Inquiry, 52*(2), 930–957. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecin.12077

Andrews, D., Sanchéz, A. C., & Johansson, A. (2011). T*owards a better understanding of the informal economy* (No. 873; ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT WORKING PAPERS). www.oecd.org/eco/workingpapers

Aspinwall, L. G., & Taylor, S. E. (1997). A stitch in time: Self-regulation and proactive coping. *Psychological Bulletin, 121*(3), 417–436. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.121.3.417

Barnett, B. R., & Bradley, L. (2007). The impact of organisational support for career development on career satisfaction. *Career Development International, 12*(7), 617–636. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430710834396

Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 103–118. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030140202

Bentler, P. M., & Chou, C. P. (1987). Practical Issues in Structural Modeling. *Sociological Methods & Research, 16*(1), 78–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124187016001004

Bimrose, J., Barnes, S.-A., & Hughes, D. (2008). *Adult career progression & advancement: A five year study of the effectiveness of guidance*. http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/ier/publications/2008/eg_report_4_years_on_final.pdf

Cai, Z., Guan, Y., Li, H., Shi, W., Guo, K., Liu, Y., Li, Q., & Han, X. (2015). Self-esteem and proactive personality as predictors of future work self and career adaptability : An examination of mediating and moderating processes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 86*, 86–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.10.004

Chan, K. Y., Uy, M. A., Ho, M. R., Sam, Y. L., Chernyshenko, O. S., & Yu, K. T. (2015). Comparing two career adaptability measures for career construction theory : Relations with boundaryless mindset and protean career attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 87*, 22–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.11.006

Cortina, J. M., & Landis, R. S. (2009). When small effect sizes tell a big story, and when large effect sizes don't. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (pp. 287–308). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203867266

Creed, P. A., Fallon, T., & Hood, M. (2009). The relationship between career adaptability, person and situation variables, and career concerns in young adults. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74*(2), 219–229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.12.004

Davis, C. G., & Asliturk, E. (2011). Toward a positive psychology of coping with anticipated events. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne, 52*(2), 101–110. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020177

Day, R., & Allen, T. D. (2004). The relationship between career motivation and self-efficacy with protégé career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 72–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00036-8

De Cuyper, N., Piccoli, B., Fontinha, R., & De Witte, H. (2018). Job insecurity, employability and satisfaction among temporary and permanent employees in postcrisis Europe. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 40*(2), 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X18804655

Feld, L. P., & Schneider, F. (2010). Survey of the shadow economy and undeclared earnings in OECD countries. *German Economic Review, 11*(2), 109–149.

Fernandes, C., & Awamleh, R. (2006). Impact of organisational justice in an expatriate work environment. *Management Research News, 29*(11), 701–712. https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170610716016

Fiori, M., Bollmann, G., & Rossier, J. (2015). Exploring the path through which career adaptability increases job satisfaction and lowers job stress: The role of affect. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 91*(51), 113–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.08.010

Forrier, A., & Sels, L. (2003a). The concept employability: a complex mosaic. *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management, 3*(2), 102–124. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJHRDM.2003.002414

Forrier, A., & Sels, L. (2003b). Temporary Employment and Employability: Training Opportunities and Efforts of Temporary and Permanent Employees in Belgium. *Work, Employment and Society, 17*(4), 641–666. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017003174003

Fugate, M., & Kinicki, A. J. (2008). A dispositional approach to employability: Development of a measure and test of implications for employee reactions to organizational change. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 81*(3), 503–527. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317907X241579

Fugate, M., Kinicki, A. J., & Ashforth, B. E. (2004). Employability: A psycho-social construct, its dimensions, and applications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*(1), 14–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2003.10.005

Gamboa, J. P., Gracia, F., Ripoll, P., & Peiró, J. M. (2009). Employability and personal initiative as antecedents of job satisfaction. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 12*(2), 632–640. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1138741600001992

González-Romá, V., Gamboa, J. P., & Peiró, J. M. (2018). University Graduates' Employability, Employment Status, and Job Quality. *Journal of Career Development, 45*(2), 132–149. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845316671607

Gravetter, F., & Wallnau, L. (2014). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences* (8th ed.). Wadsworth.

Hall, D. T. (1996). Protean Careers of the 21st Century. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 10*, 8–16. https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.1996.3145315

Hall, D. T. (2002). *Careers In and Out of Organizations*. SAGE.

Hall, D. T., & Mirvis, P. H. (1995). The New Career Contract: Developing the Whole Person at Midlife and Beyond. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 47*(3), 269–289. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1995.0004

Hamtiaux, A., Houssemand, C., & Vrignaud, P. (2013). Individual and career adaptability: Comparing models and measures. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 83*(2), 130–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.03.006

Hillage, J., & Pollard, E. (1999). Employability: developing a framework for policy analysis. *Labour Market Trends, 107*(85), 83–84.

Hirschi, A. (2009). Career adaptability development in adolescence: Multiple predictors and effect on sense of power and life satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74*(2), 145–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.01.002

Hirschi, A. (2012). The career resources model: an integrative framework for career counsellors. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 40*, 369–383. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2012.700506

Hogan, R., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Kaiser, R. B. (2013). Employability and Career Success: Bridging the Gap Between Theory and Reality. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 6*(1), 3–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12001

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Ibarra, H., & Barbulescu, R. (2010). Identity As Narrative: Prevalence, Effectiveness, and Consequences of Narrative Identity Work in Macro Work Role Transitions. *Academy of Management Review, 35*(1), 135–154.

ILO. (2018). *ILOSTAT database*. https://www.ilo.org/ilostat/faces/ilostat-home/home?_adf.ctrl-state=2vgo577p_4&_afrLoop=42357653894404#!

INEGI. (2018). *Banco de Información Económica*. http://www.inegi.org.mx/sistemas/bie/

International Monetary Fund, The World Bank, International Labor Organization, & Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2016). *Enhancing employability: Report prepared for the G20 Employment Working Group with inputs from the International Monetary Fund*. http://www.oecd.org/g20/topics/employment-and-social-policy/

Keese, M., & Pascal, M. (2016). OECD Employment Outlook 2016. In *OECD Employment Outlook* (Issue September). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/empl_outlook-2016-en

Kirves, K., De Cuyper, N., Kinnunen, U., & Nätti, J. (2011). Perceived job insecurity and perceived employability in relation to temporary and permanent workers' psychological symptoms: A two samples study. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 84*(8), 899–909. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-011-0630-y

Klehe, U.-C., Zikic, J., van Vianen, A. E. M., Koen, J., & Buyken, M. (2012). Coping Proactively with Economic Stress: Career Adaptability in the Face of Job Insecurity, Job Loss, Unemployment and Underemployment. In *The Role of the Economic Crisis on Occupational Stress and Well Being* (pp. 131–176). Emerald.

Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (3rd ed.). The Guilford Press.

Kluve, J. (2014). Youth market labor interventions. *IZA World of Labor*. https://doi.org/10.15185/izawol.106

Koen, J., Klehe, U.-C., & Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2012). Training career adaptability to facilitate a successful school-to-work transition. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 81*(3), 395–408. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.10.003

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.02.004

Konstam, V., Celen-Demirtas, S., Tomek, S., & Sweeney, K. (2015). Career Adaptability and Subjective Well-Being in Unemployed Emerging Adults: A Promising and Cautionary Tale. *Journal of Career Development, 42*(6), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845315575151

Lo Presti, A., & Pluviano, S. (2016). Looking for a route in turbulent waters: Employability as a compass for career success. *Organizational Psychology Review, 6*(2), 192–211. https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386615589398

McArdle, S., Waters, L., Briscoe, J. P., & Hall, D. T. (2007). Employability during unemployment: Adaptability, career identity and human and social capital. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 71*(2), 247–264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.06.003

McQuaid, R. W., & Lindsay, C. (2005). *The Concept of Employability*. Urban Studies, 42(2), 197–219.

Merino-Tejedor, E., Hontangas, P. M., & Boada-Grau, J. (2016). Career adaptability and its relation to self-regulation, career construction, and academic engagement among Spanish university students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 93*, 92–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2016.01.005

Miler, P. (2004). *The human costs and benefits of work : jobload, self-perceived performance, and employee wellbeing / submitted by Peta Miller - Trove* [La Trobe University]. https://trove.nla.gov.au/work/3861172

Muthén, L., & Muthén, B. (2012). *Mplus user's guide (version 7.4)*. Muthen & Muthen.

Negru-Subtirica, 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*(37), 131–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.03.004

Ng, T. W. H., Eby, L. T., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2005). Predictors Of Objective And Subjective Career Success: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 367–408. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00515.x

Nimon, K. F. (2010). Regression Commonality Analysis: Demonstration of an SPSS Solution. *Multiple Linear Regression Viewpoints, 36*(1), 10–17.

Nimon, K. F., & Oswald, F. L. (2013). Understanding the Results of Multiple Linear Regression: Beyond Standardized Regression Coefficients. *Organizational Research Methods, 16*(4), 650–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428113493929

Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. McGraw-Hill.

OECD. (2018). *Labour force participation rate (indicator)*. https://doi.org/10.1787/8a801325-en

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.01.003

Öncel, L. (2014). Career Adapt-Abilities Scale Turkey form: Convergent validity of subscale scores. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 85*(1), 13–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.03.006

Otterbach, S., & Sousa-Poza, A. (2016). Job insecurity, employability and health: an analysis for Germany across generations. *Applied Economics, 48*(14), 1303–1316. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2015.1100248

Peiró, J. M., Sora, B., & Caballer, A. (2012). Job insecurity in the younger Spanish workforce: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(2), 444–453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.09.007

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Porfeli, E. J., & Savickas, M. L. (2012). Career Adapt-Abilities Scale-USA Form: Psychometric properties and relation to vocational identity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(3), 748–753. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.009

Rhemtulla, M., Brosseau-Liard, P. É., & Savalei, V. (2012). When can categorical variables be treated as continuous? A comparison of robust continuous and categorical SEM estimation methods under suboptimal conditions. *Psychological Methods, 17*(3), 354–373. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029315

Rocha Sánchez, F. (2012). *Youth Unemployment in Spain: situation and policy recommendations*. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, International Dialogue. http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/id/09469.pdf

Rosenberg, S., Heimler, R., & Morote, E.-S. (2012). Basic employability skills: A triangular design approach. *Education + Training, 54*(1), 7–20. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911211198869

Rothwell, A., Herbert, I., & Rothwell, F. (2008). Self-perceived employability: Construction and initial validation of a scale for university students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.12.001

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: a policy-capturing approach. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 66–80. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.66

Santilli, S., Nota, L., Ginevra, M. C., & Soresi, S. (2014). Career adaptability, hope and life satisfaction in workers with intellectual disability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 85*(1), 67–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.02.011

Savickas, M. L. (2005). The Theory and Practice of Career Construction. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career development and counseling* (pp. 24–70). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Savickas, M. L. (2008). Helping People Choose Jobs: A History of the Guidance Profession. In *International handbook of career guidance* (pp. 97–113). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6230-8_5

Savickas, M. L. (2013). Career Construction Theory and Practice. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career development and counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 147–183). Wiley and Sons. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412952675.n34

Savickas, M. L., & Porfeli, E. J. (2012). Career Adapt-Abilities Scale: Construction, reliability, and measurement equivalence across 13 countries. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(3), 661–673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.011

Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kraimer, M. L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(3), 416–427. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.3.416

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. (2001). What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel Psychology, 54*(4), 845–874. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00234.x

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden, R. C. (2001). A Social Capital Theory Of Career Success. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(2), 219–237. https://doi.org/10.2307/3069452

Shockley, K. M., Ureksoy, H., Rodopman, O. B., Poteat, L. F., & Dullaghan, T. R. (2016). Development of a new scale to measure subjective career success: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*(1), 128–153. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2046

Sideridis, G., Simos, P., Papanicolaou, A., & Fletcher, J. (2014). Using Structural Equation Modeling to Assess Functional Connectivity in the Brain. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 74*(5), 733–758. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164414525397

Skorikov, V. (2007). Continuity in adolescent career preparation and its effects on adjustment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 70*(1), 8–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.04.007

Steinmetz, H., Schmidt, P., Tina-Booh, A., Wieczorek, S., & Schwartz, S. H. (2009). Testing measurement invariance using multigroup CFA: Differences between educational groups in human values measurement. *Quality and Quantity, 43*(4), 599–616. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-007-9143-x

Stoltz, K. B., Wolff, L. A., Monroe, A. E., Farris, H. R., & Mazahreh, L. G. (2013). Adlerian lifestyle, stress coping, and career adaptability: Relationships and dimensions. *Career Development Quarterly, 61*(3), 194–209. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2013.00049.x

Stringer, K., Kerpelman, J., & Skorikov, V. (2011). Career preparation: A longitudinal, process-oriented examination. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(1), 158–169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.12.012

Thompson, B. (2006). *Foundations of behavioral statistics: An insight-based approach.* The Guilford Press.

Tolentino, L. R., Garcia, P. R. J. M., Lu, V. N., Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P., & Plewa, C. (2014). Career adaptation: The relation of adaptability to goal orientation, proactive personality, and career optimism. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84*(1), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.11.004

Tonidandel, S., & LeBreton, J. M. (2015). RWA Web: A Free, Comprehensive, Web-Based, and User-Friendly Tool for Relative Weight Analyses. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 30*(2), 207–216. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-014-9351-z

Van de Vijver, F., & Tanzer, N. K. (2004). Bias and equivalence in cross-cultural assessment: An overview. *Revue Europeene de Psychologie Appliquee, 54*(2), 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2003.12.004

Van Der Heijde, C. M., & Van Der Heijden, B. I. J. M. (2006). A competence-based and multidimensional operationalization and measurement of employability. *Human Resource Management, 45*(3), 449–476. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20119

van der Heijden, B. (2002). Prerequisites to guarantee life-long employability. *Personnel Review, 31*, 44–61. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480210412418

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*(3), 716–724. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.002

Van Widenfelt, B. M., Treffers, P. D. A., De Beurs, E., Siebelink, B. M., & Koudijs, E. (2005). Translation and cross-cultural adaptation of assessment instruments used in psychological research with children and families. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 8*(2), 135–147. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-005-4752-1

Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods, 3*(1), 4–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810031002

Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L., & Ones, D. S. (2005). Is there a general factor in ratings of job performance? a meta-analytic framework for disentangling substantive and error influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(1), 108–131. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.108

Wolf, E. J., Harrington, K. M., Clark, S. L., & Miller, M. W. (2013). Sample size requirements for structural equation models: An evaluation of power, bias, and solution propriety. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 76*, 913–934. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164413495237

Zacher, H. (2014). Career adaptability predicts subjective career success above and beyond personality traits and core self-evaluations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84*(1), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.10.002

Information about corresponding author:

Jose Ramos
Facultad de Psicología, Universidad de Valencia
Av. Blasco Ibáñez, 21. 46010 Valencia (Spain)
E-mail: jose.ramos@uv.es

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sports (FPU 13/06793) and the Government of Mexico, Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores. The participation of the second author in this paper was supported by the Asociación Mexicana de Cultura A.C.

Co-authors want to thank Dr. Ana Hernández for her support and feedback on the previous draft of this manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors state that there are no conflicts of interest associated with the research.

Appendix A. Scale items of the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale – Mexican Form

Instrucciones:

Diferentes personas utilizan diferentes habilidades y estrategias para desarrollar sus carreras. Nadie es bueno haciendo cada una de ellas, cada uno de nosotros usamos más unas que otras. Por favor, evalúa en qué medida has desarrollado cada una de las siguientes habilidades: (1 = Nada Fuerte, 2 = Algo Fuerte, 3 = Fuerte, 4 = Muy Fuerte, 5 = A Tope)

Construct		Item (First-order Indicators)
Implicación	1	Pensar sobre cómo será mi futuro.
	2	Darse cuenta que las decisiones de hoy influyen en mi futuro.
	3	Prepararme para el futuro.
	4	Ser consciente de las elecciones educativas y vocacionales que debo tomar.
	5	Planificar cómo lograr mis objetivos / metas.
	6	Preocuparme por mi carrera.
Control	7	Mantenerme optimista.
	8	Tomar decisiones por mí mismo.
	9	Responsabilizarme de mis acciones.
	10	Defender mis creencias (convicciones).
	11	Confiar en mí mismo.
	12	Hacer lo que creo que está bien.
Curiosidad	13	Explorar mi entorno.
	14	Buscar oportunidades para crecer como persona.
	15	Explorar opciones antes de tomar una decisión.
	16	Considerar diferentes maneras de hacer las cosas.
	17	Examinar profundamente los interrogantes que tengo.
	18	Tener curiosidad sobre nuevas oportunidades.
Confianza	19	Realizar las tareas de forma eficiente.
	20	Tener cuidado de hacer las cosas bien.
	21	Aprender nuevas habilidades.
	22	Desarrollar al máximo mis capacidades.
	23	Superar obstáculos.
	24	Resolver problemas.

Appendix B. Scale Items in Spanish used by this Study & by available Spanish Scale

	Spanish Translation in this Study	Spanish Translation by Merino-Tejedor et al. (2016)
1	Pensar sobre cómo será mi futuro.	Pensando en cómo será mi futuro
2	Darse cuenta que las decisiones de hoy influyen en mi futuro.	Dándome cuenta de que las opciones de hoy determinan mi futuro
3	Prepararme para el futuro.	Preparándome para el future
4	Ser consciente de las elecciones educativas y vocacionales que debo tomar.	Tomando conciencia de la educación y de las opciones vocacionales que debo tomar
5	Planificar cómo lograr mis objetivos / metas.	Planificando cómo conseguir mis objetivos
6	Preocuparme por mi carrera.	Preocupándome por mi carrera
7	Mantenerme optimista.	Siendo optimista
8	Tomar decisiones por mí mismo.	Tomando decisiones por mí mismo/a
9	Responsabilizarme de mis acciones.	Siendo responsable de mis acciones
10	Defender mis creencias (convicciones).	Defendiendo las cosas en las que creo
11	Confiar en mí mismo.	Contando conmigo mismo/a
12	Hacer lo que creo que está bien.	Haciendo lo que considero correcto para mí.
13	Explorar mi entorno.	Explorando mi entorno
14	Buscar oportunidades para crecer como persona.	Buscando oportunidades para crecer
15	Explorar opciones antes de tomar una decisión.	Explorando las opciones antes de hacer una elección
16	Considerar diferentes maneras de hacer las cosas.	Observando diferentes formas de hacer las cosas
17	Examinar profundamente los interrogantes que tengo.	Indagando profundamente los interrogantes que tengo
18	Tener curiosidad sobre nuevas oportunidades.	Siendo curioso/a ante las nuevas oportunidades
19	Realizar las tareas de forma eficiente.	Llevando a cabo las tareas de forma eficiente
20	Tener cuidado de hacer las cosas bien.	Teniendo cuidado de hacer bien las cosas
21	Aprender nuevas habilidades.	Aprendiendo nuevas habilidades
22	Desarrollar al máximo mis capacidades.	Trabajando y/o estudiando de acuerdo a mis capacidades
23	Superar obstáculos.	Superando los obstáculos
24	Resolver problemas.	Solucionando los problemas