



HAL
open science

Psychometrics properties of the French version of the van Dam's Employability Questionnaire

Cindy Carrein-Lerouge, Alessandro Lo Presti, Liliane Rioux, Fabrizio Scrima

► **To cite this version:**

Cindy Carrein-Lerouge, Alessandro Lo Presti, Liliane Rioux, Fabrizio Scrima. Psychometrics properties of the French version of the van Dam's Employability Questionnaire. *European Review of Applied Psychology / Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée*, 2021, 71 (2), pp.100628. 10.1016/j.erap.2021.100628 . hal-03524539

HAL Id: hal-03524539

<https://hal.science/hal-03524539>

Submitted on 10 Mar 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

**English title: Psychometrics properties of the French version of the van Dam's
Employability Questionnaire**

**Titre en français : Propriétés psychométriques de la version française du questionnaire
de l'employabilité de van Dam**

Auteurs

Cindy Carrein-Lerouge: Université de Rouen Normandie EA 7475, 1 rue Lavoisier 76821
Mont-Saint-Aignan cedex, France
cindy.carrein@univ-rouen.fr
0235146407

Alessandro Lo Presti: Università degli Studi della Campania "Luigi Vanvitelli", Viale Ellittico,
31, 81100, Caserta, Italy

Liliane Rioux: Université Paris Nanterre EA 4386. 200, avenue de la République F-92001
Nanterre, France

Fabrizio Scrima, Université de Rouen Normandie EA 7475, 1 rue Lavoisier 76821 Mont-Saint-
Aignan cedex, France

Abstract

Introduction: The importance of employability is related to the fact that various studies show that this resource allows people to enter and maintain their employment or to progress in their career.

Objective: The aim of this study is to analyse the psychometric characteristics of the French version of van Dam's Employability Scale. **Method:** 190 French workers and job seekers completed the questionnaire. Confirmatory factor analysis was carried out, and reliability and discriminant validity between employability orientation and employability activities were tested. **Results:** The results confirm two related but independent factors. **Conclusion:** Van Dam's scale offers the professional community an excellent short instrument to measure the two dimensions of employability: employability orientation and employability activities.

Keywords: Employability, activities, orientation, career, confirmatory factor analysis, validity

Résumé

Introduction : Différentes études soulignent l'importance de l'employabilité en tant que ressource permettant aux individus d'acquérir un emploi, de le conserver ou de progresser dans leur carrière.

Objectifs : Le but de cette étude est d'analyser les caractéristiques psychométriques de la version française de l'échelle d'employabilité de van Dam (2004). **Méthode :** 190 travailleurs et demandeurs d'emploi français ont complété ce questionnaire. Une analyse factorielle confirmatoire a été réalisée, la fidélité et la validité discriminante entre le facteur orientation et le facteur activités ont été testées. **Résultats :** Les résultats confirment l'existence de deux facteurs corrélés mais indépendants. **Conclusion :** La version française de l'échelle de van Dam offre aux professionnels un excellent outil relativement court pour mesurer l'employabilité et ses deux dimensions : orientation à l'employabilité et activités d'employabilité.

Mots-clés : Employabilité, activités, orientation, carrière, analyse factorielle confirmatoire, validité

1. Introduction

Employability is a fundamental individual resource that eases labour-market entrance and job retention (Lo Presti & Pluviano, 2016), especially at a time when job security is being progressively replaced by employment security for an increasing number of workers. Job security concerns the actual job, which may be lost or whose continuity may be threatened, forcing the worker to look for another job, while employment security concerns the overall occupational situation of the individual, independently of the current job, implying the likelihood of being continuously employed, possibly doing different jobs in the course of one's career and minimizing periods of unemployment. Thus, employability is of great interest to scholars, practitioners, organizations, policy makers, and workers in general due to its positive implications for individual well-being (Berntson & Marklund, 2007), organizational performance and functioning (Camps & Rodriguez, 2011), and for society as a whole (McQuaid & Lindsay, 2005). It has been associated with several positive psychosocial outcomes, including higher self-esteem and job-seeking behaviours during unemployment (McArdle et al., 2007), higher generalized self-efficacy (Berntson et al., 2008), greater work engagement and life satisfaction (De Cuyper et al., 2008), and greater career success (van der Heijde & van der Heijden, 2006), to name but a few. According to the most recent European statistics in the EU-28 Working Conditions Survey (Eurofound, 2015), 30% of job-seekers workers aged under 35, 42% aged 35-49, and 57% over 50 had difficulty finding a similar job. This labour market complexity is also observed in France, which has relatively high unemployment and underemployment rates (Vignoli et al., 2020, p. 2), and where 24.6% of employees express worry about their job and 33.4% think they will have to change job or get a new qualification after 3 years (Bèque et al., 2019). In addition, statistics (Eurostat, 2020) suggest that women, less educated individuals and low-skilled workers are less employable. Thus, it appears that finding ways to assess and promote employability could help support workers entering or transitioning into the labour market, and reduce the proportion of people finding it difficult to find a (new) job.

Despite its increasing importance, there is no real agreement among scholars about what employability is and how it can be measured. Vanhercke et al. (2014) distinguished between a) *competence-based employability*, which is the individual's perception of his/her abilities, capacities and skills that promote employment opportunities, b) *dispositional employability*, which is the perception of the individual's proactive attitudes related to their career and work in general, and c) *perceived employability*, which is the individual's perception of the possibility of obtaining and maintaining employment. This is linked to a more general differentiation between *input-based employability* (i.e., strengths and resources that foster career success) and *output-based employability* (i.e., the extent to which it will be easy to find a similar or better job).

For the purpose of this study, we refer to Van Dam's (2004) definition of employability, which encompasses two different constructs. The author differentiated between *employability orientation*, namely "employees' attitudes toward developing their employability for the organization" (p. 29), and *employability activities*, in other words, the "activities employees undertake to improve and maintain their employability, such as engaging in development activities and extending their knowledge and work experiences" (p. 35). In this way, she distinguishes between individuals' attitudes concerning their own employability, especially with reference to the employing organizations, and the consequent activities enacted to develop such employability. This definition is organization-focused, which makes it particularly appealing for studies examining employability within organizational contexts, while other definitions of employability are more vocationally oriented or more comprehensive (Fugate et al., 2004). Van Dam (2004) developed a scale with seven items measuring employability orientation and six items measuring employability activities. However, no validation studies for these scales were reported by the author in the original or subsequent paper (Nauta et al., 2009), representing a sort of original sin that accompanied the use of this measure in subsequent studies. In fact, no validation study, in any language, could be retrieved in scientific databases. Nevertheless, this tool has been used extensively in several studies.

Van Dam's (2004) scales have been included in studies carried out in Canada (Armstrong-Stassen & Schlosser, 2008), Malaysia (Tiraieyari & Hamid, 2015), Italy (Ingusci, Manuti & Callea, 2016), the Netherlands (Boomars et al., 2018), Norway (Solberg & Dysvik, 2016), Pakistan (Rafique et al., 2015), Spain (Saorin-Iborra & Sanchez-Manjavaca, 2013), and Turkey (Serim et al., 2014), as well as in a cross-cultural Italian-Finnish study (Lo Presti et al., 2018), but to the best of our knowledge, they have not been used in research conducted in France. However, apart from one notable exception (Manuti et al., 2016), many of the studies used either the employability orientation or the employability activities scale, and with fewer items than in the original scale. For instance, Serim et al. (2014) used three items each for employability orientation and activities, while Redmond (2013) used five items for each. While some studies used only the employability orientation scale (Armstrong-Stassen & Schlosser, 2008; 5 items instead of 7), others used only the employability activities scale (Boomars et al. 2018). Regarding the internal consistency of the scales used in the studies mentioned above, Cronbach's alpha scores ranged between .70 and .83 for employability orientation, and between .69 and .88 for employability activities. On average, Cronbach's alpha was .77 for employability orientation and .81 for employability activities. As mentioned above, van Dam's (2004) scales have not been validated in any language. However, they were used (Lo Presti et al., 2019) as a measure of concurrent validity in a study that aimed to develop a new employability measure, but the two scales were collapsed in a global measure of employability, with a Cronbach's alpha of .74.

Based on the above review, it appears important to examine the psychometric properties of the employability orientation and activities scales for at least three important reasons. First, no validation studies are available, either with reference to its original version or in other languages, even though these scales have been used extensively. Secondly, like other employability measures, this scale has not been validated in French, which is a barrier to French scholars interested in carrying out research on employability, as defined here. Moreover, a validated employability scale could be useful for professional purposes, as it could help organizations to evaluate their

employees' employability and development orientation and their engagement in subsequent activities. Thirdly, it will provide the opportunity to confirm whether the scale encompasses two distinct constructs, or whether they could be collapsed into a more global measure of employability. The aim of this paper is thus to provide the first psychometric examination of both the employability orientation and activities scales in order to check both their construct (through confirmatory factor analysis) and predictive validities (contrasting them with measures of career success), with a sample of French employees.

2. Method

2.1 Participants and procedure

The research was conducted with the participation of 190 French people, including 100 employees and 90 job seekers. Some authors (Hoe, 2008; Singh et al., 2016) suggest that samples providing more than 200 observations offer adequate statistical power for AFCs. According to this criterion, our sample is not adequate. However, Muthén and Muthén (2002), using Monte Carlo simulations, demonstrated that samples consisting of 150 or 175 observations can be adequate if there are no missing data and if the variables are normally distributed.

The sample comprised 37% men and 63% women. They were aged between 18 and 62 years, with a mean age of 34.69 years ($SD = 10.29$), and their length of service ranged from 1 to 44 years, with an average of 12.02 years ($SD = 8.96$). They included 67.8% white-collar workers, 30.1% middle managers, and 2.1% senior managers; 18% did not currently have an employment contract, 30.1% had a fixed-term contract, and 51.7% had an open-ended contract. Participants were not selected randomly. The sample of employees were recruited in a public administration department in the Centre and Normandy regions of France.

The employees were assessed in their workplace and the job-seekers at the job centres. Some of the employees and job seekers were having career counselling in a training centre in Normandy,

and their counsellor asked them to complete the questionnaire before the start of a session. All the questionnaires were in paper form and took about 30 minutes to complete.

2.2. Instruments

Data were collected using a French version of van Dam's Employability Scale (van Dam, 2004, Appendix A), translated by two psychologists (Hambleton et al., 2005); first, a native French speaker translated the items into French, and then a native English speaker back-translated them. The two English versions were then compared, with a 95% agreement between judges.

This instrument has 13 items, divided into two factors: Orientation (seven items) (e.g. *“If the organization needs me to perform different tasks, I am prepared to change my work activities”*), and Activities (six items) (e.g. *“In the past year, I have been actively looking for possibilities to change my working situation”*). As in van Dam's original version, responses are made on a four-point scale ranging from 1 (Totally disagree) to 4 (Totally agree). Concurrent validity was measured using two further scales: the Subjective Career Success scale (Rothwell & Arnold, 2007) and the Objective Career Success scale (Lo Presti & Elia, 2020).

The Subjective Career Success scale, developed by Rothwell and Arnold (2007, Appendix B), has 8 items evaluating the level of satisfaction with a wide array of career success facets (e.g., *“I am in a position to do mostly work which I really like”*) rated on a five-point Likert response scale from 1 (Totally disagree) to 5 (Totally agree). The Objective Career Success scale, developed by Lo Presti and Elia (2020, Appendix C), has three items regarding indicators of how successful participants have been in the last ten years (e.g., *“my income increased”*) compared to their colleagues, rated on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (Much less than my colleagues) to 5 (Much more than my colleagues).

In sum, the following socio-demographic data were collected: age, gender, type of employment (employee, middle-manager, top-manager), type of contract (unemployed, fixed-term contract, permanent contract) and length of service. Scales were completed in random order.

2.3 Data analysis

First, descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis) for each item were calculated. Next, a series of confirmatory factor analyses was performed to test the factor structure using the Maximum Likelihood extraction method. Three models were compared: one-factor model, two-factor model and related two-factor model. Fit of the model was assessed using the following indices: Carmines-McIver index (χ^2 / df), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). According to McIver and Carmines (1981), a $\chi^2 /$ degrees-of-freedom ratio of 3 to 1 indicates a good fit of the collected data. For the remaining indices, Hu and Bentler (1999) suggested threshold values greater than or equal to .95 for CFI and NNFI, and values lower than or equal to .06 for the RMSEA and SRMR. The comparison between models was tested using the Delta X^2 . Finally, divergent validity between orientation and activity factor was tested by the procedure proposed by Farrell (2010) comparing the shared variance between latent variables with the average variance extracted (AVE) for each latent variable. Discriminant validity is confirmed if AVE is greater than shared variance. Subsequently, additional analyses were conducted to test the internal consistency with Cronbach's Alpha, and the bivariate relationships between variables through zero-order correlations to examine concurrent validity.

3. Results

3.1 Descriptive statistics

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis) of the 13 items of van Dam's employability scales. Regarding the asymmetry indexes, none of the

items showed normality violations, with indices ranging between -1 to +1. We also calculated the mean differences between the two groups. Looking at the effect size index (Partial Eta²), the only items that showed a real difference (Partial Eta² > .06; see Cohen, 1988) were item 7 of the orientation factor and item 12 of the activity factor.

Insert Table 1

3.2 Construct validity

To test the factorial structure, we compared the results of three confirmatory factor analyses. The first model (M1) is a one-factor model, all items saturating in a single latent factor. The second model (M2) is represented by two independent latent factors. The third model (M3) has two related latent factors. As can be seen in Table 2, the only model that shows satisfactory fit indices is model 3 ($X^2/df = 1.84$, CFI = .95, NNFI = .94, SRMR = .05 and RMSEA = .06). Furthermore, as indicated by ΔX^2 , the two related factor model is better than the one-factor model ($p < .001$).

Insert table 2

Table 3 shows the structural parameters of M3. All parameters are significant for $p < .001$ and the two factors are strongly correlated ($\phi = .84$). Following Farrell's suggestions, and comparing the shared variance between factors (.70) and the AVEs of the two factors (.39 and .46) to perform a discriminating analysis, the result suggests a one-factor structure.

Insert table 3

3.3 Additional analyses

After testing the two-factor structure envisaged by van Dam, we calculated the internal consistency for the whole scale (Alpha = .88), for the "Orientation" factor (Alpha = .80), and for the "Activities" factor (Alpha = .82), obtaining satisfactory results. Correlation between the two factors ($r = .68$, $p < .001$) indicates strong intensity and shared variance ($R^2 = 46\%$) much higher than the shared variance ($R^2 = 27.4\%$) found by van Dam (2004). Orientation ($r = .27$, $p < .001$) and Activities ($r = .19$, $p = .009$) seem related to gender. In our sample, women obtained higher scores than men in both dimensions. Furthermore, educational and professional levels are positively correlated with the orientation factor ($r = .29$, $p < .001$ and $r = .34$, $p < .001$) and the activities factor ($r = .27$, $p < .001$ and $r = .35$, $p < .001$). Higher educational and professional levels are associated with higher scores in both factors. Finally, regarding concurrent validity, the two employability factors seem to correlate more with subjective career success ($r = .45$, $p < .001$ for orientation and $r = .56$, $p < .001$ for activities) than with objective career success ($r = .16$, $p < .001$ and $r = .15$, $p < .001$ for orientation and activities respectively).

Insert table 4

4. Discussion

The aim of this study was to examine for the first time the psychometric properties of the French version of van Dam's employability scale (2004), administered to a sample of French workers and job seekers. To test the construct validity, three models were compared: a one-factor model, a two independent latent factor model, and a two related latent factor model. The third model (i.e., two related latent factors) was the one that showed the most satisfactory fit indices. This result is consistent with van Dam's model that postulates a link between employability orientation and employability activities. The two factors of the scale can be summarized by a general factor.

The internal consistency of these two factors was tested and proved to be satisfactory. Gender and professional level seemed to be related to employability. While the link between professional level

and employability is not surprising (Berntson et al., 2006), the finding that the women in our sample had higher scores than men is unexpected. Kirves et al. (2014) found no effect of gender on perceived employability. However, while Bargsted (2017) observed no difference when looking at the gender effect only on employability, she did find a difference when looking at the market value of occupations; in her sample, women considered that they were more employable than men when their occupations have low market value, but not when they have high market value. Gender differences observed in our study suggest that this variable should be taken into consideration in future research.

Concurrent validity of the French version of van Dam's employability scale with subjective and objective career success partly supports the results of De Vos et al. (2011). The more tenuous link between objective career success (e.g. promotion, pay rise) and employability could be explained by the organizational context; objective career success is dependent not only on employability but also on the organization's financial health and strategy.

Our research has some limitations. First, the results are based on a specific sample, which was partially composed of the employees of a single organization. Employability, understood as an organizational culture that supports individual development (Schneider et al., 1996), influences orientation employability (Nauta et al., 2009), and a sample composed of several organizations may be more representative. Furthermore, our sample was composed of job seekers engaged in training or counselling, which may influence their employability. Indeed, being supervised may increase self-esteem and self-efficacy (Bernaud et al., 2006; Whiston et al., 1998), and even if studies show that employability fosters these variables (McArdle et al., 2007; Bernston et al., 2008), it is possible that these self-evaluations influence employability. Future studies should include job seekers who are not engaged in career counselling to complete this tool's validation in a French context, and also consider the length of unemployment due to its possible impact on employability (Koen et al., 2013). Furthermore, although the size of our sample is adequate according to the criteria suggested

by Muthén and Muthén (2002), the results should be interpreted with caution, and further research is needed to replicate these findings with larger samples.

The second limitation of this study concerns methodological choice. While this study validates the employability construct in two factors, we could not test the causal link between Employability orientation and Employability activities as postulated by van Dam (2004). The predictive character of attitudes on behaviour is supported by several studies (Ajzen, 1991; Armitage & Conner, 2001; Sutton, 1998), but experiments or longitudinal studies are needed to examine whether employability orientation predicts employability activities.

Despite these limitations, the French version of van Dam's employability scale presents adequate psychometric qualities and offers a short tool for practitioners and researchers. Employability is a social, organizational and individual issue. A short tool to assess employability orientation and employability activities could be helpful when setting up workshops or training programs to enhance employability.

5. Conclusion

Van Dam (2004) considers that employability activities depend on employability orientation, the latter depending on individual characteristics (e.g. openness, initiative, tenure) and work-related characteristics (e.g. perceived organizational support and career development support). This approach focuses on the organization, highlighting the interest for organizations to enhance employability activities by acting on the antecedents of employability, particularly by increasing career development support. This is a central issue because in order to remain or become competitive assumes that the organization has employable employees and fosters an employability culture (Nauta et al. 2009). In addition to the interest for organizations, individuals should also see employability as a key factor in their personal and professional development. Indeed, changes in the labour market have led to the emergence of new career forms, for example, "protean" and "boundaryless" careers (Briscoe et al., 2006), in which individuals are assumed to take more

responsibility for their own career development and employability (Sullivan & Baruch, 2009). Employability is thus a fundamental resource for individuals who have to deal with a complex professional situation, to adapt and to manage their own career (Briscoe et al., 2006). For individuals to become or remain employable implies “developing new skills and knowledge, and changing tasks or jobs regularly (van Dam, 2003b)” (van Dam, 2004, p. 30). The link between van Dam’s approach focusing on employability as an organizational issue and those focusing on the responsibility of the individual (Vanhercke et al. 2014) or the government (McQuaid & Lindsay, 2005) could provide a better understanding of employability (Guilbert et al., 2016).

Conflict of interest: none.

Appendix A. French and original versions of van Dam's Employability Scale (van Dam, 2004)

Merci de répondre à chaque question en sachant que : /Please answer each question knowing that:

Pas du tout d'accord
/Totally disagree

1

2

3

Tout à fait d'accord
/Totally agree

4

1. (EO) Si ma société a besoin que je réalise d'autres tâches que celles réalisées jusque-là, je suis prêt.e à le faire. *(If the organization needs me to perform different tasks, I am prepared to change my work activities.)*
2. (EO) Pour moi, il est essentiel d'évoluer au sens large, c'est pourquoi je serais capable de réaliser d'autres tâches ou d'occuper d'autres postes dans ma société. *(I find it important to develop myself in a broad sense, so I will be able to perform different task activities or jobs within the organization.)*
3. (EO) En cas de changements d'organisation, je préférerais rester dans le même service et continuer à travailler avec les mêmes collègues. *(In case of organizational changes, I would prefer to stay in my department with my colleagues.)*
4. (EO) Je pense qu'il est important de participer régulièrement à des activités de formation professionnelles. *(I find it important to participate in development activities regularly.)*
5. (EO) Je suis toujours prêt.e à changer de poste. *(I am willing to start in another job.)*
6. (EO) Si mon organisation m'offrait de nouvelles opportunités professionnelles, je les accepterais certainement. *(If the organization offered me a possibility to obtain new work experiences, I would take it.)*
7. (EO) En cas de changements d'organisation, je préférerais continuer à occuper le même poste. *(In case of organizational changes, I would prefer to stay in my present job.)*
8. (EA) J'essaye activement de développer mes compétences et mon expérience professionnelle. *(I am actively trying to develop my knowledge and work experiences.)*

9. (EA) Je fais de mon mieux pour gérer ma carrière. (*I do a lot to manage my career.*)
10. J'essaie d'être le.la plus informé.e possible sur les possibilités d'évolution dans ma société. (*I make sure to be informed about internal job vacancies.*)
11. (EA) Ces dernières années, j'ai activement cherché de nouvelles opportunités professionnelles pour améliorer ma situation professionnelle. (*In the past year, I have been actively looking for possibilities to change my working situation.*)
12. (EA) Au cours des dernières années, j'ai participé à des activités de formation et de perfectionnement professionnel qui n'étaient pas en lien direct avec mon travail. (*In the past, I have engaged in development activities that were not directly necessary for my job.*)
13. (EA) J'essaye activement d'augmenter ma « valeur » sur le marché du travail. (*I am actively trying to increase my employability.*)

Note: (EO) indicates Employability Orientation items, (EA) indicates Employability Activities items.

Appendix B. French and original versions of subjective career success scale developed by Rothwell and Arnold (2007)

Merci de répondre à chaque question en sachant que : *(Please answer each question knowing that)*

Pas du tout d'accord <i>Totally disagree</i>	0	1	2	3	Tout à fait d'accord <i>Totally agree</i>
---	----------	----------	----------	----------	--

1. J'ai atteint un niveau professionnel qui me permet de faire principalement le travail que j'aime vraiment. *(I am in a position to do mostly work which I really like.)*
2. Le poste que j'occupe actuellement est révélateur de ma progression professionnelle et de mes responsabilités dans ma société. *(My job title is indicative of my progress and my responsibility in the organization.)*
3. Je suis très heureux.se des promotions reçues jusqu'à présent. *(I am pleased with the promotions I have received so far.)*
4. Je suis satisfait.e du niveau de réussite que j'ai atteint dans ma carrière. *(I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career.)*
5. Je suis satisfait.e des efforts que j'ai réalisés pour atteindre mes objectifs de carrière. *(I am satisfied with the progress I have made towards meeting my overall career goals.)*
6. Je suis satisfait.e des efforts que j'ai faits pour accéder au niveau de rémunération souhaité. *(I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income.)*
7. Je suis satisfait.e des efforts que j'ai réalisés pour atteindre mes objectifs d'avancement. *(I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for advancement.)*
8. Je suis satisfait.e des efforts que j'ai accomplis pour acquérir et développer de nouvelles compétences professionnelles. *(I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new skills.)*

Appendix C. French and original versions of objective career success scale developed by Lo Presti and Elia (2020)

Merci de répondre à chaque question en sachant que: */Please answer each question knowing that:*

Bien moins que mes collègues <i>/Much less than my colleagues</i>	Moins que mes collègues <i>/Less than my colleagues</i>	Au même niveau que mes collègues <i>/At the same level than my colleagues</i>	Plus que mes collègues <i>/More than my colleagues</i>	Bien plus que mes collègues <i>/Much more than my colleagues</i>
0	1	2	3	4

1. Au cours des 10 dernières années, j'ai eu un certain nombre de promotions ... *(In the last ten years, I had job advancements...)*
2. Au cours des 10 dernières années, j'ai eu des augmentations de salaire... *(In the last ten years, I increased my income...)*
3. Au cours des 10 dernières années, j'ai évolué hiérarchiquement... *(In the last ten years, I reached apical, or in any case relevant, hierarchical positions...)*

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analytic review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 471-499. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164939>
- Armstrong-Stassen, M. & Schlosser, F. (2008). Benefits of a supportive development climate for older workers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(4), 419-437. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2954252>
- Bargsted, M. (2017). Impact of personal competencies and market value of type of occupation over objective employability and perceived career opportunities of young professionals. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 33(2), 115-123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpto.2017.02.003>
- Bègue, M., Kingsada, A., & Mauroux, A. (2019, april). Reconnaissance, insécurité et changements dans le travail. http://www.epsilon.insee.fr/jspui/bitstream/1/95397/1/SynthStat_2019_29.pdf
- Bernaud, J.-L., Gaudron, J.-P., & Lemoine, C. (2006). Effects of career counseling on French adults: an experimental study. *Career Development Quarterly*, 54, 241-256. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2006.tb00155.x>
- Berntson, E., & Marklund, S. (2007). The relationship between employability and subsequent health. *Work and Stress*, 21(3), 279-292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370701659215>
- Berntson, E., Näswall, K., & Sverke, M. (2008). Investigating the relationship between employability and self-efficacy: A cross-lagged analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(4), 413-425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320801969699>

- Berntson, E., Sverke, M. & Marklund, S. (2006). Predicting perceived employability: human capital or labour market opportunities? *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 27(2), 223-244.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X06063098>
- Boomars, C., Yorks, L. & Shetty, R. (2018). Employee learning motives, perceived learning opportunities and employability activities. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 30(5), 335-350.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12091>
- Briscoe, J. P., Hall, D. T., & DeMuth, R. L. F. (2006). Protean and boundaryless careers: An empirical exploration, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 30-47.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.003>
- Camps, J., & Rodríguez, H. (2011). Transformational leadership, learning, and employability: Effects on performance among faculty members. *Personnel Review*, 40(4), 423-442.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481111133327>
- Carmines, E. G., & McIver, J. P. (1981). *Analyzing Models with Unobserved Variables: Analysis of Covariance Structures*. In G. W. Bohrnstedt, & E. F. Borgatta (Eds.), *Social Measurement: Current Issues* (pp. 65-115). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Erlbaum.
- De Cuyper, N., Bernhard-Oettel, C., Berntson, E., De Witte, H., & Alarco, B. (2008). Employability and employees' well-being: Mediation by job insecurity. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 57(3), 488-509. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00332.x>
- De Vos, A., De Hauw, S., & Van der Heijden, B. I. (2011). Competency development and career success: The mediating role of employability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 438-447. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.010>
- Eurofound (2015). *Sixth European Working Conditions Survey*.
<https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/european-working-conditions-surveys/sixth-european-working-conditions-survey-2015>

- Eurostat (2020, april). *Employment statistics*. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/pdfscache/1162.pdf>
- Farrell, A. M. (2010). Insufficient discriminant validity: A comment on Bove, Pervan, Beatty, and Shiu (2009). *Journal of Business Research*, 63(3), 324-327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.05.003>
- Fugate, M., Kinicki, A. J., & Ashforth, B. E. (2004). Employability: A psycho-social construct, its dimensions and applications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 14-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2003.10.005>
- Guilbert, L., Bernaud, J.-L., Gouvernet, B., & Rossier, J. (2016). Employability: a review and research's perspectives. *International Journal of Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 16(1), 69-89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-015-9288-4>
- Hambleton, R. K., Merenda, P. F., Spielberger, C. D. (Eds.) (2005). *Adapting educational and psychological tests for cross-cultural assessment*. Erlbaum.
- Hoe, S. L. (2008). Issues and procedures in adopting structural equation modeling technique. *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods*, 3(1), 76-83.
- Hu, L. T., & 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>
- Ingusci, E., Manuti, A. & Callea, A. (2016). Employability as mediator in the relationship between the meaning of working and job search behaviours during unemployment. *Electronic Journal of Applied Statistical Analysis*, 9(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1285/i20705948v9n1p1>
- Kirves, K., Kinnunen, U., De Cuyper, N., & Mäkikangas, A. (2014). Trajectories of perceived employability and their associations with well-being at work: A three-wave study. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 13(1), 46-57. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000103>

- Koen, J., Klehe, U. C., & Van Vianen, A. E. (2013). Employability among the long-term unemployed: A futile quest or worth the effort? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82(1), 37-48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12037>
- 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>
- Lo Presti, A., & Elia, A. (2020). Is the project manager's road to success paved only with clear career paths? A dominance analysis of the additive contributions of career attitudes and employability factors. *Project Management Journal*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8756972819891344>
- Lo Presti, A., Ingusci, E., Magrin, M. E., Manuti, A. & Scrima, F. (2019). Employability as a compass for career success: development and initial validation of a new multidimensional measure. *International Journal of Training and Development*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12161>
- Lo Presti, A., Tornroos, K. & Pluviano, S. (2018). "Because I am worth it and employable": A cross-cultural study on self-esteem and employability orientation as personal resources for psychological well-being at work. *Current Psychology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9883-x>
- Manuti, A., Depergola, V. & Giancaspro, M. L. (2016). "Mi spezzo ma non mi piego" L'employability per i lavoratori maturi del pubblico impiego. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*, 4, 855-873.
- 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>
- McIver, J., & Carmines, E. G. (1981). *Unidimensional scaling*, 24. Sage.

- McQuaid, R. W., & Lindsay, C. (2005). The concept of employability. *Urban Studies*, 42(2), 197-219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098042000316100>
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2002). How to use a Monte Carlo study to decide on sample size and determine power. *Structural equation modeling*, 9(4), 599-620. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0904_8
- Nauta, A., Van Vianen, A., Van der Heijden, B., Van Dam, K., & Willemsen, M. (2009). Understanding the factors that promote employability orientation: The impact of employability culture, career satisfaction, and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(2), 233-251. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908X320147>
- Rafique, A., Bashir, M., Akhtar, M. & Saqib, S. (2015). What Fuels the Engine of Career Success? *The Pakistan Journal of Social Issues*, 6, 35-52.
- Redmond, E. (2013). Competency Models at Work: The Value of Perceived Relevance and Fair Rewards for Employee Outcomes. *Human Resource Management*, 52(5), 771-792. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21560>
- Rothwell, A., & Arnold, J. (2007). Self-perceived employability: development and validation of a scale. *Personnel Review*, 36(1), 26-4. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480710716704>
- Saorin-Iborra, M. D. C. & Sanchez-Manjavacas, A. M. S. (2013). La empleabilidad interna percibida como estrategia clave del comportamiento de ciudadanía organizativo y la intención de abandonar la empresa. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 9(2), 93-99.
- Schneider, B., Brief, A. P., & Guzzo, R. A. (1996). Creating a climate and culture for sustainable organizational change. *Organizational Dynamics*, 24(4), 7-19. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(96\)90010-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(96)90010-8)
- Serim, H., Demirbağ, O., & Yozgat, U. (2014). The effects of employees' perceptions of competency models on employability outcomes and organizational citizenship behavior and

- the moderating role of social exchange in this effect. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150, 1101-1110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.125>
- Singh, K., Junnarkar, M., & Kaur, J. (2016). Norms for test construction. In *Measures of Positive Psychology* (pp. 17-34). Springer.
- Solberg, E. & Dysvik, A. (2016). Employees' perceptions of HR investment and their efforts to remain internally employable: testing the exchange-based mechanisms of the 'new psychological contract'. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(9), 909-927. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1045008>
- Sullivan, S.E. & Baruch, Y. (2009). Advances in career theory and research: a critical review and agenda for future exploration. *Journal of Management*, 35(6), 1542-1571. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309350082>
- Sutton, S. (1998). Predicting and explaining intentions and behavior: How well are we doing? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 1317-1338. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01679.x>
- Tiraieyari, N., & Hamid, J. A. (2015). Is Employability Orientation More Enhanced by Career Self-Efficacy or Leadership Attribute?. *Modern Applied Science*, 9(8), 57-63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/mas.v9n8p57>
- Van Dam, K. (2004). Antecedents and consequences of employability orientation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 13(1), 29-51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320344000237>
- 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>
- Vanhercke, D., De Cuyper, N., Peeters, E., & De Witte, H. (2014). Defining perceived employability: a psychological approach. *Personnel Review*, 43(4), 592-605. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2012-0110>

Vignoli, D., Guetto, R., Bazzani, G., Pirani, E., & Minello, A. (2020). Economic Uncertainty and Fertility in Europe: Narratives of the Future.

https://pure.mpg.de/pubman/faces/ViewItemOverviewPage.jsp?itemId=item_3204537

Whiston, S. C., Sexton, T. L., & Lasoff, D. L. (1998). Career-intervention outcome: a replication and extension of Oliver and Spokane (1988). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 45, 150-165. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.45.2.150>

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of 13 items

	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Employed		Job applicant		F	p	Eta ²
							Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
EM_OR_01	1	4	3.05	.87	-.78	.07	3.00	.93	3.11	.79	.76	n.s.	.00
EM_OR_02	1	4	3.12	.90	-.80	-.15	3.19	1.02	3.03	.75	1.47	n.s.	.01
EM_OR_03	1	4	2.66	.98	-.14	-1.00	2.68	1.03	2.63	.92	.13	n.s.	.00
EM_OR_04	1	4	3.31	.80	-.99	.34	3.32	.85	3.30	.74	.03	n.s.	.00
EM_OR_05	1	4	2.74	1.01	-.25	-1.04	2.60	1.05	2.90	.94	4.21	<.05	.02
EM_OR_06	1	4	3.29	.75	-.84	.24	3.41	.75	3.15	.71	5.78	<.05	.03
EM_OR_07	1	4	2.93	.96	-.57	-.63	3.16	.94	2.70	.93	10.89	<.001	.06
EM_AC_08	1	4	3.12	.87	-.81	.02	3.03	.96	3.21	.75	2.03	n.s.	.01
EM_AC_09	1	4	3.25	.79	-.94	.45	3.24	.83	3.27	.74	.08	n.s.	.00
EM_AC_10	1	4	2.79	.92	-.38	-.64	2.68	1.02	2.90	.78	2.76	n.s.	.01
EM_AC_11	1	4	2.90	.89	-.42	-.59	2.93	.89	2.86	.90	.32	n.s.	.00
EM_AC_12	1	4	2.01	.90	.70	-.01	1.78	.69	2.24	1.03	13.02	<.001	.06
EM_AC_13	1	4	2.93	.90	-.42	-.66	3.09	.93	2.76	.82	6.49	.01	.03

Note: N = 190

Table 2

Fit indices of three compared models

	X ²	df	p	X ² /df	CFI	NNFI	SRMR	RMSEA	(Low)	(Hi)	M1 vs. M3		
											ΔX ²	Δdf	p
M1 - One factor	158	61	<.001	2.59	.91	.89	.06	.09	.07	.11			
M2 - Two factors	236	61	<.001	3.88	.83	.78	.24	.12	.10	.14			
M3 - Two correlated factors	110	60	<.001	1.84	.95	.94	.05	.06	.04	.08	48	1	<.001

Table 3

Structural parameters of model 3, Shared variance and average variance extracted of two latent factors.

	Lambda
Item 01 --> Orientation	.63
Item 02 --> Orientation	.75
Item 03 --> Orientation	.36
Item 04 --> Orientation	.72
Item 05 --> Orientation	.68
Item 06 --> Orientation	.68
Item 07 --> Orientation	.47
Item 08 --> Activities	.78
Item 09 --> Activities	.76
Item 10 --> Activities	.81
Item 11 --> Activities	.66
Item 12 --> Activities	.33
Item 13 --> Activities	.63
	Phi
Orientation <-> Activities	.84

Note: N = 190; Shared variance = .70;
 AVE of Orientation = .39; AVE of
 Activities = .46

Table 4

Zero order correlation between socio-demographic variables, subjective career success, objective career success and employability (Alpha on the diagonal).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 Gender	-										
2 Age	.03	-									
3 Educational level	.12	.14	-								
4 Length of service	.02	.90**	-.19*	-							
5 Type of contract	-.13	.15	.08	.11	-						
6 Professional level	.01	.20*	.45***	.09	.10	-					
7 Subjective Career Success	.05	.17*	.30**	.06	.12	.53***	.91				
8 Objective Career Success	-.01	.20**	.26***	.06	.13	.39***	.59***	.93			
9 Employability Scale	.25***	.03	.31***	-.14	.09	.38***	.55***	.17*	.88		
10 - Orientation	.27***	-.02	.29***	-.14	.07	.34***	.45***	.16*	.93***	.80	
11 - Activity	.19**	.07	.27***	-.11	.10	.35***	.56***	.15*	.91***	.68***	.82

Note: N = 190; * = p<.05; ** = p<.01; *** p<.001; Gender: 1=Male, 2=Female; Educational level: 1=middle-school, 2=bachelor's degree, 3=master's degree; Type of contract: 0=without contract, 1=fixed-term contract, 2=permanent contract; Professional Level: 1=employee, 2=middle-manager; 3=top-manager.