Measuring career adaptabilities in the Brazilian context: Development and validation of

the CAAS+C Brazilian Form

Rodolfo A. M. Ambiel[1]

Thaline da Cunha Moreira[2]

Leonardo de Oliveira Barros[3]

Gustavo Henrique Martins[1]

Ana Paula Salvador[1]

Bart Wille[4]

1: Universidade São Francisco, Campinas, Brazil

2: Faculdade de Americana, Americana, Brazil

3: Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, Brazil

4: Gent University, Gent, Belgium

Measuring career adaptabilities in the Brazilian context: Development and validation of

the CAAS+C Brazilian Form

Abstract

This paper documents the translation and adaptation of the *Career Adapt-Abilities Scale +
Cooperation Scale* (CAAS+C; Savickas & Porfeli, 2015) to the Brazilian context and provides
internal structure and convergent validity evidence for this instrument through the testing its
factorial structure and exploring its relationships with external variables (i.e., Big Five traits, social
support, and preference for working in groups). We gathered data in two Brazilian samples (N =
351 and N = 920). Regarding the internal structure of the 30-item CAAS+C-Brazilian Form, the
results provided support for the expected five-dimensional solution, including career Concern,
Control, Curiosity, Confidence, and Cooperation. Further, Cooperation was the adaptability
dimension with the strongest correlation with social support, and positive and moderately
correlated with Agreeableness. Finally, Cooperation was identified as the only adaptability
dimension significantly related to the preference for working in groups. The results of this study
provide support for the structural and criterion validity of the CAAS+C scale in a Brazilian context.
The results of the Cooperation subscale are highlighted as they are initial evidence of validity for
the Brazilian context.

Keywords: career counseling; career adaptability; social support; career construction

Measuring career adaptabilities in the Brazilian context: Development and validation of

the CAAS+C Brazilian Form

21st century careers have been described as rapidly changing and increasingly characterized by uncertainty and volatility (Savickas et al., 2009). In the Brazilian context, employment forms and career constructions are on the rise that promotes this tension between stability/permanence and flexibility/change (Ribeiro, 2015). In this context, the concept of career adaptability has been introduced to help understand how people can cope with the challenges bound to the new career landscape. Proposed by Savickas (2013), the concept of career adaptability is widely explored in the literature and constantly updated. The last update was made by Savickas and Porfeli (2015), who added the Cooperation (+C) subscale to the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale (CAAS). Thus, this study aims to test the internal structure and correlations with external variables of the CAAS+C in the Brazilian context.

Career Adapt-Abilities Scale + Cooperation

Savickas (2013) defined career adaptability as a psychosocial construct related to "resources for coping with current and anticipated vocational development tasks, occupational transitions, and work traumas that, to some degree large or small, alter their social integration" (p. 157). To stimulate its use in career research and practice, Savickas and Porfeli (2012), in an integrated effort with researchers from 13 countries, developed the CAAS as a suitable assessment instrument for this construct. The widely used CAAS 24-items measures each of the four dimensions of the construct (i.e., Concern, Control, Curiosity, and Confidence), known for "four C's".

Savickas (2013) and Savickas and Porfeli (2012) defined the "four C's" of career adaptability as follows. *Concern* involves thinking about one's career-related future proactively, preparing to face challenges in an optimistic manner (e.g., planning how to achieve career goals). *Control* refers to the capability to make decisions about and to take responsibility over one's career. *Curiosity* is about the ability to explore the self as well as one's environment to make decisions in an informed and objective way. Finally, *Confidence* entails the success expectations of an individual regarding the actions that will need to be performed to establish a successful career (e.g., learning new skills). Studies using a Brazilian version of the CAAS were conducted by Teixeira, Bardagi, Lassance, Magalhães and Duarte (2012) and by Audibert and Teixeira (2015), confirming the original factor structure and showing adequate reliability coefficients for each of the four subscales of the instrument.

In 2015, Savickas and Porfeli uploaded an update/adaptation of the CAAS on the website of Vocopher (www.vocopher.com), which is a career collaboratory involving academic professionals, career counselors, and professional web developers from around the globe. The update described the development of a new version of the CAAS, also including a Cooperation subscale, composed of 11 items. In addition, the authors explained how their original attempt to add a Cooperation subscale ("+C") in the original CAAS failed because it did not correlate with any of the other CAAS dimensions.

Nye, Leong, Prasad, Gardner, and Tien (2017) suggest that adding the Cooperation subscale is necessary due to the theoretical conceptualization of adaptability, which suggests an interpersonal component that is not represented by the four C's. Furthermore, the authors point out that the interpersonal relationship is associated with individuals who live in cultures that value collectivity and need to be integrated into adaptability models. Einarsdóttir,

Vilhjálmsdóttir, Smáradóttir, and Kjartansdóttir (2015) reinforce that Cooperation can be a

resource that assists in career transitions, as individuals who have more cooperative attitudes

with other people tend to have easier adaptations.

Savickas and Porfeli (2015) defined *Cooperation* as an interpersonal resource that

becomes activated during career transitions, supporting the relational component of adaptability.

Building on this measurement innovation, Einarsdóttir et al. (2015) reported a study testing the

CAAS+C in a sample of Icelandic students. Based on factor analysis, these authors retained six

out of the original 11 items that had the strongest loadings (i.e., Getting along with all kinds of

people; Cooperating with others on group projects; Compromising with other people; Going

along with the group; Sharing with others; Understanding others point of view). In this Icelandic

sample, all CAAS+C dimensions demonstrated good internal consistencies, with Cronbach's

alpha's ranging from .82 (Control and Confidence) to .87 (Cooperation).

Following up on this, Nye et al. (2017) also conducted a psychometric study on the

CAAS+C using samples from the United States, China, and Thailand. Similar to the Icelandic

study, Nye et al. (2017) also selected the six highest-loading items (i.e., Playing my part on a

team; Getting along with all kinds of people; Compromising with other people; Learning to be a

good listener; Sharing with others; Hiding my true feelings for the good of the group) as

indicators of Cooperation. Next, Nye et al. (2017) proposed a 30-item version for CAAS+C,

representing the four original C's plus Cooperation. Again, reliability was satisfactory in the

three samples, except for the Concern dimension specifically in the American sample ($\alpha = .62$).

CAAS + C: correlation with support social and Big Five

Considering that Cooperation refers to an interpersonal resource activated during career transitions, this characteristic can expect to be associated with perceptions of received social support. Previous work relating the original four C's to social support has yielded mixed and generally weak findings, as detailed below. Kenny and Bledsoe (2005) indicated that participants with more support from family, friends, teachers, and colleagues reported higher career adaptability levels. The results found by Hirschi (2009) suggest that the perceived social support was a positive predictor of greater career adaptability. Wang and Fu (2015) demonstrated that social support positively predicted career adaptability. Ghosh and Fouad (2017) reported negative and weak correlations between social support and Concern, Control, and Confidence.

Previous studies have found statistically significant relationships between the four dimensions of career adaptability and the Big Five personality factors. A meta-analysis study conducted with data from 90 studies that the general score of career adaptability is more strongly correlated with the Big Five's Conscientiousness ($r = .49$; Rudolph, Lavigne, & Zacher, 2017). Similar results have been recovered in national studies (Bardagi & Albanaes, 2015; Teixeira et al., 2012). In both studies, Conscientiousness was identified as the trait most strongly correlated to a total score of career adaptability ($r = .56$ and $.48$, respectively). In addition, strong correlations were observed between Concern, Control, Confidence and Conscientiousness, and Curiosity and Openness regarding career adaptability dimensions. To the best of our knowledge, no previous research has investigated the relationship between social support and the Big Five and the extended model of career adaptabilities, including Cooperation in addition to the previously defined four C's.

Purpose and hypotheses of the study

The current study, testing the internal structure and external correlations of the CAAS+C in a Brazilian context, is consistent with a greater effort in the literature to expand the international use of career assessment instruments. It can be argued that Brazil, as an example of a collectivist culture (Gouveia & Clemente, 2000; Vaz-Torres & Pérez-Nebra, 2015), represents a particularly appropriate setting to test the relevance of an additional Cooperation scale in the context of career adaptabilities. Evidence for the validity of the CAAS+C will be sought in two ways. First, factor analysis will be used to investigate the internal structure of the CAAS+C in the Brazilian context. Second, CAAS+C dimensions will be related to a range of criteria, including perceived social support, Big Five personality traits, and the preference for working in groups to seek evidence of convergent validity for CAAS+C.

Four hypotheses were formulated to guide this research. First, regarding the internal structure of the CAAS+C, it is expected that five dimensions can be identified, describing Concern, Control, Confidence, Curiosity, and Cooperation (Hypothesis 1). In addition, three hypotheses describe the expected associations between career adaptabilities and the external variables included in this study. Regarding the relationship of perceived social support, we expect the Cooperation dimension to demonstrate stronger correlations than the other adaptability dimensions (Hypothesis 2). Regarding associations with Big Five traits, we expect all adaptability dimensions to demonstrate positive and moderate correlations with Conscientiousness (Hypothesis 3a) and, for Cooperation in particular, we also expected an additional positive association with Agreeableness (Hypothesis 3b). Finally, regarding the relationship of a preference for working in groups, we expected the Cooperation to be positively correlated with this preference (Hypothesis 4).

Method

Translation

Prior to collecting data, a Brazilian-Portuguese version of the CAAS+C was developed using a translation-back translation procedure. Because Brazilian Portuguese items were already available for the original C's of adaptability, only the 11 Cooperation items needed to be translated and adapted. Three bilingual psychologists, i.e., Portuguese native speakers who are proficient in English, translated the items as part of their graduate program. Once finished, there was a brief discussion to select the best wording for the items. In the second stage, the Portuguese version was back-translated into English by a professional who was not familiar with the original items. These back-translated items were sent back to one of the authors of the original instrument, who considered 10 out of 11 items appropriate. The only item indicated as inappropriate in the original version was "Going along with the group," which was back-translated as "Making part of a group." After the author's advice of the original instrument, this item was modified in Portuguese and, when back-translated again, was considered appropriate.

Participants and procedures

The Sample 1 consisted of 351 people (62.7% female) with ages ranging from 18 to 65 years old ($M = 33.48$; $SD = 9.81$). All participants were employed at the time of the data collection, and the educational level of participants ranged from elementary school to graduate program, with the highest concentration of participants at the levels of College ($n = 107$; 30.5%) and Graduate program ($n = 84$; 23.9%). Participants were from 18 Brazilian states; around 70% were from the southeast region, where the cities of São Paulo, Campinas, Belo Horizonte, and Rio de Janeiro are located.

Data were collected using an online survey that was distributed by e-mail and social media (i.e., Facebook). Participants provided their informed consent before completing the questionnaires. Participants subsequently completed a socio-demographic questionnaire, followed by the newly developed CAAS+C.

Sample 2 consisted of 920 (53.4% female) participants between 15 and 65 years old (M = 23.53; SD = 8.53). Most of the participants came from the Southeast (63.8%) and Mideast (where cities of Brasilia and Goiania are located; 11.7%) regions. There was no overlap with Sample 1.

Sample 2 was split into two subsamples, one formed by adolescents (Sample 2a) and the other populated by adults (Sample 2b). The adolescent subsample consisted of 293 participants (68.9% female), ranging between 15 and 18 years old (M = 17.20; SD = .86). All of them were either still in high school (80.9%) or completed high school the year before (19.1%). The adult subsample consisted of 627 participants (64.2% female) ranging between 19 and 65 years old (M = 26.51; SD = 8.88). Educational levels included Elementary school (n = 158; 25.4%), Higher education (n = 361; 57.9%) and Graduate program (n = 104; 16.7%).

Data collection for Study 2 was conducted after finishing Study 1. In addition to CAAS+C, two other constructs were assessed in this study, including social support and Big Five personality. Similar to Study 1, all data for this study were collected using an online survey that was distributed via e-mail and social media. Adolescents and Adults (Sample 2a and 2b) were asked to complete only the socio-demographic questionnaire and the CAAS+C. In addition to these instruments, 253 adults (Sample 2b) also answered two other instruments for measuring social support and Big Five traits.

Instruments

   Socio-demographic questionnaire. All participants were asked to report on their

demographic characteristics, including gender (1 = female; 2 = male), age (open question),

educational level (1 = high school; 2 = higher education; 3 = graduate students), current

occupation (open question) and state of residence. To assess the preference for working in

groups, in Sample 2a and 2b, participants were additionally asked: "how do you prefer to

accomplish your activities (at work or school): alone or in groups?". Participants had to select

one of both response options.

   Career Adapt-Abilities Scale + Cooperation Scale (CAAS+C). We used the Brazilian

version of CAAS (Savickas & Porfeli, 2015), adapted by Audibert and Teixeira (2015). This

scale consists of 24 items to measure the 4 C's (and a general adaptability score). For the current

study, we included 11 additional items (see Study 1) to measure a fifth Cooperation dimension,

bringing the total number of items for the CAAS+C to 35. Cronbach alpha coefficients are

reported in Table 1 and Table 3.

   Social Support Perceptions Scale – adult Version (EPSUS-A, from Portuguese acronym -

Cardoso & Baptista, 2014). This widely used instrument aims to assess perceptions of received

social support. The scale has 36 items, distributed across four factors: Affective (referring to

emotional support; $\alpha = .92$), Social Interactions (referring to support from interpersonal

relationships; $\alpha = .75$), Instrumental (referring to the perception of material and financial support;

$\alpha = .82$) and Coping with Problems (referring to the perceived availability of people who can

help out with decision making or conflict solving; $\alpha = .83$). Responses are coded using a 4-point

Likert-type scale, ranging from 0 (never) to 3 (often).

*Big Five Inventory (*John & Srivastava, 1999; Brazilian version by Andrade, 2008*).* This inventory assesses personality from a Big Five perspective. It consists of 44 items distributed across five factors, including Openness (values the artistic, the aesthetic; $\alpha = .75$), Conscientiousness (insists on completing task or work; $\alpha = .79$), Agreeableness (likes to cooperate with others; $\alpha = .71$), Extraversion (is conversational, communicative; $\alpha = .82$), and Neuroticism (is depressed, sad; $\alpha = .82$). Response options are presented on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Data analysis

Study 1. To test Hypothesis 1, we conduct Exploratory Factor Analysis to investigate CAAS + C's internal structure. We used Weighted Least Squares Mean and Variance Adjusted (WLSMV) estimators and the Geomin rotation method since they are ordinal data and with dimensions that are related to each other. Initially, we used the Parallel Analysis how the factorial retention method to investigate the number of factors to be extracted (Hayton, Allen, & Scarpello, 2004). Reliability was evaluated based on internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha).

Study 2. In addition, Confirmatory Factor Analysis was conducted using Weighted Least Squares Mean and Variance Adjusted (WLSMV) estimators. Model fit was evaluated using the chi-square test and other commonly used indices, including Confirmatory Fit Index (CFI > .95), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI > .95), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA < .06; Hu & Bentler, 1999). To test Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4, we performed Pearson correlations between career adaptability, social support, and the Big Five. To perform the analysis, we used MPlus 7.11 and SPSS 25 software.

Results

Study 1

After the translation, the newly developed Cooperation items were integrated into the existing CAAS Brazilian form (Audibert & Teixeira, 2015; Teixeira et al., 2012) and administered in Sample 1. The 35 items were submitted to Exploratory Factor Analysis, expecting that five dimensions would emerge. However, a Parallel Analysis suggested the extraction of only three dimensions. We next performed Exploratory Factor Analysis to evaluate the extraction of one (X^2 (560) = 3936.977; p = .01; CFI = .80; TLI = .79; RMSEA = .13), two (X^2 (526) = 2654.889; p = .01; CFI = .87; TLI = .86; RMSEA = .11), three (X^2 (493) = 2043.193; p = .01; CFI = .91; TLI = .89; RMSEA = .10), four (X^2 (461) = 1505.925; p = .01; CFI = .94; TLI = .92; RMSEA = .08), and five (X^2 (430) = 1212.801; p = .01; CFI = .95; TLI = .94; RMSEA = .07) dimensions. The five-dimensional structure was the one with the best fit indexes, according to theoretical expectations. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

CAAS+C Exploratory Factor Analysis with five dimensions

Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
1- Thinking about what my future will be like	**.83**	-.05	-.06	.02	.10
2- Realizing that today's choices shape my future	**.72**	.05	-.06	.08	.16
3- Preparing for the future	**.78**	-.01	.12	.15	-.08
4- Becoming aware of the educational and vocational choices that I must make	**.67**	.07	.20	-.01	.03
5- Planning how to achieve my goals	**.60**	.03	.38	.02	-.01
6- Concerned about my career	**.63**	.00	.40	-.04	.01
7- Keeping upbeat	.09	**.52**	.20	-.02	.06
8- Making decisions by myself	.18	**.66**	.00	.02	-.08
9- Taking responsibility for my actions	-.01	**.56**	.00	.15	.22
10- Sticking up for my beliefs	-.10	**.73**	.06	.06	.13
11- Counting on myself	.04	**.70**	.09	.05	.08
12- Doing what's right for me	-.06	**.74**	.06	.02	.09
13- Exploring my surroundings	.00	.49	**.39**	.04	.01

Item					
14- Looking for opportunities to grow as a person	.12	.40	**.43**	.09	-.01
15- Investigating options before making a choice	.08	.17	**.58**	-.02	.14
16- Observing different ways of doing things	.04	.08	**.68**	.01	.15
17- Probing deeply into questions that I have	-.02	.16	**.56**	.15	.12
18- Becoming curious about new opportunities	.03	.30	**.43**	.24	-.04
19- Performing tasks efficiently	.07	.08	.17	**.69**	.06
20- Taking care to do things wel	.05	.05	.00	**.85**	.09
21- Learning new skills	.00	.15	.27	**.54**	.04
22- Working up to my ability	.09	.01	.15	**.74**	.09
23- Overcoming obstacles	.02	.02	.47	**.55**	.01
24- Solving problems	-.01	.02	.48	**.60**	.00
25- Becoming less self-centered	-.07	-.30	.33	.04	**.65**
26- Acting friendly	-.01	-.30	.27	.11	**.79**
27- Getting along with all kinds of people	-.10	-.01	.10	.05	**.76**
28- Cooperating with others on group projects	-.05	-.08	-.03	.08	**.92***
29- Playing my part on a team	.03	.10	-.19	.19	**.81***
30- Compromising with other people	.06	.15	-.19	.11	**.81***
31- Learning to be a good listener	.12	-.06	.11	-.13	**.80***
32- Contributing to my Community	.05	.07	.20	-.21	**.68**
33- Going along with the group	.02	.12	.02	-.34	**.84***
34- Sharing with others	.00	.14	-.02	-.21	**.89***
35- Hiding my true feelings for the good of the group	.16	.00	.02	-.28	**.53**
Alpha	.88	.90	.89	.91	.93

Correlations between factors					
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
Concern	1				
Control	.48	1			
Curiosity	.36	.56	1		
Confidence	.40	.57	.45	1	
Cooperation	.36	.59	.52	.63	1

Note. Items in bold indicate factors to which they were alocated; * = 6 items with higher loadings. Labels: F1 = Concern; F2 = Control; F3 = Curiosity; F4 = Confidence; F5 = Cooperation. Items in Portuguese can be found in the supplementary materials.

Table 1 shows that the item loadings were generally consistent with the expectations.

However, three Curiosity items (see items 13, 14, and 18) and two Confidence items (see items

23 and 24) demonstrated substantial cross-loadings: in this case, loaded on Curiosity and

Control. It is essential to highlight that item 13 had primary loadings on a different dimension

than Curiosity. In other cases, when cross-loadings were observed, primary loadings were

located on the expected dimensions. Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from .88 to .93, and

correlations between factors ranged from .36 to .63.

Focusing on the Cooperation scale (items 25-35), results showed that all items behaved as

expected, and only smaller cross-loadings were observed. The six highest loading items were 28,

29, 30, 31, 33, and 34. Cronbach's alpha for this scale with only six items was .90. which was

close to the alpha obtained when all 11 items were included (.93).

Study 2

In Study 2, we tested the structure of both the 35-item scale (CAAS + 11 Cooperation

items) and the 30-item scale (CAAS + 6 selected items). This was done in the total Sample 2 (n =

920) as well as in the adolescent and adult subsamples separately. Additionally, we analyzed the

associations with external variables, including social support, Big Five personality, and

preference for working in groups.

Table 2

CAAS+C Confirmatory Factor Analysis

	TS-35i	TS-30i	Adults-35i	Adults-30i	Adolescents-35i	Adolescents-30i
X^2	2311.033	1778.169	1790.751	1379.304	1034.182	771.495
df	550	395	550	395	550	395
p	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01
CFI	.95	.96	.96	.96	.95	.96
TLI	.95	.95	.95	.96	.95	.95
RMSEA	.06	.06	.06	.06	.06	.06
Items			Loadings			
Concern						

Item 1	.70	.70	.71	.71	.69	.69
Item 2	.73	.73	.73	.73	.71	.71
Item 3	.82	.82	.84	.84	.76	.76
Item 4	.83	.83	.84	.84	.78	.78
Item 5	.83	.83	.84	.84	.80	.80
Item 6	.80	.80	.85	.84	.69	.69
Control						
Item 7	.74	.73	.76	.75	.69	.70
Item 8	.68	.68	.71	.72	.60	.60
Item 9	.78	.77	.80	.79	.74	.73
Item 10	.79	.79	.77	.77	.81	.81
Item 11	.78	.78	.80	.80	.76	.76
Item 12	.72	.72	.74	.74	.64	.64
Curiosity						
Item 13	.73	.73	.75	.75	.69	.69
Item 14	.83	.83	.84	.84	.81	.81
Item 15	.76	.76	.78	.78	.69	.68
Item 16	.81	.81	.81	.81	.80	.80
Item 17	.76	.76	.77	.77	.70	.70
Item 18	.78	.78	.78	.79	.75	.75
Confidence						
Item 19	.82	.83	.84	.84	.78	.78
Item 20	.79	.79	.82	.82	.72	.72
Item 21	.80	.80	.79	.79	.84	.84
Item 22	.85	.85	.85	.85	.83	.82
Item 23	.82	.81	.83	.83	.79	.79
Item 24	.81	.81	.84	.83	.71	.71
Cooperation						
Item 25	.62		.68		.49	
Item 26	.75		.78		.68	
Item 27	.76		.78		.74	
Item 28	.81	.79	.84	.83	.74	.69
Item 29	.82	.86	.82	.86	.84	.88
Item 30	.80	.81	.80	.80	.81	.81
Item 31	.69	.67	.72	.72	.62	.56
Item 32	.73		.75		.68	
Item 33	.57	.55	.60	.60	.47	.42
Item 34	.75	.75	.78	.79	.65	.63
Item 35	.33		.32		.41	

Note. TS = total sample; 35i = 35-item version; 30i = 30-item version. Total sample = 920; Adults = 627; Adolescents = 293.

The results of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis are shown in Table 2. It can be seen that in all conditions tested, across instrument versions and samples, fit values were good. Although the indices were quite similar in all configurations tested, the model with six items in the Cooperation dimension slightly outperformed the model with all 11 Cooperation items as

indicated by more favorable CFI and TLI values. It is noted in Table 2 that the factorial loads

were all greater than .30 in all conditions tested, highlighting the conditions with the six selected

Cooperation items, which presented loads of .40 in the Cooperation dimension. Table 3 presents

the correlations between the CAAS+C (30 items), the EPSUS-A, and the BFI, based on data

from participants who completed all instruments ($n = 252$).

Table 3

Correlations between career adaptability, social support, and Big Five

	M(SD)	Conc	Cont	Curi	Conf	Coop	Af	SI	In	CP	Ext	Agre	Cons	Neur	Open
Concern	3.52(.80)	(.88)													
Control	3.73(.78)	.61***	(.84)												
Curiosity	3.48(.81)	.68***	.64***	(.87)											
Confidence	3.85(.75)	.60***	.65***	.71***	(.88)										
Cooperation	3.85(.72)	.44***	.48***	.51***	.58***	(.84)									
Affective	2.14(.51)	.15*	.17**	.19**	.26***	.38**	(.94)								
Social interactions	1.64(.62)	.12	.13*	.12	.16*	.22**	.69***	(.80)							
Instrumental	1.71(.81)	.03	-.03	.07	.05	.14*	.52***	.41***	(.93)						
Coping problem	1.84(.59)	.09	.10	.15*	.19**	.23**	.81***	.60***	.63***	(.88)					
Extraversion	3.32(.71)	.22***	.37***	.26***	.32***	.28**	.32***	.29***	.06	.25**	(.82)				
Agreeableness	3.57(.54)	.23***	.17**	.20***	.26***	.46***	.38***	.27***	.15*	.28**	.25***	(.71)			
Conscientiouness	3.64(.60)	.35***	.28***	.28***	.45***	.21***	.14*	.14*	-.10	.04	.24***	.26***	(.79)		
Neuroticism	2.98(.72)	-.26***	-.29***	-.19***	-.21***	-.23***	-.24***	-.27***	-.13*	-.15*	-.17**	-.57***	-.28***	(.82)	
Openness	3.66(.54)	.23***	.31***	.40***	.34***	.22***	.12	.08	-.01	.08	.40***	.10	.12*	-.08	(.75)
Working in group	.57(.50)	-.01	.04	.04	.06	.20**	.18**	.17***	.17**	.15*	.17**	.34***	.01	-.23***	.09

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. $n = 252$ participants (adults). In parentheses are Alphas. Working alone was scored 0; working in a group was scored 1.

Correlations between adaptability and social support were generally weak, and

Cooperation was the only adaptability dimension significantly correlated with all EPSUS-A

subscales. The strongest correlation was observed for Cooperation and Affective, social support.

Correlations between adaptability and the five big personality factors were generally positives,

with magnitudes weak and moderate. All dimensions of CAAS+C were negatively correlated

with Neuroticism. Finally, participants were also asked whether they preferred to carry out their

activities (work or academic) alone or in a group. Among the dimensions of CAAS+C, only

Cooperation showed a significant correlation, positive and of weak magnitude with preference for working in groups.

Discussion

Across the globe, professional careers are increasingly characterized by volatility and uncertainty. To facilitate the understanding of how people can cope with this changing career context, researchers and practitioners have introduced tools such as the career adaptabilities scale (CAAS) and its extended version, the CAAS+C, which includes an additional Cooperation scale. The objective of this paper was to document the development and validation of the CAAS+C Brazilian form. In general, our results showed that the CAAS+C Brazilian form has an internal structure closely resembling what can be expected based on the underlying theory, although some additional findings also emerged. One noteworthy finding from Study 1 relates to the presence of cross-loadings, in particular for items that belong to the Curiosity and Confidence dimensions. In this regard, our findings somewhat diverge from previous research using this item set in a Brazilian context (Audibert & Teixeira, 2015) without comparable structural problems. More importantly, all items belonging to the newly developed Cooperation scale, which was the main focus of the present study, behaved as expected in the exploratory analysis.

Based on the results of the exploratory factor analysis in Study 1, we identified the six items with the highest factor loading to match the number of items in the Cooperation dimension Cooperation to the other dimensions of the CAAS. This approach was similar to previous research by Einarsdóttir et al. (2015) and Nye et al. (2017), which developed adaptations of the CAAS+C in different cultural contexts. Two Cooperation items are shared across the three adapted versions, namely item 30 ('Compromising with other people') and item 34 ('Sharing

with others'). The four other items of the Brazilian translation were as follows: 'Cooperating with others in group projects' and 'Going along with the group' (items 28 and 33), also present in the version of Einarsdóttir et al. (2015), and 'Playing my part on a team' and 'Learning to be a good listener' (items 29 and 31), also included in the version of Nye et al. (2017). On the one hand, these findings may be indicative of a common core of the Cooperation dimension across cultural contexts, pointing to the importance of committing to and sharing with other people. On the other hand, there also appear to be subtle cross-cultural differences in the exact meaning of the Cooperation dimension that can be taken into account when assessing this construct.

One can further note that the selection of six Cooperation items (out of originally eleven items) did not lead to a significant loss of scale reliability. The result of this item selection was corroborated in Study 2, where it was shown that the six-item Cooperation scale demonstrated the most optimal fit indexes in the confirmatory factor analysis, both in the total sample and in the adolescent and adult subsamples.

Study 2 sought to provide further convergent validity evidence for the CAAS+C scale by examining relations with other relevant variables. First, as expected (Hypothesis 2), Cooperation was the only adaptability dimension that correlated significantly with all social support factors, and the highest correlations with these social support factors were also found for this adaptability dimension in particular. These results are in line with earlier findings (Hirschi, 2009; Kenny & Bledsoe, 2005; Wang & Fu, 2015), in which social support has also been positively correlated with the dimensions of career adaptability. Zooming in on these associations, the correlation between Cooperation and Affective Support ($r = .38$) can be highlighted, showing that cooperation, as an adaptation strategy, is related to the perception of emotional closeness, more than other forms of support (Cardoso & Baptista, 2014). Affective Support too was most strongly

correlated with the other career adaptability dimensions. In a longitudinal study, Fiori, Bollmann, and Rossier (2015) found that participants with higher scores for career adaptability experienced more positive affections than those with lower scores. Thus, high levels of career adaptability work as a protection against the decline of these affections.

Our expectations about the correlations between CAAS+C and Big Five personality factors (Hypotheses 3a and 3b) were confirmed. As expected, all adaptability dimensions correlated significantly with Conscientiousness, with weak and moderate magnitudes, As pointed out in previous studies (Bardagi & Albanes, 2015; Rudolph et al., 2017; Teixeira et al., 2012). In particular, the Cooperation dimension showed weak correlations with personality traits, except with Agreeableness, that the correlation was positive and moderate, as expected (Hypothesis 3b).

It was also observed that the Curiosity and Confidence correlated with the Coping with problems dimension of social support. Moreover, among the dimensions of career adaptability, these were the most strongly related with Openness to Experience and Conscientiousness. The Coping with problems dimension is related to the perception of listening and empathy behaviors offered by other people, which help in conflict resolution and decision making (Cardoso & Baptista, 2014). Career adaptability plays a prominent role in career exploration behaviors, highlighting the Curiosity dimension. Li et al. (2015) found that the factors Openness and Conscientiousness are strong predictors of career exploration. Thus, individuals who tend to be more curious, creative, receptive to change, disciplined, and self-confident have a high level of propensity to perform career exploration behaviors and decision making.

Finally, confirming our expectations (Hypothesis 4), our results showed that a high score on Cooperation is related to the preference for group activities. In addition, it is worth noting that Cooperation was the only dimension of CAAS+C that significantly correlated with working in

groups. Thus, the results obtained in this study suggest that Cooperation, as an adaptive resource, functions as an interpersonal strategy in work environments that are likely to encourage sharing of information and commitment to team goals and objectives (Savickas & Porfeli, 2015).

In summary, the present study showed that the newly developed CAAS+C tailored to the Brazilian context demonstrates adequate psychometric properties for use in career interventions. Furthermore, the CAAS+C is a necessary extension of the CAAS given that, in unstable career contexts, it is important to evaluate not only intrapersonal resources but also interpersonal aspects of adaptability, such as cooperative strategies. Using the CAAS+C in this context will facilitate interventions that aim to promote the development of the career competencies which are essential for career self-management.

Ethical Compliance Section

Funding: This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001

Compliance with Ethical Standards: All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Informed Consent: Informed consent was obtained from all individual adult participants included in the study; assent was obtained from children.

References

Andrade, J. M. (2008). *Evidências de validade do inventário dos cinco grandes fatores de personalidade para o Brasil* [*Validity evidence of Big Five Inventory in Brazil*] (Doctoral Thesis on Social Psychology, Work and Organizations). Universidade de Brasília, Brasília-DF Brazil.

Audibert, A., & Teixeira, M. A. P. (2015). Escala de adaptabilidade de carreira: evidências de validade em universitários brasileiros [Career adaptability scale: evidences of validity in Brazilian university students]. *Revista Brasileira de Orientação Profissional*, *16*(1). Retrieved from http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=203041069009

Bardagi, M. P., & Albanaes, P. (2015). Relações entre Adaptabilidade de carreira e personalidade: Um estudo com universitários ingressantes brasileiros [Relationship between career adaptability and personality: A study with Brazilian university students]. *Psicologia, 29*(1), 35–44. Retrieved from http://www.scielo.mec.pt/pdf/psi/v29n1/v29n1a04.pdf

Cardoso, H. F., & Baptista, M. N. (2014). Escala de Percepção do Suporte Social (versão adulta) – EPSUS-A: estudo das qualidades psicométricas [Social Support Perception Scale (adult version) - EPSUS-A: a study of psychometric qualities]. *Psico-USF, 19*(3), 499-510. https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-82712014019003012

Cardoso, H. F., & Baptista, M. N. (2015). Evidência de Validade para a Escala de Percepção do Suporte Social (Versão Adulta) - EPSUS-A: um Estudo Correlacional [Evidence of Validity for the Social Support Perception Scale (Adult Version) - EPSUS-A: a Correlational Study]. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão, 35*(3), 946-958. doi: 101590/1982-3703001352013

Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Einarsdóttir, S., Vilhjálmsdóttir, G., Smáradóttir, S. B., & Kjartansdóttir, G. B. (2015). A culture-sensitive approach in the development of the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale in Iceland: Theoretical and operational considerations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 89*, 172-181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.06.006

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

Ghosh, A., & Fouad, N. A. (2017). Career Adaptability and Social Support Among Graduating College Seniors. *The Career Development Quarterly, 65*(3), 278-283. https://doi.org/10.1002/cdq.12098

Gouveia, V. V., & Clemente, M. (2000). O individualismo-coletivismo no Brasil e na Espanha: Correlatos sócio-demográficos [Individualism-collectivism in Brazil and Spain: Socio-demographic correlates]. *Estudos de Psicologia (Natal), 5*(2), 317-346. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-294X2000000200003

Hayton, J. C., Allen, D. G., & Scarpello, V. (2004). Factor retention decisions in exploratory factor analysis: A tutorial on parallel analysis. *Organizational Research Methods, 7*(2), 191-205. doi: 10.1177/1094428104263675

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

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

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.

Johnston, C. S. (2016). A sistematic review of the career adaptability literature and future outlook. *Journal of Career Assessment, 26*(1), 3-30. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072716679921

Kenny, M. E., & Bledsoe, M. (2005). Contributions of the relational context to career adaptability among urban adolescents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*(2), 257−272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.10.002

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.04.006

Nye, C., Leong, F., Prasad., J., Gardner, D., & Tien, H. L. S. (2017). Examining the Structure of the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale: The Cooperation Dimension and a Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072717722767

Ribeiro, M. A. (2015). Contemporary patterns of career construction of a group of urban workers in São Paulo (Brazil). *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 88*, 19-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.02.008

Rudolph, C. W., Lavigne, K. N., & Zacher, H. (2017). Career adaptability: A meta-analysis of relationships with measures of adaptivity, adapting responses, and adaptation results. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 98*, 17-34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2016.09.002

Savickas, M. L. (2013). The theory and practice of career construction. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career Development and Counseling: Putting Theory and Research to Work* (2nd ed., pp. 147–183). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

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

Savickas, M. L., & Porfeli, E. J. (2015). The Career Adapt-Abilities Scale + Cooperation Scale. *Vocopher*.

Savickas, M. L., Nota, L., Rossier, J., Dauwalder, J., Duarte, M. E., Guichard, J., … Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2009). Life designing: A paradigm for career construction in the 21st century. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*(3), 239–250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.04.004

Teixeira, M. A. P., Bardagi, M. P., Lassance, M. C. P., Magalhães, M. de O., & Duarte, M. E. (2012). Career Adapt-Abilities Scale — Brazilian Form: Psychometric properties and relationships to personality. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(3), 680–685. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.007

Timmerman, M. E., & Lorenzo-Seva, U. (2011). Dimensionality assessment of ordered polytomous items with parallel analysis. *Psychological methods*, *16*(2), 209-220. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023353

Vaz-Torres, C., & Pérez-Nebra, A. R. (2015). Evaluación del individualismo-colectivismo vertical-horizontal en Brasil: una propuesta de medida [Assessing vertical-horizontal individualism-

collectivism in Brazil: an instrument proposed]. *Perspectivas en Psicología, 12*(2), 9-21.

Retrieved from http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/4835/483547667002.pdf

Wang, Z., & Fu, Y. (2015). Social support, social comparison, and career adaptability: A moderated

mediation model. *Social Behavior and Personality, 43*(4), 649–659.

https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2015.43.4.649

Appendix

Career Adapt-Abilites Scale + Cooperation Scale - CAAS+C Brazilian Form

Diferentes pessoas usam diferentes pontos fortes para construir suas carreiras. Ninguém é bom em tudo, cada um de nós enfatiza alguns pontos mais do que outros. Por favor, **avalie o quanto você desenvolveu cada uma das seguintes habilidades** usando a escala abaixo. Por favor, marque a resposta de acordo com o seu momento atual, isto é, de acordo com o modo como você vê, hoje, o quanto desenvolveu cada uma das habilidades abaixo:

Desenvolvi pouco ou nada	Desenvolvi mais ou menos	Desenvolvi bem	Desenvolvi muito bem	Desenvolvi extremamente bem
1	2	3	4	5

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Pensar sobre como será o meu futuro	1	2	3	4	5
2. Perceber que meu futuro depende das escolhas de hoje	1	2	3	4	5
3. Preparar-me para o futuro	1	2	3	4	5
4. Estar atento(a) às escolhas educacionais e profissionais que eu devo fazer	1	2	3	4	5
5. Planejar como atingir meus objetivos	1	2	3	4	5
6. Pensar com cuidado sobre minha carreira	1	2	3	4	5
7. Manter-me entusiasmado(a) e otimista	1	2	3	4	5
8. Tomar decisões por conta própria	1	2	3	4	5
9. Assumir responsabilidade pelos meus atos	1	2	3	4	5
10. Manter-me fiel às minhas convicções	1	2	3	4	5
11. Acreditar na minha capacidade de dirigir a própria vida	1	2	3	4	5
12. Fazer o que eu considero certo para mim	1	2	3	4	5
13. Explorar o ambiente ao meu redor	1	2	3	4	5
14. Procurar por oportunidades de crescimento pessoal	1	2	3	4	5
15. Explorar as opções antes de fazer uma escolha	1	2	3	4	5
16. Observar diferentes maneiras de fazer as coisas	1	2	3	4	5
17. Investigar profundamente as questões/dúvidas que eu tenho	1	2	3	4	5
18. Ser curioso(a) com relação a novas oportunidades	1	2	3	4	5
19. Realizar as tarefas de forma eficiente	1	2	3	4	5
20. Ser cuidadoso(a) para fazer as coisas bem feitas	1	2	3	4	5
21. Aprender novas habilidades	1	2	3	4	5
22. Esforçar-me para fazer o melhor possível dentro das minhas habilidades	1	2	3	4	5
23. Superar obstáculos	1	2	3	4	5
24. Solucionar problemas	1	2	3	4	5
25. Ser menos egoísta	1	2	3	4	5
26. Agir amigavelmente	1	2	3	4	5
27. Estabelecer relações com todos os tipos de pessoas	1	2	3	4	5
28. Cooperar com os outros em projetos grupais*	1	2	3	4	5
29. Fazer minha parte em uma equipe*	1	2	3	4	5
30. Comprometer-me com outras pessoas*	1	2	3	4	5
31. Aprender a ser um bom ouvinte*	1	2	3	4	5

32. Contribuir para a minha comunidade	1	2	3	4	5
33. Abrir mão de uma opinião e aceitar o que o grupo decidir*	1	2	3	4	5
34. Compartilhar com os outros*	1	2	3	4	5
35. Esconder meus verdadeiros sentimentos pelo bem grupal	1	2	3	4	5

Note. The itens from 1 to 24 was retrieved from Audibert and Teixeira (2015). Marked with an asterisk are selected Cooperation items in this manuscript.