Accepted Manuscript

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

Hannes Zacher

Daily Manifestations of Career Adaptability: Relationships with Job and Career Outcomes

Hannes Zacher

University of Groningen

Author Note

Hannes Zacher, Department of Psychology, University of Groningen, the Netherlands.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Hannes Zacher,

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

the Netherlands, phone: +31 50 363 6187, e-mail: h.zacher@rug.nl

Abstract

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

Keywords: career adaptability; career success; diary study; job satisfaction; performance

1. Introduction

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

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

Hurst, & Kelley, 2014). The present research explored the extent to which daily behavioral

manifestations of employees' career adaptability and career adaptability dimensions fluctuate

across one work week, and to examine how these daily manifestations relate to employees'

reports of their daily task and career performance, as well as their daily job and career

satisfaction. Task performance has been defined as employee behavior that contributes to

organizational goals by supporting the production of goods or the provision of services (Borman

& Motowidlo, 1993). Career performance refers to behaviors that facilitate employees' career

advancement, such as developing new skills and seeking out opportunities (Welbourne, Johnson,

& Erez, 1998). Job satisfaction is defined as an attitude that includes affective and cognitive job

evaluations (Brief & Weiss, 2002). Finally, career satisfaction is a subjective indicator of career

success that entails employees' evaluations of their career progress (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, &

Wormley, 1990).

        From a theoretical perspective, biological factors (e.g., genes) and relatively stable inter-

individual difference characteristics ("traits") interact with environmental factors (e.g., job

demands) in triggering dynamic manifestations of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors ("states";

Mischel & Shoda, 1995). The sociogenomic model of personality suggests that states are directly

influenced by biological factors, traits, and the environment (Roberts & Jackson, 2008). In

contrast, only biological factors influence traits directly; the environment may influence traits

indirectly, through biological factors and states, over longer periods of time (Roberts & Jackson,

2008). This implies that dynamic variation in states across days exists because situational factors,

and possibly other states, enhance or constrain the expression of biological factors and traits. For

instance, an employee may not be able to express her generally high levels of career adaptability

equally well every day due to fluctuations in daily job demands or daily energy. These

assumptions are consistent with career construction theory, which argues that both dispositional and contextual factors influence career adaptability (Savickas, 2013). Moreover, even if inter-individual differences in career adaptability are positively associated with inter-individual differences in performance, the effects of daily manifestations of career adaptability on daily performance could be enhanced or mitigated by other daily person-related states and situational factors. It is therefore important to analyze variation in career adaptability and job and career outcomes at both the between- and within-person levels. In the present research, I investigate stable inter-individual differences in career adaptability as predictors at the between-person level in addition to dynamic daily manifestations of career adaptability as predictors at the within-person level, to compare their effects on daily job and career outcomes.

2. Development of Hypotheses

2.1. Daily Manifestations of Career Adaptability and Daily Job and Career Outcomes

According to career construction theory (Savickas, 2013), individuals with high levels of career adaptability possess greater competence and more psychosocial resources that enable them to adapt to and manage work- and career-related demands and changes. Successful adaptation, in turn, should positively impact their task and career performance, as well as their job and career satisfaction. Empirical research has provided support for these assumptions at the between-person level (Chan & Mai, 2015; Ohme & Zacher, 2015; Zacher, 2014a). At the within-person level, employees may not behaviorally express their career adaptability to the same extent every day, because their daily internal states (e.g., affect, motivation) or daily external circumstances (e.g., task requirements, situational constraints) can facilitate or hinder certain expressions (Mischel & Shoda, 1995; Roberts & Jackson, 2008). I propose that on days on which an employee shows more behavioral manifestations of career adaptability, his or her task and

career performance, as well as job and career satisfaction, will be higher than on days in which

the same employee shows less behavioral manifestations of career adaptability. The rationale for

this assumption is consistent with theorizing on the between-person level. Specifically, showing

more behaviors indicative of high levels of career adaptability on a given day should allow an

employee to better adapt to and more effectively manage his or her daily work and career

demands (Savickas, 1997). This, in turn, should result in higher levels of job and career

outcomes on that particular day. In contrast, on days on which an employee is not able or willing

or does not have opportunities to show behaviors indicative of high career adaptability (due to

internal or external factors), he or she should struggle more with daily work and career demands

which, in turn, should result in lower daily job and career outcomes.

Hypothesis 1: Daily career adaptability relates positively to (a) daily task performance, (b) daily

career performance, (c) daily job satisfaction, and (d) daily career satisfaction.

2.1. Daily Career Adaptability Dimensions and Daily Job and Career Outcomes

Taking a more differentiated perspective, I further expected differential effects of daily

manifestations of the four career adaptability dimensions on daily job and career outcomes. Daily

control involves behaviors such as making independent decisions, taking responsibility for one's

actions, and doing what is best for oneself; daily confidence entails behaviors such as performing

tasks efficiently, taking care to do things well, learning new skills, overcoming obstacles, and

solving problems (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). Both sets of behaviors are likely to associate

positively with daily task and career performance, as well as daily job and career satisfaction,

because they are conceptually related to high levels of task motivation, goal self-concordance,

and goal-setting behavior (Erez & Judge, 2001; Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005). Empirical

research has shown that individual difference characteristics closely related to control and

confidence – self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, internal locus of control, and emotional

stability (cf. Hirschi et al., 2015; Öncel, 2014; Zacher, 2014a) – are associated positively with

task and career performance, as well as job and career satisfaction (Debusscher, Hofmans, & De

Fruyt, 2015; Judge & Bono, 2001; Zacher, 2014a).

Hypothesis 2: Daily control relates positively to (a) daily task performance, (b) daily career

performance, (c) daily job satisfaction, and (d) daily career satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3: Daily confidence relates positively to (a) daily task performance, (b) daily career

performance, (c) daily job satisfaction, and (d) daily career satisfaction.

Daily concern involves behaviors such as thinking about one's future career, preparing

for the future, and planning the achievement of future career goals; daily curiosity entails

behaviors such as exploring one's surroundings, looking for opportunities that allow personal

growth, investigating different options before making a choice, observing different ways of

doing things, and probing deeply into one's questions (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). Previous

research found concern to relate positively to future time perspective (Öncel, 2014; Zacher,

2014b), satisfaction with career opportunities (Coetzee & Stoltz, 2015), and self-rated career

performance (Zacher, 2014a). Curiosity has been shown to relate positively to proactive

personality (Öncel, 2014) and proactive skill development and networking behavior (Taber &

Blankemeyer, 2015), and relate negatively to perceived career entrenchment (Zacher, Ambiel, &

Porto Noronha, 2015). Moreover, concern and curiosity relate positively to career exploration

behaviors (Li et al., 2015) and to behaviors that facilitate the development of professional

competencies (Guo et al., 2014). Consistent with career construction theory (Savickas, 2013) and

previous empirical research on concerns and curiosity, I argue that preparing for future career

tasks and exploring possible future selves and career opportunities should improve employees'

evaluations of their daily career success in the form of self-rated career performance and

satisfaction. In contrast, daily concern and curiosity should be less likely than daily control and

confidence to contribute to daily task performance and job satisfaction, which require a stronger

focus on momentary work demands and resources.

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

career satisfaction.

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

career satisfaction.

3. Method

3.1. Participants and Procedure

I conducted two quantitative daily diary studies to test the hypotheses. Study 1 examined

only relationships between career adaptability and task performance, whereas Study 2 examined

relationships between career adaptability and all job and career outcomes.

3.1.1. Study 1

Participants were 53 employees working for a university in the Netherlands. Of the

participants, 41 (77.4%) were female and 12 (22.6%) were male. Employees' ages ranged from

22 to 62 years, with a mean age of 36.33 years ($SD = 12.93$). The majority of participants held a

university degree (62.3%). Participants' job tenure ranged from a few months to 22 years, with a

mean job tenure of 4.06 years ($SD = 4.66$). Twenty-nine participants (54.7%) were

administrative employees (i.e., job descriptions included library officer, study coordinator,

secretary, and personnel department employee), and 24 participants (45.3%) were academic

employees (e.g., lecturer, postdoctoral researcher, and PhD candidate; note that PhD candidates

are considered full-time employees in the Netherlands).

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

3.1.2. Study 2

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

Participants were recruited with the help of a professional survey panel provider (Clear Voice Research). A baseline survey which included measures of career adaptability, as well as demographic and employment characteristics, was completed by 300 employees. Across one work week (Monday through Friday), these employees received an e-mail every day in the afternoon with a link to a daily survey to be completed at the end of the work day, which

included measures of daily career adaptability and daily job and career outcomes. In total, 234

participants (response rate of 78%) completed the baseline survey and at least two daily surveys,

with a total of 945 completed daily surveys (4.04 daily surveys on average per employee).

3.2. Measures

3.2.1. Career Adaptability

Career adaptability and its four dimensions (concern, control, curiosity, and confidence)

were measured in the baseline surveys with the Dutch (Study 1) and the English (Study 2)

versions of the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale (CAAS; Savickas & Porfeli, 2012; van Vianen,

Klehe, Koen, & Dries, 2012). The CAAS was developed based on career construction theory

(Savickas, 1997) and has 24 items (6 items for each of the four dimensions). Example items are

"Thinking about what my future will be like" (concern), "Making decisions by myself" (control),

"Exploring my surroundings" (curiosity), and "Overcoming obstacles" (confidence). Participants

first read the instructions provided by the scale authors ("Different people use different strengths

to build their careers. No one is good at everything, each of us emphasizes some strengths more

than others. Please rate how strongly you have developed each of the following abilities"").

Participants provided their answers on 5-point scales ranging from 1 (*not strong*) to 5 (*strongest*).

Career adaptability or its dimensions were included as predictors at the between-person level to

compare their effects with the effects of daily career adaptability or its dimensions.

I adapted the CAAS to measure daily behavioral manifestations of career adaptability. In

each daily survey, participants were asked to indicate to what extent they had engaged in the

specific behaviors on that day. The wording of the 24 career adaptability items was changed to

past tense and the word "today" was added such that the items referred to the past work day, for

example "Today, I thought about what my future will be like" (concern), "Today, I made

decisions by myself" (control), "Today, I explored my surroundings" (curiosity), and "Today, I overcame obstacles" (confidence). Participants rated the extent to which they had engaged in each of the behaviors on 5-point scales ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*).

3.2.2. Task and Career Performance

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

3.2.3. Job and Career Satisfaction

Daily job and career satisfaction were measured in each daily survey using two sets of five items adapted from Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger (1998) and Greenhaus et al. (1990), respectively. An example item for daily job satisfaction is "Today I felt fairly well satisfied with my job" and an example item for daily career satisfaction is "Today I was satisfied with the

success I have achieved in my career." Participants provided their answers on 5-point scales

ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

3.2.4. Demographic and Employment Characteristics

In the baseline surveys, participants indicated their age (in years), gender (1 = *male*, 2 =

female), highest level of education (ranging from 1 = *middle school* to 4 = *university degree* in

Study 1, and from 1 = *some high school* to 6 = *graduate university degree* in Study 2), job tenure

(in years), job type (only Study 1: 1 = *academic*, 2 = *administrative*), and job status (only Study

2: ranging from 1 = *entry level* to 7 = *executive level*). Due to the relatively small sample size in

Study 1, I only controlled for these characteristics in Study 2 (note that the pattern of results at

the within-person level in Study 1 did not change when these variables were controlled).

3.3. Statistical Analyses

As data collected in daily diary studies has a multilevel structure (i.e., daily survey entries

nested within employees), I used hierarchical linear modeling software to run a series of

multilevel regression analyses (Hofmann, Griffin, & Gavin, 2000). For each outcome variable,

Model 1 included career adaptability and daily career adaptability as predictors at the between-

and within-person levels, respectively. Again for each outcome, Model 2 included career

adaptability dimensions and their daily manifestations as predictors at the between- and within-

person levels, respectively. The between-person predictors were centered at the grand (or

sample) mean, and the within-person variables were centered at each participant's mean.

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Variance Components

Descriptive statistics and correlations at the between- and within-person levels appear in

Table 1 (Study 1) and Table 2 (Study 2). Table 1 shows that career adaptability, control, and

confidence, as well as their daily manifestations, correlated positively with daily task

performance at the between- and within-person levels in Study 1. Table 2 shows that career

adaptability and all of its dimensions correlated positively with the daily job and career outcomes

at the between- and within-person levels in Study 2; only the relationships between concern and

job satisfaction were weaker (and non-significant at the between-person level).

Table 3 presents the multilevel variance components and the proportions of between- and

within-person variance in the daily variables. In Study 1, 34% of the variance in daily career

adaptability (and between 44 and 53% of the variance in the daily career adaptability

dimensions) resided at the within-person level, and 36% of the variance in daily task

performance resided at the within-person level. In Study 2, 30% of the variance in daily career

adaptability (and between 31 and 43% of the variance in the daily career adaptability

dimensions) resided at the within-person level, and the share of within-person variance in the

daily job and career outcomes ranged from 37 to 47%. Overall, these findings suggest that daily

career adaptability and its dimensions fluctuated considerably across five work days, and that

there were substantial shares of within-person variability in the daily job and career outcome

variables that could potentially be explained by daily manifestations of career adaptability.

4.2. Hypothesis Tests

Table 4 shows the results of the multilevel analyses predicting daily task performance

(Study 1), and Table 5 shows the results predicting all four daily job and career outcomes (Study

2). According to Hypothesis 1a, daily career adaptability relates positively to daily task

performance. In Study 1, career adaptability positively predicted daily task performance at the

between-person level ($\gamma = .51$, $p = .005$), but not at the within-person level ($\gamma = .21$, $p = .101$;

Table 4). In Study 2, career adaptability positively predicted daily task performance both at the

between-person level ($\gamma = .26$, $p = .005$) and at the within-person level ($\gamma = .40$, $p < .001$; Table 5). Thus, Hypothesis 1a was supported by the findings of Study 2, but not by those of Study 1.

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

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

Hypotheses 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d were supported by positive effects of daily confidence on daily task performance in Study 1 ($\gamma = .44$) and Study 2 ($\gamma = .22$), and on daily career performance ($\gamma = .25$), daily job satisfaction ($\gamma = .26$), and daily career satisfaction ($\gamma = .22$) in Study 2, respectively (all $ps < .001$). At the between-person level, confidence positively predicted daily task performance in Study 1 ($\gamma = .53$, $p = .002$) and Study 2 ($\gamma = .24$, $p < .001$), and daily job satisfaction in Study 2 ($\gamma = .22$, $p = .008$).

According to Hypotheses 4a and 4b, daily concern relates positively to daily career performance and satisfaction. Table 5 shows that daily concern positively predicted both career

outcomes (both γs = .17, *p*s < .001), but not daily task performance and job satisfaction. Thus,

findings of Study 2 provided support for Hypotheses 4a and 4b. Moreover, concern positively

predicted daily career performance (γ = .14, *p* = .049) and, marginally, daily career satisfaction (γ

= .13, *p* = .081) at the between-person level.

According to Hypotheses 5a and 5b, daily curiosity relates positively to daily career

performance and career satisfaction, respectively. As shown in Table 5, daily curiosity positively

predicted daily career satisfaction (γ = .16, *p* < .001), but not the other outcomes. Thus,

Hypothesis 5b was supported, whereas Hypothesis 5a was not supported. Note that daily

curiosity had a weakly negative effect on daily task performance in Study 1 (γ = -.14, *p* = .039),

which was not replicated in Study 2.

5. Discussion

5.1. Summary and Interpretation of Results

Consistent with expectations based on career construction theory (Savickas, 1997, 2013),

daily career adaptability positively predicted daily task and career performance, as well as daily

job and career satisfaction in Study 2. The trend of the effect of daily career adaptability on daily

task performance in Study 1 was in the expected direction but, probably due to the relatively

small sample size and associated issues with statistical power, did not reach conventional levels

of significance. Career construction theory suggests that individuals with high levels of career

adaptability possess greater competence and more psychosocial resources to adapt to and manage

work- and career-related demands (Savickas, 1997). Higher adaptation and successful

management of demands should, in turn, enhance employees' job and career outcomes.

The analyses of effects of the four daily career adaptability dimensions provided a more

differentiated perspective. Specifically, results showed that daily control positively predicted

daily task performance, as well as job and career satisfaction, but not daily career performance.

Daily confidence positively predicted all four job and career outcomes. Thus, on days on which

employees showed more behaviors associated with control and confidence (e.g., making

independent decisions, solving problems; Savickas & Porfeli, 2012), their perceived task

performance, as well as their job and career satisfaction were higher than on days on which they

did not express behaviors associated with control and confidence. A potential explanation for

these findings is that daily control and confidence behaviors are conceptually related to task

motivation, self-concordance, and goal-setting behavior (Erez & Judge, 2001; Judge et al., 2005),

and they are related to characteristics such as self-efficacy and internal locus of control that

contribute to effective task performance, as well as job and career satisfaction (cf. Hirschi et al.,

2015; Öncel, 2014; Zacher, 2014a).

Confidence and, in Study 2, control positively predicted daily task performance at the

between-person level, suggesting that employees with high confidence and control show on

average higher daily task performance than employees with low confidence and control. Only

confidence positively predicted daily job satisfaction, and confidence and control did not have

significant effects on daily career performance and satisfaction at the between-person level.

While researchers have suggested that relationships may differ at the between- and within-person

levels of analysis (Dalal, Bhave, & Fiset, 2014), there is no straightforward explanation for these

non-significant findings. It may be possible that the direction and strength of the between-person

relationships depend on third variables. For instance, psychosocial resources associated with

high control, such as making independent decisions (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012), may be generally

more important for career outcomes in jobs and occupations that provide high autonomy. Future

research using multilevel research designs is needed to examine possible explanations.

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

Two additional findings are noteworthy. First, descriptive statistics showed that, overall, daily manifestations of concern and curiosity were less frequently shown by employees in both studies than daily manifestations of control and confidence. This may indicate that employees had fewer opportunities in their daily work to show behaviors associated with concern and curiosity compared to behaviors associated with control and confidence. Future research could

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

Research designs exploring intra-individual variability may take different forms, ranging from diary studies that investigate daily manifestations of career adaptability to longitudinal studies that investigate antecedents and outcomes of change in career adaptability over longer time periods (e.g., Guan et al., 2013; Hirschi, 2009; Negru-Subtirica et al., 2015; Zacher, 2014b). Future research could combine both types of studies by conducting "measurement burst" studies (Sliwinski, Almeida, Smyth, & Stawski, 2009). These studies allow linking short-term variability in a construct with longer-term changes in the same construct. For instance, it may be possible that the career adaptability of employees who have more daily opportunities to express their

career adaptability will develop more positively over longer time periods than the career

adaptability of employees who are not able to express their career adaptability on a daily basis.

5.2. Limitations and Future Research

The studies reported in this article have a number of limitations. First, self-reports of task

and career performance may be susceptible to biases, for instance employees' tendency to

present themselves more favorable to others than is justified by their actual performance. I took a

number of steps in this study to minimize such concerns. Participation was anonymous and

employees were aware that their data would be used for research purposes only. Moreover,

employees were asked to rate their performance from the perspective of their supervisors, which

may reduce self-report bias and increase the likelihood that self-reports correspond more strongly

to supervisory ratings of performance (Schoorman & Mayer, 2008). Using self-reports of

performance is also less problematic when they are included in within-person designs, because

these designs aim to explain variation from each employee's average daily performance, and

self-report bias would be expected to influence all daily ratings of an employee in a similar way.

Nevertheless, future research should collect actual supervisor ratings of daily performance.

Second, the relatively small sample size of Study 1 did not allow the inclusion of

potentially important control variables and may have limited statistical power to detect small

effect sizes. However, Study 2, which used a much larger sample and additional control

variables, largely replicated the findings of Study 1. Finally, future research is needed to examine

daily employee states (e.g., positive affect) as well as daily work events and job characteristics

(e.g., time pressure, autonomy) as potential boundary conditions of within-person relationships

between daily manifestations of career adaptability and daily job and career outcomes.

5.3. Practical Implications

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

References

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the

active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1252-

1265. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1252

Beal, D. J. (2015). ESM 2.0: State of the art and future potential of experience sampling methods

in organizational research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and*

Organizational Behavior, 2, 383-407. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111335

Biemann, T., Zacher, H., & Feldman, D. C. (2012). Career patterns: A twenty-year panel study.

Journal of Vocational Behavior, 81, 159-170. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2012.06.003

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements

of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in*

organizations (pp. 71-98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual*

Review of Psychology, 53, 279-307. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135156

Chan, S. H. J., & Mai, X. (2015). The relation of career adaptability to satisfaction and turnover

intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 89*, 130-139. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2015.05.005

Coetzee, M., & Stoltz, E. (2015). Employees' satisfaction with retention factors: Exploring the

role of career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 89*, 83-91. doi:

10.1016/j.jvb.2015.04.012

Dalal, R. S., Bhave, D. P., & Fiset, J. (2014). Within-person variability in job performance: A

theoretical review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 40*, 1396-1436. doi:

10.1177/0149206314532691

Debusscher, J., Hofmans, J., & De Fruyt, F. (2015). The effect of state core self-evaluations on

task performance, organizational citizenship behaviour, and counterproductive work

behaviour. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. doi:

10.1080/1359432X.2015.1063486

Erez, A., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations to goal setting, motivation,

and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1270-1279. doi: 10.1037/0021-

9010.86.6.1270

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational

experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management

Journal, 33*, 64–86. doi: 10.2307/256352

Guan, Y., Deng, H., Sun, J., Wang, Y., Cai, Z., Ye, L., . . . Li, Y. (2013). Career adaptability, job

search self-efficacy and outcomes: A three-wave investigation among Chinese university

graduates. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 83*, 561-570. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2013.09.003

Guan, Y., Zhou, W., Ye, L., Jiang, P., & Zhou, Y. (2015). Perceived organizational career

management and career adaptability as predictors of success and turnover intention

among Chinese employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 88*, 230-237. doi:

10.1016/j.jvb.2015.04.002

Guo, Y., Guan, Y., Yang, X., Xu, J., Zhou, X., She, Z., . . . Fu, M. (2014). Career adaptability,

calling and the professional competence of social work students in China: A career

construction perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 85*, 394-402. doi:

10.1016/j.jvb.2014.09.001

Hirschi, A. (2009). Career adaptability development in adolescence: Multiple predictors and

    effect on sense of power and life satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74*, 145-

    155. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2009.01.002

Hirschi, A., Herrmann, A., & Keller, A. C. (2015). Career adaptivity, adaptability, and adapting:

    A conceptual and empirical investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 87*, 1-10. doi:

    10.1016/j.jvb.2014.11.008

Hofmann, D. A., Griffin, M. A., & Gavin, M. B. (2000). The application of hierarchical linear

    modeling to organizational research. In K. Klein & S. W. J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel

    theory, research, and methods in organizations* (pp. 423-468). San Francisco: Jossey-

    Bass.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem,

    generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction

    and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 80-92. doi:

    10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life

    satisfaction: the role of self-concordance and goal attainment. *Journal of Applied

    Psychology, 90*, 257-268. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.257

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job

    and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 17-

    34. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.17

Judge, T. A., Simon, L. S., Hurst, C., & Kelley, K. (2014). What I experienced yesterday is who

    I am today: Relationship of work motivations and behaviors to within-individual

variation in the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*, 199-

221. doi: 10.1037/a0034485

Koen, J., Klehe, U.-C., Van Vianen, A. E. M., Zikic, J., & Nauta, A. (2010). Job-search

strategies and reemployment quality: The impact of career adaptability. *Journal of

Vocational Behavior, 77*, 126-139. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2010.02.004

Li, Y., Guan, Y., Wang, F., Zhou, X., Guo, K., Jiang, P., . . . Fang, Z. (2015). Big-five

personality and BIS/BAS traits as predictors of career exploration: The mediation role of

career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 89*, 39-45. doi:

10.1016/j.jvb.2015.04.006

Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system theory of personality:

Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality

structure. *Psychological Review, 102*, 246-268. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.102.2.246

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*, 131-142. doi:

10.1016/j.jvb.2015.03.004

Ohme, M., & Zacher, H. (2015). Job performance ratings: The relative importance of mental

ability, conscientiousness, and career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 87,*

161-170. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2015.01.003

Öncel, L. (2014). Career Adapt-Abilities Scale: Convergent validity of subscale scores. *Journal

of Vocational Behavior, 85*, 13-17. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2014.03.006

Raabe, B., Frese, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2007). Action regulation theory and career self-

management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 70*, 297-311. doi:

10.1016/j.jvb.2006.10.005

Roberts, B. W., & Jackson, J. J. (2008). Sociogenomic personality psychology. *Journal of

Personality, 76*, 1523-1544. doi: doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00530.x

Savickas, M. L. (1997). Career adaptability: An integrative construct for life-span, life-space

theory. *Career Development Quarterly, 45*, 247-259. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-

0045.1997.tb00469.x

Savickas, M. L. (2013). Career construction theory and practice. In R. W. Lent & S. D. Brown

(Eds.), *Career development and counselling: Putting theory and research into work* (2nd

ed., pp. 147-183). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Savickas, M. L., & Porfeli, E. J. (2012). Career Adapt-Abilities Scale: Construction, reliability,

and measurement equivalence across 13 countries. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*,

661-673. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.011

Schoorman, F. D., & Mayer, R. C. (2008). The value of common perspectives in self-reported

appraisals: You get what you ask for. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 148-159.

doi: 10.1177/1094428107307168

Sliwinski, M. J., Almeida, D. M., Smyth, J., & Stawski, R. S. (2009). Intraindividual change and

variability in daily stress processes: Findings from two measurement-burst diary studies.

Psychology and Aging, 24, 828-840. doi: 10.1037/a0017925

Super, D. E., & Knasel, E. G. (1981). Career development in adulthood: Some theoretical

problems and a possible solution. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 9*, 194-

201. doi: 10.1080/03069888108258214

Taber, B. J., & Blankemeyer, M. (2015). Future work self and career adaptability in the

prediction of proactive career behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 86*, 20-27. doi:

10.1016/j.jvb.2014.10.005

van Vianen, A. E. M., Klehe, U.-C., Koen, J., & Dries, N. (2012). Career adapt-abilities scale—

Netherlands form: Psychometric properties and relationships to ability, personality, and

regulatory focus. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*, 716-724. doi:

10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.002

Welbourne, T. M., Johnson, D. E., & Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale:

Validity analysis of a theory-based measure. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 540-

555. doi: 10.2307/256941

Zacher, H. (2014a). Career adaptability predicts subjective career success above and beyond

personality traits and core self-evaluations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84*, 21-30.

doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2013.10.002

Zacher, H. (2014b). Individual difference predictors of change in career adaptability over time.

Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84, 188-198. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2014.01.001

Zacher, H., Ambiel, R. A. M., & Porto Noronha, A. P. (2015). Career adaptability and career

entrenchment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 88*, 164-173. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2015.03.006

Zacher, H., & Griffin, B. (2015). Older workers' age as a moderator of the relationship between

career adaptability and job satisfaction. *Work, Aging and Retirement, 1*, 227-236. doi:

10.1093/workar/wau009

Zacher, H., Jimmieson, N. L., & Winter, G. (2012). Eldercare demands, mental health, and work

performance: The moderating role of satisfaction with eldercare tasks. *Journal of

Occupational Health Psychology, 17*, 52-64. doi: 10.1037/a0025154

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 1)

Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Between-person variables																		
1. Age	36.33	12.93	-															
2. Gender	1.77	0.42	-.08	-														
3. Education	3.32	0.96	-.53**	-.10	-													
4. Job tenure	4.06	4.66	.77**	-.02	-.49**	-												
5. Job type	1.55	0.50	.70**	.05	-.65**	.51**	-											
6. Career adaptability	3.15	0.53	.01	.06	-.06	-.05	.20	(.91)										
7. Concern	2.68	0.68	-.39**	.11	.13	-.34*	-.12	.68**	(.85)									
8. Control	3.33	0.67	.17	.05	-.17	.14	.34*	.77**	.25	(.82)								
9. Curiosity	3.05	0.69	-.09	.00	.13	-.09	.16	.81**	.54**	.46**	(.80)							
10. Confidence	3.53	0.74	.32*	.02	-.25	.12	.37**	.81**	.32*	.64**	.47**	(.88)						
Within-person variables																		
11. Daily career adaptability	2.55	0.54	.08	-.10	.11	-.05	.12	.42**	.31*	.18	.38**	.42**	(.90)	.79**	.57**	.81**	.71**	.37**
12. Daily concern	1.63	0.83	-.22	-.14	.30*	-.30*	-.13	.29*	.34*	-.03	.34*	.23	.85**	(.94)	.17*	.67**	.31**	.06
13. Daily control	3.51	0.62	.36**	.04	-.21	.27	.30*	.41**	.13	.39**	.19	.53**	.62**	.25	(.79)	.19**	.45**	.52**
14. Daily curiosity	1.93	0.81	-.13	-.15	.25	-.23	-.05	.24	.20	.06	.38**	.10	.85**	.81**	.27	(.86)	.36**	.06
15. Daily confidence	3.14	0.70	.33*	-.06	-.10	.21	.35*	.43**	.30*	.22	.26	.52**	.80**	.50**	.55**	.50**	(.79)	.55**
16. Daily task performance	3.60	0.84	.48**	-.23	-.35*	.26	.49**	.37**	.12	.30*	.20	.50**	.43**	.17	.53**	.15	.56**	(.92)

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

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

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 2)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Between-person variables																					
1. Age	44.60	10.26	-																		
2. Gender	1.55	0.50	.05	-																	
3. Education	4.18	1.25	-.01	-.04	-																
4. Job tenure	10.64	8.02	.42**	-.01	-.09	-															
5. Job status	4.38	1.40	.14*	-.08	.07	.31**	-														
6. Career adaptability	3.60	0.72	-.01	.02	.05	.05	.26**	(.96)													
7. Concern	3.37	0.85	-.16*	.03	.09	.00	.24**	.82**	(.88)												
8. Control	3.72	0.82	.12	-.02	-.06	.11	.23**	.86**	.53**	(.90)											
9. Curiosity	3.50	0.85	-.09	.04	.13*	-.03	.21**	.90**	.67**	.70**	(.91)										
10. Confidence	3.79	0.81	.08	.03	.01	.09	.23**	.90**	.62**	.77**	.75**	(.93)									
Within-person variables																					
11. Daily career adaptability	3.49	0.68	-.04	.06	.05	-.01	.24**	.60**	.59**	.42**	.57**	.50**	(.95)	.83**	.76**	.90**	.84**	.44**	.58**	.33**	.61**
12. Daily concern	3.05	0.94	-.19**	.05	.08	-.12	.12	.45**	.58**	.21**	.48**	.30**	.86**	(.91)	.40**	.76**	.50**	.18**	.48**	.07*	.46**
13. Daily control	3.90	0.71	.23**	.06	-.03	.11	.27**	.56**	.38**	.56**	.46**	.54**	.78**	.43**	(.89)	.53**	.71**	.56**	.39**	.47**	.50**
14. Daily curiosity	3.26	0.90	-.16*	.08	.06	-.07	.18**	.50**	.52**	.30**	.53**	.38**	.93**	.86**	.55**	(.92)	.65**	.26**	.53**	.20**	.53**
15. Daily confidence	3.74	0.72	.08	.02	.03	.10	.30**	.59**	.51**	.47**	.51**	.56**	.88**	.57**	.83**	.71**	(.83)	.55**	.54**	.45**	.57**
16. Daily task performance	4.02	0.74	.26**	.14*	-.02	.12	.16*	.52**	.34**	.52**	.41**	.54**	.49**	.19**	.68**	.29**	.67**	(.89)	.48**	.42**	.36**
17. Daily career performance	3.42	0.87	-.03	.04	.03	.01	.33**	.44**	.40**	.34**	.41**	.38**	.67**	.55**	.49**	.63**	.66**	.55**	(.90)	.34**	.62**
18. Daily job satisfaction	3.53	0.74	.17**	-.05	-.06	.08	.24**	.27**	.12	.31**	.19**	.33**	.35**	.05	.56**	.21**	.52**	.54**	.43**	(.74)	.54**
19. Daily career satisfaction	3.64	0.84	.00	-.07	-.06	.05	.32**	.40**	.36**	.33**	.36**	.36**	.66**	.49**	.58**	.59**	.65**	.46**	.73**	.61**	(.94)

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

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

Table 3

Variance Components and Proportions of Between- and Within-Person Variance in the Daily

Variables

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

Note. τ_{00} = between-person variance component, σ^2 = within-person variance component. The

proportion of between-person variance is computed as $\tau_{00} / (\tau_{00} + \sigma^2)$, and the proportion of

within-person variance is computed as $1 - (\tau_{00} / [\tau_{00} + \sigma^2])$.

Table 4

Results of Hierarchical Linear Modeling Analyses Predicting Daily Task Performance (Study 1)

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

Note. $N = 53$ participants provided 201 daily survey responses. Unstandardized multilevel

modeling coefficients (γ) with standard errors (*SE*) are shown. τ_{00} = between-person variance

component, σ^2 = within-person variance component. Pseudo R^2 = proportion of variance

explained in dependent variable by predictors at both the between- and within-person levels;

calculated as ([null model τ_{00} + null model σ^2] - [model τ_{00} + model σ^2]) / (null model τ_{00} + null

model σ^2).

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

Table 5

Results of Hierarchical Linear Modeling Analyses Predicting Daily Job and Career Outcomes (Study 2)

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

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

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

Highlights

- Two diary studies demonstrate substantial within-person variability in expressions of career adaptability across five days.

- Daily career adaptability positively predicted daily task and career performance, as well as job and career satisfaction.

- Daily confidence also positively predicted all four daily job and career outcomes.

- Daily control positively predicted daily task performance, as well as daily job and career satisfaction.

- Daily concern positively predicted career performance and satisfaction; daily curiosity only predicted career satisfaction.