THE IMPACT OF CULTURAL INDIVIDUALISM & COLLECTIVISM ON

PROTEAN & BOUNDARYLESS CAREER ATTITUDES

AND JOB SATISFACTION

By

RE-AN REN HONG

Bachelor of Business Administration
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas
2005

Master of Arts
Texas State University–San Marcos
San Marcos, Texas
2007

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July 2012

THE IMPACT OF CULTURAL INDIVIDUALISM & COLLECTIVISM ON

PROTEAN & BOUNDARYLESS CAREER ATTITUDES

AND JOB SATISFACTION

Dissertation Approved:

_____

John Romans, Ph.D.
Dissertation Advisor

_____

Donald Boswell, Ph.D.

_____

Julie Koch, Ph.D.

_____

Julie Dorton Clark, Ph.D.

_____

Mark Gavin, Ph.D.

_____

Sheryl A. Tucker, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iv

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The nature of work has "shifted dramatically since the days of the corporate career," where the organization itself was designated to be the primary career driver for its employees (Briscoe & Finkelstein, 2009, p. 242). Instead, various factors such as globalization, organizational downsizing, and technological advancements have spurred on changes to the economy and emerging careers (Parker, 2008). The influence of an evolving economy has transformed the concept of a career from a static lifelong guarantee with one employer to a dynamic adaptation of the individual in order to sustain employability (Coutino, Dam, & Blustein, 2008).

In response to these changes in the nature of work, there has been an emergence of recent career theories (Walsh et al., 2010). Amongst these are two prominent career theories: the protean career and the boundaryless career. Unlike the "corporate career," also known as the traditional career, these theories propose that the individual employee maintains direct control over his or her career. Protean career theory states that individuals are more self-directed and base career decisions on personal values (Hall, 1976). Boundaryless career theory describes people as being more mobile by preemptively creating career opportunities and maintaining professional relationships outside of their companies (Arthur & Rosseau, 1996).

Protean and boundaryless theories postulate that people retain a greater degree of personal control over their careers today (Briscoe & Hall, 2005). Several studies have indicated that being vocationally proactive and self-driven lead to greater levels of job satisfaction and perceived career success (Cabrera, 2008; Cooper-Hakim & Visweseran, 2005; Eby, Butts, & Lockwood; 2003; Sargent & Domberger, 2007). Career success has been defined as "the

accomplishment of desirable work-related outcomes at any point in a person's work experiences over time" (Arthur, Khapova, & Wilderom, 2005, p. 179). Studies have differentiated two types of career success: objective and subjective. While both are perceived to be important and have warranted considerable attention, they describe different facets of success. Objective success is often assessed by conventional salary increases, promotions, and other tangible measures (De Vos & Soens, 2008). Subjective success, on the other hand, lies in psychological satisfaction and accomplishment with one's personal work. In other words, people's perceptions of their employability and positive acknowledgement of their career status are all indicators of subjective career success.

Career satisfaction is the most commonly operationalized determinant of subjective career success, especially amongst studies of protean or boundaryless theories (Arthur, Khapova, & Wilderom, 2005; Briscoe & Hall, 2005). Studies have linked career satisfaction to a multitude of variables such as job performance and organizational commitment (Blau, 2001; Chung-Yan, 2010; Spector, 1985). As the concept of work is continually undergoing a global change, members of society must redefine their own vocational careers. Although they may be able to successfully adapt to today's work environment, people may struggle with the satisfaction of their work output, which has been demonstrated to potentially lead to other issues within their vocational development and their overall psychological welfare (Fouad, 2007).

A greater percentage of the country's workforce is comprised of minorities today than ever before (Parker, 2008). Work has been described as "a functional aspect of life in that individuals contribute their skills and labor to their cultural societies and the maintenance of their families" (Carter & Cook, 1992, p. 199). One of the most common methods of distinguishing

amongst cultures is determining the degree of individualism and collectivism (Sivadas, Bruvold, & Nelson, 2008). Strunk and Chang (1999) define these terms as the following:

> In general, collectivism promotes a sense of the self as interdependent. Collectivistic people are motivated by the norms and duties of their collectives, give priority to the goals of the collectives and emphasize their connectedness to members of the collectives. In contrast, individualism promotes a sense of the self as independent. Individualistic people are motivated by their own desires, give priority to their personal goals and use reason to analyze the advantages and disadvantages of associating with others. (p. 665)

The workforce in the United States has also been impacted since the nation has become increasingly more culturally diverse (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005). With the influx of an increasingly diverse labor market, there is a greater need for a research emphasis on the relationship between cultural background and one's career development (Walsh et al., 2010). Historically, though, the field of psychology has not placed adequate emphasis on career issues (Blustein, 2006).

With more people redefining the meaning in their work, the literature calls for innovative approaches to career counseling that adequately accounts for the diversity of backgrounds, needs, and experiences in today's workers (Peterson & Gonzalez, 2005). While there has been a trend of career theories that offer a conceptualization of today's career attitudes, studies examining their applicability to collectivistic cultures have been limited. Additionally, as the client population of today's career counselor becomes steadily more diverse, culturally sensitive strategies are also warranted. Therefore, career counselors need to increase their competencies by

refreshing their understanding of the needs of today's employee. This study seeks to bridge that gap by investigating whether adherence to varying cultural dimensions predicts adaptation to protean or boundaryless career theories and higher rates of job satisfaction.

The Progression of Career Development

Definition of Career

  Work has been defined as "purposeful, mental, physical, or combined mental-physical activity that produces something of economic value such as a service to others as well as a material product" (Peterson, 2005, p. 3). Work may not necessarily be strictly limited to paid employment as caregiving and volunteering may also be considered as a means of work. *Career*, on the other hand, has been defined as "the evolving sequence of a person's work experiences over time" (Arthur, 2008). Career, in contrast to other vocational terms such as *work* or *job*, accounts for the variable of time.

  Several factors, both individual and environmental, influence a career. Individual factors are not limited to, but may include, one's intrinsic values, experiences, socio-economic conditions, and personal goals. On the contrary, environmental factors are determined not by the individual per se but by external variables such as global influences, overall society, and one's affiliated professional organization (Arthur, 2008).

Fulfillment of Work

  At first glance, there may be a seemingly unlimited amount of reasons why people work. After all, many factors within one's history and culture influence his or her work. Each person has a unique work experience in today's world. However, Blustein (2006) proposed three basic

4

needs are fulfilled through work in people's lives: basic survival, a foundation for meaningful relationships, and self-motivation.

First, work is considered as a means for survival and attainment of power (Blustein, 2006). According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, physiological needs and safety needs rank as the most fundamental (Maslow, 1943). People work to provide basic needs such as food and shelter for themselves and their families. In addition, work aims to offer a sense of financial security necessary for continual provisions. As the nature of work continues to evolve, people are required to evaluate if their means of survival and volition are being threatened.

Second, work also functions as a basis for meaningful social relationships with others (Blustein, 2006). Traditionally, work has given opportunities for people to connect with others on both a professional and a personal level (Schultheiss, 2003). This function of work addresses the need for love and belonging in Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943). However, with the advancement of technology and non-traditional work environments, there is a growing concern that the methods of developing relationships at work are also being extinguished. Without work as a means of sustaining social connections, people may be discontent and more disengaged from their work (Fouad, 2007).

The third function of work is a means of self-determination or motivation. This coincides directly with Maslow's proposed levels of esteem and self-actualization (Maslow, 1943). Work can provide a sense of satisfaction, accomplishment, and self-expression. Removal of interest or self-determination could contribute to higher stress levels and reduction of one's overall welfare (Blustein, 2006; Fouad, 2007).

The Traditional Career

Traditionally, a significant portion of career development rested upon the shoulders of the employer (Granrose & Baccili, 2006). While not everyone may have experienced employment security, traditional career theory suggests that people were expected to develop careers in one or a few organizations and relied upon these organizations for upward mobility. This expectation became known as the basis for a psychological contract (Hall & Moss, 1998; Rousseau, 1995). A psychological contract has been defined as "individual beliefs, shaped by the organization, regarding terms of an exchange agreement between individuals and their organizations" (Rousseau, 1995, p. 9). Perceived violation in a contract between one or both parties involved led to negative reactions, lower commitment, and turnover. Traditional career theory drew from *implicit* psychological contracts, which were typically unspoken yet understood assumptions about the working agreement between employer and employee.

Gasteiger (2007) identified key aspects in the traditional career. In exchange for company loyalty, the employer would furnish job security for the individual. Therefore, the responsibility of managing one's career rested on the organization itself. Individuals' job skills tended to be specific to the firm through formal training programs. The criteria to measure success were based on individual promotions, salary boosts, and the success of the overall organization. Career milestones were age-related and seniority within the company.

Modernization of Work

Gasteiger (2007) identified changes that were contrary to the traditional career within emerging careers. The underlying attitude in these emerging careers stresses success via personal job satisfaction, self-fulfillment, and overall professional commitment rather than an allegiance

to a specific organization. Hence, the individual takes a more direct and personal responsibility in managing his or her career. In addition to job performance, the employability of an individual now also relies significantly on the flexibility and adaptation to new challenges or tasks. The skills learned on the job are no longer firm specific but are transferable and adapted to multiple situations. Training is performed on-the-job as opposed to relying on formal programs. Lastly, milestones are no longer necessarily set by one's age but by one's capability to learn and perform the job requirements.

Conceptualizing the Modern Career

The reshaping of the concept of career has dictated a change in conventional career theory models and has driven the emergence of new career theories (Briscoe & Finkelstein, 2009; Hall, 2004). Two popular theories that have been espoused by the organizational literature are protean career theory (Hall, 1976) and boundaryless career theory (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996).

Protean Career Theory

Protean career theory emphasizes career management by the individual as opposed to the organization itself. This theory promotes a career management style that encompasses both a values-driven attitude and a self-directed attitude. The name of this theory is based upon the Greek god, Proteus, who was known for his versatility, flexibility, and adaptability (Briscoe & Hall, 2006).

7

Experiences from one's education, experience, career goals, and search for self-fulfillment all integrate as factors of protean career theory. Table 1 (Hall, 1976, p. 202) lists several major differences between the protean career and the traditional career:

Table 1

Traditional Career & Protean Career

Emphasis	Protean Career	Traditional Career
Career Management	Individual	Organization
Core Values	Autonomy/	Advancement/
	Personal Growth	Authoritative Power
Level of Mobility	Higher	Lower
Performance Traits	Psychological Success	Organiz. Position/
		Career Salary
Attitude Traits	Work Satisfaction/	Work Satisfaction/
	Professional Commitment	Organiz. Commitment
Identity Traits	Self-Esteem/	Esteem from Others/
	Self-Awareness	Organiz. Awareness
Adaptation Traits	Professional Marketability	Organiz. Survival

Those who are oriented to a protean career mindset tend to hold values in freedom and personal growth. On the contrary, an individual who may not rely on protean attitudes would be more apt to follow external standards and directions instead of internally developed ones. Success is derived from one's own internal measure and not based on external criterion (Hall & Moss, 1998). Additionally, the emphasis of the career shifts from advancement within a company to self-awareness and adaptation to change. Questions from a traditional career perspective could be "Do I find myself respected by others in this company?" and "What should

I do in this organization?" The protean career asks "Do I respect myself?" and "What would I like to do?"

Hall and Mirvis (1996) postulated that a protean attitude teaches meta-skills to develop self-identity and adaptation. These meta-skills then aid people in undergoing multiple career paths or career cycles throughout their lifetime. Through these repeated stages of exploration-trial-mastery-exit, an individual's chronological age may not be synonymous to his or her position with a career cycle.

Protean career theory has been a popular subject of research within career issues. Briscoe, Waters, and Hall (2005) found that individuals who adopted a protean attitude were more apt to constructively cope with unemployment and were able to find a new job more quickly than those who were more oriented to traditional career mindsets. Baruch and Quick (2007) found that unemployed participants who identified with a protean career mindset rated higher levels of career satisfaction when compared with those who did not identify with a protean career mindset. Although their data regarding objective career successes such as rate of promotions and salary increases were inconclusive, the study determined that those who held a protean career orientation typically rated higher with subjective career success.

Boundaryless Career Theory

Boundaryless career theory is a model that promotes a "limitless" attitude by creating and sustaining professional relationships beyond organizational boundaries (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Sullivan & Arthur, 2006). While boundaryless attitudes are predominantly a psychological concept, there is a component of physical employment mobility that is attached to the theory as well. This theory promotes comfort with pursuing outside professional relationships and a sense

of high mobility that can progress across several employers (Briscoe, Hall, & Demuth, 2006). Table 2 (Sullivan, 1999, p. 458) outlines a comparison between the traditional career and the boundaryless career:

Table 2

Traditional Career & Protean Career

Emphasis	Boundaryless Career	Traditional Career
Employment Relationship	Employability for Performance & Flexibility	Job Security for Loyalty
Organizational Boundaries	Limitless	Limited
Skills	Transferrable	Organization-Specific
Measurement of Success	Personally Meaningful	Salary/Promotion
Career Management	Individual	Organization
Training	Formal & Informal	Formal
Milestones	Learning-Related	Age-Related

Arthur and Rousseau (1996) describe boundaryless career theory as a psychological perspective that draws validation and marketability from outside the present employer, sustained by outside networks and information. The boundaryless orientation may be perceived and pursued regardless of structural constraints. The emphasis on networking beyond the perimeter of the firm not only creates inter-organizational relationships but also learning opportunities for new skills and knowledge (Arthur, 1994).

Baker and Aldrich (1996) further investigated the boundaryless theory and attributed three traits that must be present for a boundaryless career. The individual must have access to inter-organization mobility, a wealth of accumulated knowledge or skill, and a strong sense of personal identity. Eby et al. (2003) postulated that developing a portfolio of career competencies

such as "knowing why, knowing whom, and knowing how" were salient predictors of a successful boundaryless career (p. 690). "Knowing why" refers to personal motivation and meaning where the person is not relying on the firm's culture and may hold occupational values independent of the organization itself. "Knowing whom" relates to professional networking both within and outside the organization. Lastly, "knowing how" describes career competencies that stretch beyond the requirements of the current job position.

Major Differences Between Theories

There is a visible overlap between the two career models. For example, a person with a protean mindset may exhibit characteristics of the employment mobility that is upheld in boundaryless theory. However, the current research literature views these two theories as independent yet related constructs (Briscoe & Finkelstein, 2009; Cheramie, Sturman, & Walsh, 2007; Granrose & Baccili, 2006). Someone who has a self-directed protean attitude may prefer not to collaborate with others across organizational boundaries. On the contrary, an employee can hold a boundaryless attitude while adopting the values of the organization itself. Measures are used to distinguish the two career theories and assess the presence of the particular theory in question. Briscoe et al. (2006) suggested that a boundaryless career could be witnessed either subjectively by the individual or objectively by others. However, a true protean career can only be perceived and determined solely by the individual.

Protean and boundaryless attitudes are often negatively associated with the concept of organizational commitment (Briscoe & Finkelstein, 2009). Essentially, people are believed to be more likely to leave and find alternative employers if their needs are not being fulfilled. Notably,

11

Granrose and Baccili (2006) found that the negative association was more evident in cases of boundaryless careers as opposed to protean careers.

Individualism and Collectivism

As the world becomes more globalized, research has directed much more attention to cultural issues (Chung & Mallery, 2000; Robert, Lee, & Chan, 2006; Yetim, 2003). One notable difference between cultures is their adherence to the degree of individualism or collectivism (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Gudykunst and Matsumoto (1996) described the individualism-collectivism continuum as "the major dimension of cultural variability isolated by theorists across disciplines to explain similarities and differences in behavior" (p. 511).

Developing Individualism-Collectivism Constructs

Hofstede (1980) is regarded as one of the first contemporary researchers on the issue of developing individualism-collectivism (I-C) constructs. However, these constructs have been challenged as being vague, problematic, and borderline stereotyping. Gudykunst and Matsumoto (1996) postulated that while these concepts could be useful as descriptors of cultures, they might not be able to capture all cultural variables.

Due to the seemingly indefinite variables that shape cultures, the measurement to quantify these concepts of individualism and collectivism has been difficult. Furthermore, cultures are dynamic – they evolve through time. Researchers must account for factors that are currently consistent within cultures, but also maintain pace with continued changes as well. Strunk and Chang (1999) have attempted to define these constructs. They stated that collectivism defines the self as interdependent to members, norms, and duties of the culture. Individualism, on

the other hand, promotes an independent self, giving priority to personal goals and utilizing reason to determine the advantages and disadvantages of associating with others (Strunk & Chang, 1999).

Measuring Individualism and Collectivism

Singelis and Triandis (1995) developed a research instrument that aimed to measure the constructs of individualism and collectivism. However, cultural concepts vacillated between too broad or too concrete. Different cultural groups also interpreted concepts differently. The authors determined that there needed to be a balance between ambiguity and specificity to moderate between high and low reliability coefficients.

After conducting factor analyses with multiple groups of participants, Singelis and Triandis (1995) defined four independent attributes that develop within all cultures. The attributes are: independence vs. interdependence, personal goals vs. group goals, exchange vs. communal relationships, and attitudes vs. norms as social determinants. For example, individualistic cultures tend to give more weight to attitudes than norms while collectivistic cultures value norms over attitudes (Kashima, Siegel, Tanaka, & Kashima, 1992; Trafimow & Finlay, 1996).

The current research literature has attempted to further define dimensions to help shape the constructs of individualism and collectivism (Kemmelmeier et al., 2003; Nelson & Shavitt, 2002; Ng & Van Dyne, 2001; Park, Rehg, & Lee, 2003). With a multidimensional model, both individualism and collectivism can coexist across a culture as collectivistic individuals have the capability to act in an individualistic manner and vice versa (Hartung, Fouad, Leong, & Hardin, 2010).

Vertical and Horizontal Dimensions

Triandis (1995) proposed that individualism and collectivism could be further designated into vertical and horizontal dimensions. Individuals who adhere more closely to the vertical dimension tend to promote achievement, status, hierarchy, and competition. However, those who identify more with the horizontal dimension support notions of equality, value uniqueness without comparison to others, and do not strive to be better than others (Oishi, Schimmack, Diener, & Suh, 1998). When the dimensions of individualism-collectivism and horizontal-vertical are integrated, they yield four distinct constructs: Horizontal Individualism (HI), Vertical Individualism (VI), Horizontal Collectivism (HC), and Vertical Collectivism (VC).

People who identify strongly with Horizontal Individualism tend to promote autonomy, self-reliance, and value the freedom to express themselves, although they view themselves as equal to other people and are less likely to compare themselves with others. On the other hand, those who identify with Vertical Individualism, while also independent, also value competition and seek to be the best. They typically try to differentiate themselves from others and strive for dominance through higher statuses. Next, the people who adhere towards Horizontal Collectivism tend to seek identity with their membership to a group and view themselves as being on equal footing with others. While they acknowledge their interdependence with others and their common goals, they prefer not to relinquish themselves to authority. Lastly, those who adhere towards Vertical Collectivism also identify with their cultural group, but they are consigned to an overt hierarchy of the group and are willing to give up personal interests if required by the authority within the group itself. They acknowledge the differences between members and are more accepting of inequality (Komarraju & Cokley, 2008; Triandis, 1995).

14

Research Aims and Questions

The aim of this study is to gain further understanding on the cultural dimensions of individualism and collectivism and how they influence protean career attitudes, boundaryless career attitudes, and overall job satisfaction. While there is a growing amount of literature on protean and boundaryless career theories, research examining its adherence across multiple cultures in the United States has been limited. The following research questions will be addressed in this exploratory study:

1) Is each cultural variable of Vertical Individualism (VI), Horizontal Individualism (HI), Vertical Collectivism (VC), and Horizontal Collectivism (HC) predictive of one's adherence to protean career attitudes?

2) Is each cultural variable of Vertical Individualism (VI), Horizontal Individualism (HI), Vertical Collectivism (VC), and Horizontal Collectivism (HC) predictive of one's adherence to boundaryless career attitudes?

3) Is each cultural variable of Vertical Individualism (VI), Horizontal Individualism (HI), Vertical Collectivism (VC), and Horizontal Collectivism (HC) predictive of one's overall level of job satisfaction?

Out the cultural variables, Horizontal and Vertical Individualism are expected to be predictive of a protean career attitude. The self-driven career seems to tailor more closely with the values of independence and less reliance on a group mentality existing within collectivism. For example, the protean career emphasizes autonomy and defines career success as one that is personally meaningful. These aspects appear to be opposite of those promoted in the

collectivistic mentality. Thus, the collectivism variables are hypothesized not to be statistically significant in predicting a protean career attitude.

Since boundaryless career theory promotes organizational mobility and maintaining professional relationships that transcend the boundaries of the firm, there may lay a greater sense of interdependence with others; hence, Horizontal Collectivism is expected to be a predictor of a boundaryless career attitude. The other three cultural variables do not seem to fit as closely with the boundaryless model. Even though Vertical Collectivism does bear a sense of interdependence like HC, VC attests to a personal sense of duty that could detract people from pursuing opportunities outside of the organization. Also, the two individualism dimensions may be more fitting for someone adhering to a higher level of autonomy and independence found in a protean career mentality. Therefore, Horizontal Collectivism is expected to be the only significant predictor.

The literature indicates that job satisfaction is defined differently depending on one's cultural upbringing (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005; Hartung et al., 2010). While there are objective measures such as salary that could influence job satisfaction, subjective success is uniquely interpreted since personally meaningful work can vary in definition amongst individuals. For example, a person with the high sense of duty expounded in Vertical Collectivism may be satisfied with performing menial tasks for a larger group because satisfaction can be derived from the end result of the group's efforts. However, another person who identifies more strongly with Horizontal Individualism may display significantly less satisfaction in the same work position because he or she finds the work personally meaningless and unfulfilling. Therefore, satisfaction could theoretically occur within each of the cultural

dimensions. Based on that notion, each of the cultural variables is hypothesized to be a

significant predictor of overall job satisfaction.

METHOD

Participants

A total of 244 participants began the survey questionnaires; however, 203 participants (83.2%) completed all of the survey instruments. Therefore, only the completed 203 surveys were considered for data analyses. Due to the variables examined in the study, all individuals must have been employed at least part-time, at least 18 years of age, and were currently residing in the United States at the time of participation. Participants were recruited through online methods such as professional organization listservs and emails to various firms in the United States. While the study was open to any qualified person in the United States, participant recruitment drew primarily from the West South Central division (Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana) due to proximity and accessibility (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). This study's sample is considered a convenience sample due to the absence of investigator-generated randomization.

Recruitment of participants who identified with individualism was not projected to be difficult because of the majority culture's traditional adherence to individualism (Singelis et al., 1995). On the other hand, those who identified more closely with collectivism may have been more challenging to locate. While collectivistic values can exist within members of the majority culture, participation from traditionally collectivistic cultures could be more representative of collectivism as a whole. Therefore, a diverse set of professional organizations were contacted, including but not limited to: Oklahoma Professional Search, Oklahoma Medical Association, National Hispanic Professional Organization, The National Association of Asian American Professionals, and India Association of North Texas. These organizations provide a pool of professional contacts from diverse career fields as well both majority and minority cultures. Each

organization's public contact, human resource manager, and webmaster were contacted via email

to promote the study. All emails contained a script (Appendix C) that explained the research

aims of the study, the potential benefits of the results, and procedure of participation.

General demographic information about the participants is included in Table 3:

Table 3
Participants' Demographic Data

Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
	34.86	10.32	19	74
Gender			Frequency	%
Female			116	57.1
Male			87	42.9
Marital Status				
Single			95	46.8
Married			87	42.9
Widowed			2	1.0
Common-Law Married			4	2.0
Separated			3	1.5
Divorced			12	5.9
Highest Level of Education				
No Degree			2	1.0
High School or GED			8	3.9
Some College			37	18.2
Associate's Degree			17	8.4
Bachelor's Degree			73	36.0
Master's Degree			51	25.1
Professional or Doctoral Degree			15	7.4

Of the 203 participants, the average age was approximately 35 years old. The youngest participant was 19 years old and the oldest was 74 years old. More females (57.1%) completed the surveys than males (42.9%). Participants had six different options to choose regarding marital status: single, married, widowed, common-law married, separated, or divorced. The majority of the participants described themselves as either single or married (89.7%). Lastly, three-quarters of the participants listed themselves as having a degree beyond a high school diploma (76.9%).

Table 4 lists ethnic and geographic information about the study's sample:

Table 4

Participants' Ethnic Data & Region of Residence

Ethnicity	Frequency	%
Asian or Asian American	71	35.0
African or African American	10	4.9
Caucasian	99	48.8
Latino/a	18	8.9
Native American	5	2.5
Nationality		
United States	172	84.7
Other	31	84.7
U.S. Region of Residence[1]		
Northeast	28	13.8
Midwest	28	13.8
South	111	54.7

West	27	13.3
Unspecified	9	4.4

Approximately half of the participants identified themselves as Caucasian (48.8%) Another 35% of participants identified as Asian (identifying a country in Asia as home) or Asian American (claiming American citizenship). The remaining 16.2% of the sample were categorized under African or African American, Latino/a, or Native American.

Since the study required current residence in the United States, a large portion of the sample considered their nationality as American (84.7%). The other 31 participants (15.3%) considered another country as their home. 23 participants claimed nationality with a country in Asia (China, India, Taiwan, South Korea, Malaysia, and Thailand). The remaining 8 participants identified with another country (Mexico, Ireland, Bermuda, Poland, and Venezuela).

Table 4 also indicates the participants' region of residence in the United States. The United States Census Bureau (2010) divides the U.S. into four distinct regions: Northeast, Midwest, South, and West. These regions are then further split into a total of nine divisions. Over half of the sample identified their current residence in the South region (54.7%). 87 participants of the South region (78.4%) live in the West South Central division (Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana). A total of 33 states were represented in the study. 9 participants (4.4%) did not identify their regions of residence. Table 5 lists information about the participants' careers.

Table 5

Participants' Career Data

Career Field	Frequency	%
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, or Hunting	0	0.0
Arts, Entertainment, or Recreation	11	5.4
Broadcasting or Journalism	2	1.0
Education (College, University, or Adult)	19	9.4
Education (K-12th Grade)	11	5.4
Construction	5	2.5
Finance and Insurance	16	7.9
Government and Public Administration	8	4.0
Healthcare and Social Assistance	46	22.7
Hotel and Food Services	5	2.5
Legal Services	1	0.5
Manufacturing	30	14.8
Military	2	1.0
Real Estate	1	0.5
Religious	4	2.0
Retail	9	4.4
Telecommunications	19	9.4
Transportation and Warehousing	3	1.5
Utilities	10	4.9
Wholesale	1	0.5

Role in Industry		
Upper Management	13	6.4
Middle Management	25	12.3
Junior Management	9	4.4
Administrative Staff	23	11.3
Support Staff	20	9.9

Trained Professional	75	36.9
Skilled Laborer	13	6.4
Researcher	9	4.4
Self-Employed	16	7.9

Employer Type

For-Profit Company or Business	120	59.1
Non-Profit, Tax-Exempt, or Charitable Organization	37	18.2
City, State, or Federal Government (including U.S. Military)	30	14.3
Self-Employed	16	7.9

Employment Status

Full-time (40+ hours/week)	162	79.8
Part-time (<40 hours/week)	41	20.2

Average Hours Worked Per Week

Mean	41.72
Std. Deviation	12.01
Minimum	6
Maximum	90

Annual Personal Income	Frequency	%
Unpaid Volunteer	1	0.5
Less than $10,000	15	7.4
$10,000 to $19,999	19	9.4
$20,000 to $29,999	24	11.8
$30,000 to $39,999	36	17.7
$40,000 to $49,999	26	12.8
$50,000 to $59,999	19	9.4
$60,000 to $69,999	15	7.4
$70,000 to $79,999	16	7.9

$80,000 to $89,999	13	6.4
$90,000 to $99,999	1	0.5
$100,000 to $149,999	15	7.4
$150,000 or more	3	1.5

Annual Household Income		
Unpaid Volunteer	0	0.0
Less than $10,000	7	3.4
$10,000 to $19,999	11	5.4
$20,000 to $29,999	16	7.9
$30,000 to $39,999	20	9.9
$40,000 to $49,999	18	8.9
$50,000 to $59,999	25	12.3
$60,000 to $69,999	15	7.4
$70,000 to $79,999	15	7.4
$80,000 to $89,999	13	6.4
$90,000 to $99,999	13	6.4
$100,000 to $149,999	35	17.2
$150,000 or more	15	7.4

First, participants chose one career field out of twenty listed options (Appendix I). These options were taken directly from an online career survey template (Questionpro, 2011). The most common responses were Healthcare and Social Services (22.7%) and Manufacturing (14.8%). However, all fields with the exception of Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, or Hunting were represented.

Participants also identified their roles in their respective fields. Management positions were split between Upper, Middle, and Junior Management. Upper Management refers to the

senior executive teams (e.g. CEO) while Middle Management describes a layer of management that monitors and relays activities of subordinate positions to senior management (e.g. Senior Manager). Junior Management encompasses assistant managerial positions or project leaders. The role most chosen was Trained Professional (36.9%). Junior Management and Researcher were the two least chosen options, each representing 4.4% of the sample. 16 participants identified themselves as Self-Employed (7.9%).

The majority of participants are employed at a for-profit institution (59.1%). Participants who either worked for the government, military, or at a non-profit institution made up 32.5% of the sample. Additionally, 79.8% of the participants worked full-time whereas 20.2% are part-time employees. The reported average number of hours worked in the study's sample was approximately 42 hours. Hours worked per week ranged from 6 to 90.

Lastly, participants reported their annual personal and household income. Salary choices increased in increments of ten thousand. For Annual Personal Income, 18 participants (9.1%) earned over $100,000 a year. 16 participants (7.9%) earned less than $10,000, including one person who was an unpaid volunteer. The most common annual salary choice selected was $30,000 to $39,999 (17.7%). Annual Household Income responses indicated that 50 participants (24.6%) had a household income of over $100,000 per year. 7 participants (3.4%) earned less than $10,000. The most common annual salary choices selected was $100,000 to $149,999 (17.2%).

Procedure

Individuals who were invited to complete the study were informed that participation was voluntary and that the completion of the questionnaires served as their consent to participate. The

participation information sheet (Appendix B) was listed as the first page before the surveys began. Confidentiality of the survey responses was explicitly stated in the participation information sheet so that participants were aware that their detailed responses would be kept securely and only accessible to the primary investigator. Also, the names of the participants and their places of employment were not collected. A range of occupations and ages were garnered; there were no researcher-induced preferences towards any particular vocational group.

All participants were given the five questionnaires along with a demographic form through the online survey software known as SurveyMonkey. The website hosting the survey, http://www.surveymonkey.com, is securely password-protected, and only the primary investigator and the dissertation advisor had access to the responses. The total time required to complete all of the questionnaires was approximately 20 to 30 minutes. To improve the validity of the responses, the order of the surveys was counterbalanced. Counterbalancing reduces the likelihood that earlier questions will consistently influence later questions (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006).

Every participant who completed all of the questionnaires had the opportunity to be entered into a raffle with the chance to win a $25 gift card to a major retail store. At the end of the survey, participants were given the option to list a contact email should they like to be registered for the raffle. Besides the contact email address, no other identifying information about the participants was collected. Participation in the raffle was completely optional, and the contact emails were not included with the data analyses. Once the data collection process was complete and the required sample size met, a random participant was selected to win the gift card. The participant was contacted via the provided email so that the gift card could be mailed to the selected recipient.

Measures

Participants were asked to complete a series of scales that aim to assess career theory orientation, job satisfaction, and personal degree of individualism or collectivism.

1) The *Protean Career Attitudes Scale* (PCAS) is designed to assess one's adherence towards protean career theory (Briscoe et al., 2006). The scale consists of 14 items that determine a protean career attitude by measuring two subscales: the Self-Directed Career Management Scale (SDCMS) and the Values-Driven Scale (VDS). The first 8 items measure SDCMS while the last 6 items measure VDS. Briscoe et al. (2006) reported a Cronbach's alpha of $\alpha = 0.81$ for the Self-Directed Career Management Subscale and $\alpha = 0.69$ for the Values-Driven Subscale.

Each item utilizes a Likert-type scale in which answers range from 1 (To little or no extent) to 5 (To a great extent). The results of the scale yields two subscale scores that will be added together for a total score. SDCMS scores can range from 8 to 40; VDS will range from 6 to 30. Therefore, total scores can range from 14 to 70. A higher combined score denotes a greater protean attitude. Sample items include "I am in charge of my own career" and "What I think about is right in my career is more important to me than what my company thinks." The PCAS had a final overall Cronbach's alpha score of $\alpha = 0.88$. The two subscales, the Self-Directed Career Management Scale and the Values-Driven Scale, had Cronbach's alpha scores of $\alpha = 0.85$ and $\alpha = 0.73$, respectively.

2) The *Boundaryless Career Attitudes Scale* (BCAS), also authored by Briscoe et al. (2006), measures one's boundaryless attitude. The scale includes 13 items split amongst 2 subscales: 8 items in the Boundaryless Mindset Scale (BMS) and 5 items in the Organizational

Mobility Preference Scale (OMPS). Briscoe et al. (2006) reported a Cronbach's alpha (α) of 0.89 for items assessing boundaryless mindset and 0.75 for items assessing mobility preference. Like the PCAS, items are answered with a Likert-type scale where answers can range from 1 (To little or no extent) to 5 (To a great extent). BMS scores can range from 8 to 40 while OMPS scores can range from 5 to 25.

The total boundaryless score is a sum of both the BMS score and the OMPS score. Therefore, total scores can possibly range from 13 to 65. Higher total scores suggest a greater boundaryless attitude. Sample items include "I enjoy working with people outside of my organization" and "I prefer to stay in a company I am familiar with rather than look for employment elsewhere." The BCAS had a final overall Cronbach's alpha score of α = 0.82. The two subscales, Boundaryless Mindset Scale and the Organizational Mobility Scale, had Cronbach's alpha scores of α = 0.90 and α = 0.80, respectively.

3) The *Job Satisfaction Survey* (JSS) is a 36-item career satisfaction measure that was developed to assess the degree of satisfaction of those who worked in the social service sector (Spector, 1985). However, the scale has been implemented in other vocational backgrounds as well (Van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, & Frings-Drsen, 2003). The scale utilizes a 6-point Likert-type scale that ranges from 1 (disagree very much) to 6 (agree very much). The JSS consists of nine sub-scales: Salary, Promotion, Supervision, Fringe Benefits (non-wage compensations), Contingent Rewards (performance-based rewards), Operating Procedures (rules of operation), Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication. Each subscale is represented through four items on the survey.

Some of the items on the JSS are written in a positive direction while others are in a negative direction. Therefore, answers on negatively worded items must be reverse-scored. The

total score of the JSS can range from 36 to 216. A high score on the scale suggests participant job satisfaction. The scale has demonstrated high reliability and construct validity. Van Saane et al. (2003) reported that the JSS had an internal consistency of 0.91 and a test-retest score of 0.71. Sample items include "I like the people I work with" and "I am satisfied with my chances for promotion." The variety of subscales is implemented to account for both objective career satisfaction as well as subjective career satisfaction.

The JSS had a final overall Cronbach's alpha score of $\alpha = 0.93$. Reliabilities were mixed throughout the individual subscales. The subscales are Pay ($\alpha = 0.79$), Promotion ($\alpha = 0.79$), Supervisor ($\alpha = 0.82$), Fringe Benefits ($\alpha = 0.82$), Contingent Rewards ($\alpha = 0.76$), Operating Conditions ($\alpha = 0.52$), Coworkers ($\alpha = 0.44$), Nature of Work ($\alpha = 0.80$), and Communication ($\alpha = 0.70$). Both Operating Conditions and Coworkers had low reliability coefficients. However, when item numbers 15 (My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.) and 34 (There is too much bickering and fighting at work.) were dropped from reliability calculations, the Cronbach's alphas rose to $\alpha = 0.64$ for Operating Conditions and $\alpha = 0.60$ for Coworkers.

While the other instruments forced the participants to choose a listed answer choice, the Job Satisfaction Survey was given an additional option of "Does Not Apply to Me" by this study's primary investigator. This extra option was incorporated because some participants, notably those who were self-employed, may not be able to answer select JSS items such as those regarding coworkers and supervisors. However, this posed a problem for the scoring of the JSS because the instrument requires a numerical score from the Likert-type scale. In other words, the "Does Not Apply to Me" responses, which encompassed 5.8% of the total JSS scores, still needed to be accounted for.

Participants' answers for "Does Not Apply to Me" were deliberate and are not synonymous with leaving a blank answer. Therefore, these individual responses were omitted from the calculations altogether instead of other methods such as data imputation. In conclusion, the nine subscales had various sample sizes: Pay (N = 172), Promotion (N = 186), Supervisor (N = 187), Fringe Benefits (N = 186), Contingent Rewards (N = 191), Operating Conditions (N = 193), Coworkers (N = 189), Nature (N = 196), and Communication (N = 192). The overall job satisfaction score was calculated from a sample size of 172.

4) Individualism and collectivism was measured using the *Individualism-Collectivism Scale* (INDCOL) (Singelis et al., 1995). The instrument consists of 32 items that measure the four cultural variables, which are Horizontal Individualism, Horizontal Collectivism, Vertical Individualism, and Vertical Collectivism. The instrument's authors, Briscoe et al. (2006), assessed and determined that the scale had reasonable Cronbach's alphas (HI α = 0.67, HC α = 0.74, VI α = 0.74, and VC α = 0.68).

Originally, the INDCOL was a 9-point Likert-type scale. However, the instrument was modified. This modification was previously suggested by Snider and Styles (2005). The number of points in the Likert-type scale was reduced from nine to six. Based on participants' potential degree of proficiency and the possible unfamiliarity of Likert-type scales, the answer choices were altered from strictly numerical responses to a labeling of each category. With this alteration, participants were shown "(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Slightly Disagree, (4) Slightly Agree, (5) Agree, and (6) Strongly Agree" with the intention of clarifying each answer choice.

The four variables are each represented by eight items. Individual questions measure adherence to a specific cultural variable. Sample items include "Winning is everything" (VI) and

"The well-being of my co-workers is important to me" (HC). Upon this study's reliability analysis, the final overall scale was found to be reliable ($\alpha = 0.85$). The 32-item instrument produced a total of four scores that yielded acceptable Cronbach's alphas: HI ($\alpha = 0.77$), HC ($\alpha = 0.74$), VI ($\alpha = 0.77$), and VC ($\alpha = 0.76$).

5) Demographic information was collected from all participants. Items on the demographic form were taken from QuestionPro, an online survey software package that provides Questionnaire templates (Questionpro, 2011). The form incorporates general demographic questions (e.g. age, gender), cultural background questions (e.g. ethnicity, nationality), and career questions (e.g. role in industry, annual income). The data assisted in exploring any significant correlations between particular characteristics of the participants, their career attitudes, and their job satisfaction.

RESULTS

Statistical Analyses

The data were securely downloaded and stored from SurveyMonkey. After properly labeling each of the instruments' results, the data were entered into SPSS 16.0 for analysis. The SPSS package calculated descriptive statistics, reliabilities, correlational relationships, and multiple regressions to answer each of the research questions. Descriptive statistics such as means and standard deviations were calculated on each instrument to evaluate their distributions and frequency of responses.

Participant responses were calculated into scale scores for each of the instruments. A scale score is a conversion of a participant's raw score on a questionnaire to a common scale that allows for a numerical comparison with other participants. Correlation and multiple regression analyses were run using these scale scores.

Descriptive statistics for all variables are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics

INDCOL	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Horizontal Individualism (HI)	36.29	5.47	29.94
Horizontal Collectivism (HC)	35.82	5.50	30.27
Vertical Individualism (VI)	27.90	6.55	42.86
Vertical Collectivism (VC)	30.10	6.46	41.74
PCAS, BCAS, & JSS			
Self-Directed Career Management	30.67	5.66	32.04
Values-Driven	21.31	4.01	16.10
Protean Career (Overall)	51.99	8.82	77.71

Boundaryless Mindset	29.67	6.29	39.59
Organizational Mobility	15.04	4.30	18.46
Boundaryless Career (Overall)	44.71	7.47	55.76
Pay	14.17	3.23	10.45
Promotion	14.38	3.96	15.68
Supervision	17.73	3.71	13.73
Fringe Benefits	15.06	3.47	12.02
Contingent Rewards	14.49	3.25	10.58
Operating Procedures	14.06	3.28	10.73
Coworkers	17.37	3.13	9.82
Nature of Work	18.77	2.53	6.38
Communication	14.84	3.42	11.70
Job Satisfaction Survey (Overall)	140.94	13.88	192.76

Correlations

Correlations were calculated between all of the studied variables and are listed in Tables 7 and 8. Table 7 shows correlation coefficients between the dimensions of the Individualism-Collectivism Scale (INDCOL) and the total scores of the dependent variables. Table 8 displays the Pearson's correlational coefficient between the dimensions of INDCOL and the individual subscales for each of the remaining instruments.

The first correlational analysis of the total scores determined that there was a distinctly positive correlation between protean career attitudes and both Horizontal Individualism (HI) and Horizontal Collectivism (HC). Boundaryless career attitudes (BCAS) positively correlated with every cultural dimension. Job satisfaction was only significantly correlated with the Protean Career Attitudes Scale (PCAS) and did not significantly correlate with any of the independent variables. PCAS and BCAS correlated positively with one another, although this is may be due to overlapping attributes of both career theories. Although the dimensions of the Individualism-

33

Collectivism Scale (INDCOL) are viewed as separate variables, HI and HC demonstrated a significant correlation, and VC positively correlated with the other three INDCOL dimensions.

The second correlational analysis examined the correlational values between subscales. Some of the noteworthy correlations were found between the independent variables and the dependent variables' subscales. First, Horizontal Individualism (HI) was significantly correlated with both subscales of the Protean Career Attitudes Scale (PCAS), the Boundaryless Mindset subscale of BCAS as well as the Nature of Work and the Communication subscales of the Job Satisfaction Survey. Secondly, HC significantly correlated with both subscales of PCAS, BCAS, and the Nature of Work subscale of JSS. Thirdly, Vertical Individualism (VI) significantly correlated with the Self-Directed Career Management subscale of PCAS. Lastly, Vertical Collectivism (VC) only significantly correlated with the Organizational Mobility subscale of BCAS.

Since the purpose of the study was to examine career attitudes and job satisfaction in their entirety, the primary investigator examined the predictive value of cultural dimensions on the total scores of the Protean Career Attitudes Scale and the Job Satisfaction Survey. Consistent with previous literature, the PCAS's subscales demonstrated positive correlation with one another. Although the JSS's subscales showed inconsistent correlations with one another, the present study examined the impact on overall job satisfaction as opposed to individual subscales such as promotion opportunities or supervisory relationships. Therefore, only the total score of the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was used for the statistical calculations.

The Boundaryless Career Attitude Scale's subscales, Boundaryless Mindset and Organizational Mobility, appeared to be independent constructs. There was no statistically significant correlation between the two subscales. Due to this result, the subscales were treated as

separate variables, and regressions were calculated with each subscale independently. In turn, this altered the initial research question into two research questions. In other words, do the cultural variables predict adherence to 1) Boundaryless Mindset and 2) Organizational Mobility?

Table 7

Pearson's Correlational Coefficients – Total Scores

	HI	HC	VI	VC	PCAS	BCAS	JSS
HI	1.00						
HC	0.47**	1.00					
VI	0.11	0.15*	1.00				
VC	0.16*	0.54**	0.32**	1.00			
PCAS	0.50**	0.23**	0.12	-0.05	1.00		
BCAS	0.32**	0.38**	0.17*	0.27**	0.49**	1.00	
JSS	0.12	0.14	0.03	-0.06	0.17*	0.08	1.00

** - Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

* - Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 8

Pearson's Correlational Coefficients – Subscale Scores

	INDCOL				PCAS		BCAS		JSS								
	HI	HC	VI	VC	SDCMS	VDS	BMS	OMS	PAY	PROMO.	SUPVR.	FR. BNFT.	CNT. REW.	OP. CON.	CWRKER.	NAT. WRK.	COMM.
HI	1.00																
HC	0.47**	1.00															
VI	0.11	0.15*	1.00														
VC	0.16*	0.54**	0.32**	1.00													
SDCMS	0.51**	0.22**	0.16*	-0.06	1.00												
VDS	0.37**	0.20**	0.04	-0.03	0.65**	1.00											
BMS	0.31**	0.28**	0.13	0.09	0.57**	0.46**	1.00										
OMS	0.11	0.24**	0.11	0.34**	-0.04	0.06	-0.04	1.00									
PAY	-0.10	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.09	0.02	0.00	0.08	1.00								
PROMO.	0.06	0.09	-0.06	-0.06	0.09	0.05	0.07	-0.09	0.26**	1.00							
SUPVR.	0.12	-0.01	0.04	-0.11	0.12	0.08	0.04	-0.11	0.09	0.21**	1.00						
FR. BNFT.	0.00	0.08	-0.01	0.02	0.08	-0.01	0.03	-0.02	0.13	0.08	0.12	1.00					
CNT. REW.	0.00	0.02	-0.09	-0.10	-0.10	0.02	0.05	-0.04	0.21**	0.19**	0.11	0.14	1.00				
OP. CON.	0.12	0.07	-0.03	0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.02	-0.03	-0.00	0.17*	1.00			
CWRKER.	0.05	0.02	0.06	0.00	-0.04	-0.00	0.05	-0.11	0.01	0.06	0.25**	-0.01	0.05	0.04	1.00		
NAT. WRK.	0.18*	0.14*	0.04	0.00	-0.11	0.01	0.04	-0.01	-0.08	0.02	0.16*	0.12	0.22**	0.17*	0.04	1.00	
COMM.	-0.02*	0.12	0.07	-0.10	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.06	-0.02	0.06	0.20**	0.09	0.10	0.19**	0.22**	0.09	1.00

** - Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

* - Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

Four linear regressions were run to assess the relationship between the predictor variables of cultural dimensions with the dependent variables of protean career attitude, boundaryless mindset, organizational mobility and job satisfaction. A 95% confidence interval was used to assess for statistical significance ($p < 0.05$) in all analyses. Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12 show regression coefficients for each of the analyses.

Table 9

Regression Coefficients for Protean Career Attitudes Scale (PCAS)

Predictors	B	Std. Error	Beta	t
Horizontal Individualism	0.75	0.11	0.46	6.75*
Horizontal Collectivism	0.19	0.13	0.12	1.50
Vertical Individualism	0.16	0.09	0.12	1.90
Vertical Collectivism	-0.31	0.10	-0.23	-3.00*

* Significant at the .05 level

The first regression was conducted to measure the predictability of individualism-collectivism to the protean career attitude (Table 9). The coefficient of determination (R^2) was found to be 0.285, thus, the portion of variance explained in PCAS scores is 28.5%. Of the four individualism-collectivism variables, HI and VC are significant with beta-weights of 0.46 ($p < 0.000$) and -0.23 ($p < 0.003$), respectively.

Table 10

Regression Coefficients for BCAS – Boundaryless Mindset

Predictors	B	Std. Error	Beta	t
Horizontal Individualism	0.24	0.09	0.21	2.72*
Horizontal Collectivism	0.25	0.10	0.22	2.46*
Vertical Individualism	0.10	0.07	0.10	1.45
Vertical Collectivism	-0.09	0.08	-0.09	-1.09

* Significant at the .05 level

Table 11

Regression Coefficients for BCAS – Organizational Mobility

Predictors	B	Std. Error	Beta	t
Horizontal Individualism	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.43
Horizontal Collectivism	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.70
Vertical Individualism	0.00	0.05	0.00	-0.01
Vertical Collectivism	0.20	0.06	0.30	3.58*

* Significant at the .05 level

The second and third regressions were run to measure the predictability of individualism-collectivism to boundaryless career attitudes (Tables 10 and 11). Unlike the PCAS, the subscales of the BCAS are statistically distinct enough that separate regression analyses were conducted on each subscale. For the Boundaryless Mindset (BM) subscale, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was found to be 0.13 or 13% of the portion of variance explained in BM scores. Two of the independent variables, HI and HC, were statistically significant. Their beta-weights were 0.206 $(p < 0.007)$ and 0.102 $(p < 0.015)$, respectively. The other subscale of the BCAS, Organizational Mobility (OM), had a coefficient of determination (R^2) at 0.12, thus having a 12% as the percentage of variance explained in OM scores. Of the four independent variables, only VC was found to be significant at 0.301 $(p < 0.000)$.

Table 12

Regression Coefficients for Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS)

Predictors	B	Std. Error	Beta	t
Horizontal Individualism	0.09	0.21	0.03	0.40
Horizontal Collectivism	0.57	0.25	0.23	2.27*
Vertical Individualism	0.15	0.17	0.07	0.89
Vertical Collectivism	-0.45	0.20	-0.21	-2.19*

* Significant at the .05 level

The final regression was run to measure the predictability of individualism-collectivism on overall job satisfaction. The coefficient of determination (R^2) was 0.051 or 5.1% of the fraction of variance explained in job satisfaction scores. Two of the independent variables were significant: HC and VC. HC had a reported beta-weight of 0.23 ($p < 0.05$), and VC and a reported beta-weight of -0.21 ($p < 0.05$).

Research Question #1

Is each cultural variable of Vertical Individualism (VI), Horizontal Individualism (HI), Vertical Collectivism (VC), and Horizontal Collectivism (HC) predictive of one's adherence to protean career attitudes?

The results indicate that out of the four cultural dimensions, HI and VC were statistically significant. Due to its significance, HI was determined to be a positive predictor of protean career attitudes (t = 6.75). VC, on the other hand, negatively predicted a protean career. (t = -3.00). The other two dimensions, HC and VI, were not found to be statistically significant predictors.

Research Question #2

Is each cultural variable of Vertical Individualism (VI), Horizontal Individualism (HI), Vertical Collectivism (VC), and Horizontal Collectivism (HC) predictive of one's adherence to boundaryless career attitudes?

Since the two subscales of the boundaryless career attitude were examined separately, a regression was run on each subscale. For the Boundaryless Mindset subscale, both horizontal dimensions, HI ($t = 2.72$) and HC ($t = 2.46$), were statistically significant and positive predictors. The two vertical dimensions, VI and VC, were not significant predictors.

The regression run on the Organizational Mobility subscale showed that VC was the only significant and positive predictor ($t = 3.58$). The other three cultural variables, HI, VI, and HC, were not found to be significant predictors of Organizational Mobility.

Research Question #3

Is each cultural variable of Vertical Individualism (VI), Horizontal Individualism (HI), Vertical Collectivism (VC), and Horizontal Collectivism (HC) predictive of one's overall level of job satisfaction?

A fourth regression was run on the overall score of job satisfaction. The regression output displayed HC ($t = 4.29$) and VC ($t = -3.72$) as significant predictors of job satisfaction. HC demonstrated as a positive predictor of job satisfaction while VC was determined to be a negative predictor. However, HI and VI were not found to be significant predictors. Notably, HI, which was predictive of an overall protean attitude and a boundaryless mindset, was not a predictive determinant of overall job satisfaction.

DISCUSSION

First, the overview of these findings is explored. Next, the interpretation of these findings, as related to the measures, is also explained. Lastly, the implications for future research studies and the study's limitations are reviewed.

Overview of the Correlational Findings

The Protean Career Attitudes Scale and the Boundaryless Career Attitudes Scale, which measured each theory respectively, were found to be related constructs. The two scales significantly and positively correlated with one another. There has been speculation that the two theories are synonymous (Briscoe & Hall, 2006; Granrose & Baccili, 2006). After all, the correlation is a 0.49 ($p < 0.01$) between the overall PCAS and BCAS scales. However, upon further inspection of the subscales, the results suggest that there is a difference between them.

First, the two subscales of the PCAS, Self-Directed Career Management and Values-Driven, were found to correlate positively with one another, similarly to the past findings of Briscoe and Finkelstein (2009). However, the BCAS's subscales, Boundaryless Mindset and Organizational Mobility, did not significantly correlate with one another. Instead, they clearly appeared to be independent constructs. Additionally, Boundaryless Mindset significantly and positively correlated with the Self-Directed Career Management Subscale (0.57 @ $p < 0.01$) and the Values-Driven Subscale (0.65 @ $p < 0.01$). This result seems to confirm that the two constructs are interrelated through Boundaryless Mindset. However, the other BCAS subscale, Organizational Mobility, did not significantly correlate with Boundaryless Mindset as well as both of the Protean Career Attitudes Scale's subscales. There are several conclusions that can be drawn from this result. First, this particular finding appears to suggest that the Boundaryless

42

Mindset and Organizational Mobility may represent contrasting aspects of the overall boundaryless career attitude. Secondly, the results suggest that while there may be overlap between the two theories, there is also a distinction between them. Thirdly, this distinction may lie primarily in a person's adherence to Organizational Mobility.

Although the regression analysis was run on the overall Job Satisfaction Survey, there are several relationships between the subscales that are noteworthy. First, Pay, Promotion, and Contingent Rewards were found to have a significant relationship. With an observable increase in a person's salary, there appears to be a relationship with the advancement of the job position as well as an increase of compensation due to rewarding good work. This seems to be generally ubiquitous. Second, Supervisor, Coworkers, and Communication significantly correlated. This result suggested that as supervisory relationships became more satisfied, relationships with fellow coworkers and communication across the organization also improved. Again, this notion appears to be appropriate.

While the other subscales of the Job Satisfaction Survey correlated with at least one other JSS subscale, Fringe Benefits did not correlate with any of the JSS subscales. This finding was perplexing because a benefits package such as a retirement plan or health insurance can often be found paired with a promotional offer or salary to "sweeten" the job position. However, the results of this particular correlational analysis suggests that Fringe Benefits may be a relatively standalone aspect of one's job satisfaction. The last correlational point of interest is the lack of significance in correlation between all subscales of the JSS and the subscales of the Protean Career Attitudes Scale (PCAS) and Boundaryless Career Attitudes Scale (BCAS). Although an overall JSS score correlated with the overall PCAS score, no single individual JSS subscale had a significant relationship with the Self-Directed Career Management Subscale, Values-Driven

43

Subscale, Boundaryless Mindset Subscale, or Organizational Mobility Subscale. This result may warrant further research as to how protean and boundaryless career theories relate to individual traits of career satisfaction.

Protean Career Discussion

First, Horizontal Individualism (HI) was determined to be the only significant positive predictor. A possible explanation of this result may be attributed to the aspect of autonomy that rests within the protean mindset (Briscoe & Hall, 2005). HI is defined by the combination of equality while maintaining a form of independence (Triandis, 1995). This cultural perspective may tap into core protean values of self-directed career guidance, psychological success (e.g. personally meaningful work instead of simply a paycheck), and a higher priority of the self instead of a collective group. The lack of direct competitiveness bolstered in the HI dimension attitude (e.g. INDCOL #21: I often "do my own thing") seems to directly translate into the protean mindset (e.g. PCAS #10: It doesn't matter much to me how other people evaluate the choices I make in my career).

Horizontal Collectivism (HC) was not a significant indicator of a protean attitude. HC suggests that there is a certain level of equality amongst members of a group while retaining a collective group mentality. Sivadas et al. (2008) described modern day China as a prime example of HC. Even though HC promotes a sense of equality that could coincide with characteristics of a protean attitude, the group mentality of collectivism could detract from one's full adherence to the overall protean career. For example, HC's level of interdependence (e.g. INDCOL #9: My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me) is a stark contrast to the

44

independence factor of the protean attitude (e.g. PCAS #11: What's most important to me is how I feel about my career success, not how other people feel about it).

Vertical Individualism (VI) did not significantly predict a protean attitude while Vertical Collectivism (VC) was a significant and negative indicator of one. Although VI is considered an individualistic variable, people who uphold this particular dimension tend to embrace an organizational hierarchy that can potentially conflict with ideas of personal career management outside of the organization. Furthermore, competition is overtly espoused in VI (e.g. INDCOL #4: Winning is everything), which appears to contradict the protean core value of finding personal psychological success (e.g. PCAS #9: I navigate my own career, based on my personal priorities, as opposed to my employer's priorities). The embrace of hierarchical competition rooted in the VI dimension appears to be a dominant factor than detracts from an adherence to an overall protean career model.

The last cultural variable, Vertical Collectivism (VC), was a significant predictor of the protean attitude, albeit a negative one. Statistically, this means that a higher identification with VC negatively predicts a protean mindset. In other words, the more one identifies with VC, the less he or she will adhere to the protean career attitude. This finding, although not originally hypothesized, does not appear to be completely unexpected. The combination of hierarchical dominance within a group membership is inherently opposite of protean characteristics. Sivadas et al. (2008) listed India as an example of VC due to its traditional caste system. Members of each caste are expected to perform within the confines of their caste and maintain harmony as a collective societal group, even at the expense of individual interests. For example, personal sacrifice found in VC (INDCOL #7: I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group) is contrasting to the protean attitude of independence (PCAS #14: In the past, I have sided

45

with my own values when the company has asked me to do something I don't agree with). When examining traits of VC such as sacrificing personal interests for the identified group's well being, the notion that VC can be significantly antithetical to the protean career is not far fetched.

Another important issue to expand upon is that the PCAS was devised to solely measure protean career attitudes. Since this present study did not directly measure the traditional career, one cannot conclude with certainty that VC's negative predictive value of the protean career directly translates into a significant predictor of a traditional career mindset. In other words, even though there appears to be opposing attributes between the protean career model and the traditional career model (Table 1), the authors of the PCAS did not explicitly equate low scores of the PCAS with a traditional career mentality. Therefore, low scores cannot be treated as such. Additional research needs to be conducted before a definite answer can be produced.

Boundaryless Career Discussion

Due to the Boundaryless Career Attitudes Scale (BCAS) being treated as two separate constructs, two regression analyses were run and yielded two contrasting results. The first regression on the Boundaryless Mindset subscale determined that the two horizontal cultural variables, Horizontal Individualism (HI) and Horizontal Collectivism (HC), significantly and positively predicted a boundaryless mindset. HC was initially expected to be a significant predictor because of the perceived emphasis on interdependence within the boundaryless career attitude. The sense of group mentality found in HC (e.g. INDCOL #28: I feel good when I cooperate with others) may be a contributing factor to a boundaryless mindset (e.g. BCAS #6: I enjoy jobs that require me to interact with people in many different organizations). This particular finding suggests that the perception of 'equal-footing' found within the horizontal

perspective is a significant determinant for boundaryless mindset traits such as developing skills

that transcend one particular job and finding personally meaningful work as a measurement of

success (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996).

While HC was confirmed to be a significant predictor, HI was an unexpected significant

predictor. The individualism component of HI was originally hypothesized to not be a significant

indicator of the boundaryless attitude due to its stressor of independence. After all, the

individualism of HI (e.g. INDCOL #5: One should live one's life independently of others) seems

to contradict group efforts of Boundaryless Mindset (e.g. BCAS #2: I would enjoy working on

projects with people across many organizations). However, the significance of HI on

Boundaryless Mindset could be attributed to the individual career management style of the

boundaryless career mindset (Table 2). For example, by developing oneself independently (e.g.

INDCOL #15: I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways), one can collaborate

with others and utilize that uniqueness as a benefit in working with others both inside and outside

an organization (e.g. BCAS #3: I enjoy job assignments that require me to work outside the

organization).

Neither Vertical Individualism (VI) nor Vertical Collectivism (VC) were not found to be

significant predictors of Boundaryless Mindset. This appears to suggest that the competitiveness

component found within the vertical dimensions is a key factor in detracting from a boundaryless

career. The overt competitiveness fostered in VI (e.g. INDCOL #8: It annoys me when other

people perform better than I do), is contrary to collective efforts with Boundaryless Mindset (e.g.

BCAS #2: I would enjoy working on projects with people across many organizations).

Additionally, the collective attitude found in VC (e.g. INDCOL #29: I hate to disagree with

others in my group) may tap into a sense of personal contribution to a collaborative project

(BCAS #7: I have sought opportunities in the past that allow me to work outside the organization). Someone who would proactively seek new opportunities with a group of others would likely be an active participant of that group.

The second regression was run on the other BCAS subscale, Organizational Mobility. Again, Horizontal Collectivism (HC) was originally believed to be the sole predictor while the other three cultural dimensions would not yield significance. The regression did produce only one predictor; however, the significant predictor was VC and not HC. Notably, HC was not a significant predictor. One possible explanation is that the notion that HC seems to promote a collaborative mindset (INDCOL #28: I feel good when I cooperate with others) could be geared more towards the Boundaryless Mindset component of an overall boundaryless attitude.

Upon first glance, this significance of Vertical Collectivism (VC) as a predictor of Organizational Mobility may seem contradictory as VC upholds values of group hierarchy and embracing one's role within this group. However, organizational mobility is defined by promoting flexibility both *within* and outside of the organization. Members of a group perform various tasks imposed by the authoritative power or expectation over the members. Thus, these tasks may change and demand a certain degree of flexibility of the group's members to adjust accordingly. Perhaps a person who upholds organizational mobility can be flexible or mobile enough to switch tasks for the sake of the group. This could be manifested as being flexible enough to consort with others even at the expense of the individual's personal gain (e.g. INDCOL #7: I usually sacrifice my self-interest in the benefit of my group). While this could potentially be a viable explanation, there are likely other reasons that can explain this result. Continued research can shed new light on the relationship between VC and organizational mobility and issues such as organizational flexibility, duty, and self-sacrifice.

Another noteworthy aspect of Organizational Mobility is that all five items that measure the subscale are reverse-written and must be reverse-scored to interpret. This subscale is the only measure that was based completely on reverse-scored items. Although the subscale demonstrated acceptable reliability ($\alpha = 0.80$), reverse-scoring items may have elicited a difference in responses had an alternate positively written set of items been used to measure Organizational Mobility.

Job Satisfaction Discussion

The third research question dealt with the predictive power of the cultural dimensions on overall job satisfaction. Of the four cultural variables, Horizontal Collectivism (HC) and Vertical Collectivism (VC) were significant predictors. First, HC was determined to be a positive predictor of overall job satisfaction. This finding suggests that a sense of equality within a group found in HC (e.g. INDCOL #14: The well-being of my coworkers is important to me) is a significant indicator of overall job satisfaction (e.g. JSS #7: I like the people I work with). This may be due in part an indicator of overall job satisfaction as defined by high ratings on communication with others (e.g. JSS #9: Communications seem good within this organization) and workplace harmony with supervisors (e.g. JSS #3: My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job) and coworkers (e.g. JSS #25: I enjoy my coworkers).

On the other hand, Vertical Collectivism (VC) was concluded to be a negative predictor of job satisfaction. The issue of self-sacrifice (e.g. INDCOL #29: I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group) may be directly countering the notion of personal satisfaction (e.g. JSS #19: I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me). Although there is likely a sense of duty in all types of jobs across the career spectrum in

49

the U.S., relinquishing control and submitting to an external workplace authority within the dominant culture may require a balance through a sense of personal compensation (e.g. JSS #1: I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do). For example, if individuals were increasingly asked by their firms to sacrifice personal gains and interests without being offered anything in return, they would respond by becoming more dissatisfied in their work. However, this result may need to be cross-examined in working populations with a dominant adherence to Vertical Collectivism.

Horizontal Individualism (HI) and Vertical Individualism (VI) were not significant predictors of job satisfaction. This result suggests that the individualistic variables do not significantly predict overall job satisfaction. Notably, the predictor of protean career attitudes, Horizontal Individualism, was not a predictor of job satisfaction. However, as mentioned in the literature, autonomy and a self-driven career has been linked to perceived success and satisfaction (Cooper-Hakim & Visweseran, 2005; De Vos & Soens, 2008; Sargent & Domberger, 2007). One possible explanation of this finding is that because several of the Job Satisfaction Survey's subscales assess satisfaction through working with others in an organization as opposed to self-managing entrepreneurial work, the instrument may slant towards rating higher levels of job satisfaction for those who are employed through an organization. Strictly speaking, the nature of the JSS may tailor toward people who identify more strongly with collaborative efforts instead of individualized work environments. For example, the independent pursuits of one person (e.g. INDCOL #18: I often "do my own thing") may be satisfying to him or her but may not be proportionally ranked as highly by the JSS.

Implications

The foundation that the protean and boundaryless career literature rests upon states that these theories stem from changes within societal and organizational structures (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Briscoe et al., 2006; Hall, 1976). In response to these often unsettling changes, individuals adapt by becoming more self-reliant to ensure their own futures. Thus, the more people become self-directed in managing their careers and finding self-fulfilling work, their greater the likelihood that they would adhere to one or more modern career theories.

The results of this study seem to indicate that certain types of cultural perspectives along the individualism/collectivism and vertical/horizontal axes may be more apt to identify with a protean or boundaryless career. For example, people who identified highly with Horizontal Individualism would be more likely to embrace a protean career while those who identified highly with Vertical Collectivism (VC) would be most likely not to. This appears to suggest that retaining VC characteristics could make one less prepared for future career trends such as increased global competition.

Although Vertical Individualism (VI) would appear to be a moderately effective cultural perspective in preparing for either modern career theory, this study's findings did not indicate so. Perhaps steadily climbing up the "corporate ladder" still seems to fit a traditional career model. Future studies may need to be conducted to examine what role hierarchical acknowledgement factors into a protean or boundaryless career.

Regarding the contention that protean and boundaryless career theories are synonymous, the findings argue for distinct differences. A boundaryless mindset may be similar to the protean career model, but perhaps the defining difference between the two theories is the notion of organizational mobility. Even though a protean career could lead to a more mobile career, inter-

and intra-organizational mobility is more characteristic of a boundaryless career. Future studies could explore any potential differences between mobility within an organization (e.g. moving departments) and moving between firms themselves.

Lastly, the study's findings indicated that overall job satisfaction might not be guaranteed even with a protean or boundaryless career. Thus, if people were to be dissatisfied with their work, this could potentially lead to a negative impact in other areas of their lives such as financial stability, mental health, and family dynamics (Fouad, 2007). Moreover, the findings that Vertical Collectivism negatively predicts job satisfaction may suggest that people from that cultural perspective could be experiencing higher levels of overall job dissatisfaction. A poor sense of job satisfaction can factor into both acute and chronic mental health issues. Thus, vocational counseling or other types of mental healthcare may be beneficial for those who approach their careers from that cultural standpoint.

Limitations

The current study comes with several inherent limitations. First, the study's results come from a convenience sample. The lack of randomization may affect the study's generalizability to a broader population. Second, the data provided for analyses were based on participants' self-report. The degree of self-report inaccuracy may be contingent on factors outside of the researcher's control. Third, the sample size for measuring overall job satisfaction was affected by the removal of the "Does Not Apply to Me" responses. Allowing this option in the measure may have captured a more accurate depiction of job satisfaction, but the decrease in the sample size may have reduced the sample's statistical power. Fourth, the present study did not examine participants who would otherwise claim multiethnic backgrounds. As globalization continues, it

could be likely that a greater amount of people would classify themselves not as a singular

ethnicity but a myriad of several heritages. Fifth, specific geographic areas were not specifically

examined. Instead, the sample hailed from various states in the U.S., each with its own set of

subcultural norms and expectations. Depending on the region, these norms could vary in

influencing people's career trajectories. Sixth, a diverse number of careers were examined. The

study's favor for breadth may have come at the expense of overlooking key differences between

types of careers. For example, individuals may approach careers with a higher level of overall

job security (e.g. department manager) differently than those careers that bear more of an

unpredictable sense of job demand (e.g. contract worker). Seventh, in addition to the diversity of

career fields included in the study, there is limitation regarding the absence of assessing cultural

atmospheres within the employing institutions. For example, if one's organization promotes

more of a group effort, a person who identifies strongly with individualism could also experience

a decrease of satisfaction while working in that environment. Eighth, approximately 20% of the

participants indicated that they currently held a part-time job. The approach to a part-time job

may not be identical to one's approach to a lifelong career. Ninth, as the survey was offered

solely online, qualified individuals who did not have Internet access were unable to participate in

the study. For example, a rancher in a desolate area of the country may not have had consistent

Internet access to participate.

Future Research

      Future areas of research should continue to identify characteristics of individuals who are

more apt to embrace protean or boundaryless career theories as well as the relationship between

cultural background, career attitudes, and job satisfaction. For example, this study's participants

primarily hailed from the West South Central division and should be replicated in other areas of the United States. Additionally, although demographic data was gathered, variables such as age, gender, and career field were not examined extensively. Significant differences may lie within these differences. For instance, a significant portion of the sample claimed to be self-employed. The job satisfaction instrument used in this study contained items that were not applicable to self-employed business owners. Individuals who adhere to a protean career may find their self-directed careers easily leading them to become "their own bosses". Future studies can examine specific subscales of job satisfaction to gain a clearer picture of how small business owners or self-employed individuals determine their job satisfaction. By focusing on specific career fields or subscales of the Job Satisfaction Scale, issues such as suppression variables may be better mitigated. Lastly, the present study incorporated both full-time and part-time employees. The perception of one's career may be different between these two types of employees. Examining differences in adherence to the protean and boundaryless career theories may differ depending if one considers his or her present job as a true career.

Conclusion

This study supported the two-factor model of the boundaryless career in containing both psychological (Boundaryless Mindset) and physical mobility (Organizational Mobility) (Sullivan & Arthur, 2006). Additional research can be conducted to further examine the two-factor model of the protean career and the nine-factor model of job satisfaction. Furthermore, the study has added to the knowledge on how cultural individualism and collectivism could impact career attitudes and satisfaction.

The results of this study add to the growing literature on career issues for today's worker. As demonstrated, cultural perspectives can directly influence job satisfaction and adaptation to a changing work environment. This study can contribute towards the importance for vocational counselors and other mental healthcare professionals alike to retain cultural awareness when providing psychological and vocational assistance to today's worker. Cultural backgrounds have been demonstrated to directly relate to the embracing of career modernization and satisfaction. Since a career (or lack thereof) can likely be a crucial part of one's identity, drastically reducing job satisfaction or intensifying career distress can perpetuate a host of other mental health issues. In conclusion, career counselors and other mental healthcare providers should continuously update and maintain their cultural competence in working with an increasingly diverse client population.

REFERENCES

Adelman, I., & Morris, C.T. (1967). *Society, politics and economic development: A quantitative approach.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Arnett, J.J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *American Psychologist, 57,* 774-783. Examining contemporary careers: a call for interdisciplinary inquiry. *Human Relations, 61*(2), 163-186.

Arthur, M.B., Khapova, S.N., & Wilderom, C.P.M. (2005). Career success in a boundaryless career world. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*, 177-202.

Arthur, M.B., & Rousseau, D.M. (Eds.). (1996). *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Baker, T., & Aldrich, H.E. (1996). Prometheus Stretches: Building identity and cumulative knowledge in multiemployer careers. In M.B. Arthur & D.M. Rousseau (Eds.), *The Boundaryless Career* (p. 132-149). New York: Oxford University Press.

Baruch Y. & Quick J. C. (2007) Understanding Second Careers: Lessons from a Study of U.S. Navy Admirals. *Human Resource Management, 46*(4), 471-491.

Blau, G. (2001). On assessing the construct validity of two multidimensional constructs: Occupational commitment and occupational entrenchment. *Human Resource Management Review,* 11, 279-298.

Blustein, D.L. (2006). *The psychology of working: A new perspective for career development, counseling, and public policy.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erblaum Associates.

Briscoe, J.P., & Finkelstein, L.M. (2009). The "new career" and organizational commitment: Do boundaryless and protean attitudes make a difference? *Career Development International, 14*(3), 242-260.

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.

Briscoe, J.P., Hall, D.T. (2006). Special section on boundaryless and protean careers: Next steps in conceptualizing and measuring boundaryless and protean careers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 1-3.

Briscoe, J.P., & Hall, D.T. (2005). *Protean and boundaryless career assessment collection.* Boston, MA: Unpublished, copyrighted scale collection.

Briscoe, J.P., Waters, L.E., & Hall, D.T. (2005). A Protean Approach to Unemployment: Results of a Qualitative Study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management. Honolulu, HI, August 8.

Cabrera, E.F. (2008). Protean organizations, Reshaping work and careers to retain female talent. *Career Development International*, *14*(2), 186-201.

Cheramie, R.A., Sturman, M.C., Walsh, K. (2007). Executive career management: Switching organizations and the boundaryless career. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 71*, 359-374.

Chiou, J.S. (2001). Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and collectivism among college students in the United States, Taiwan, and Argentina. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 141*(5), 667-678.

Chirkov, V.I., Ryan, R.M., & Willness, C. (2005). Cultural context and psychological needs in Canada and Brazil – testing a self-determination approach to the internalization of

cultural practices, identity, and well-being. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 46*(4), 423-443.

Chung, T. & Mallery, P. (2000). Social Comparison, Individualism-Collectivism, and Self-Esteem in China and the United States. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, and Social, 18*(4), 340-352.

Chung-Yan, G.A. (2010). The Nonlinear Effects of Job Complexity and Autonomy on Job Satisfaction, Turnover, and Psychology Well-Being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15*(3), 237-251.

Cooper-Hakim, A., Visweseran, C. (2005). The Construct of Work Commitment: Testing an Integrative Framework. *Psychological Bulletin, 131*(2), 241-259.

Coutinho, M.T., Dam, U.C., Blustein, D.L. (2008). The psychology of working and globalization: a new perspective for a new era. *International Journal of Educational and Vocational Guidance, 8,* 5-18.

De Vos, A., & Soens, N. (2008). Protean attitude and career success: The mediating role of self-management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*, 449-456.

Dumont, L. (1986). *Essays on individualism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eby, L.T., Butts, M., Lockwood, A. (2003). Predictors of success in the era of the boundaryless career. *Journal of Management, 33*(3), 350-377.

Feldman, D.C., Leana, C.R., Bolino, M.C. (2002). Underemployment and relative deprivation among re-employed executives. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75*(4), 453-471.

Fernandez, V., & Enache, M. (2008). Exploring the relationship between protean and

    boundaryless career attitudes and affective commitment through the lens of a fuzzy set

    QCA methodology. *Intangible Capital, 4*(1) 31-66.

Fouad, N.A. & Byars-Winston, A.M. (2005). Cultural Context of Career Choice: Meta-Analysis

    of Race/Ethnicity Differences. *The Career Development Quarterly 53*, 223-233.

Fouad, N.A. (2007). Work and Vocational Psychology: Theory, Research, and Applications.

    Annual Review of Psychology, 58, 543-564.

Friedman, T.L. (2006). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century updated and

    expanded.* New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Gasteiger, R. (2007). *Self-directed Career Management: The Protean Approach to Career

    Success. An Empirical Study of German Executives and Professionals.* University of

    Amsterdam Business School. QMSS Conference, Prague. 22 June 2007. Lecture.

Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysts

    and applications* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-Merrill Prentice Hall.

Granrose, C.S., Baccili, P.A. (2006). Do psychological contracts include boundaryless or protean

    careers? *Career Development International, 11*(2), 163-182.

Grantham, C. (2000). *The future of work: The promise of the new digital work society.* New

    York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gudykunst, W. & Matsumoto, Y. (1996). The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism,

    self-construals and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human

    Communication Research, 22,* 510-543.

Hall, D.T. & Mirvis, P.H. (1996). The new protean career – psychological success and path with a heart. In *The career is dead-long live the career: a relational approach to careers* (p. 15-45). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Hall, D.T., & Moss, J.E. (1998). The New Protean Career Contract: Helping Organizations and Employees Adapt. *Organizational Dynamics, 26*(3), 22-37.

Hall, D.T. (2004). The protean career: A quarter-century journey. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 1-13.

Hall, D.T. (1976). *Careers in organizations.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Hardin, E.E., Leong, F.T.L., & Osipow, S.H. (2001). Cultural relativity in the conceptualization of career maturity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58,* 36-42.

Hartung, P.J., Fouad, N.A., Leong, F.T.L., & Hardin, E.E. (2010). Individualism-Collectivism: Links to Occupational Plans and Work Values. *Journal of Career Assessment, 18*(1), 34-45.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultural consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hsu, F.L. (1983). *Rugged individualism reconsidered.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Jenkins, H. (2004). Pop Cosmopolitanism: Mapping Cultural Flows in an Age of Media Convergence. In M.M. Suárez-Orozco and Desiree Baolian Qin-Hillard (Eds.), *Globalization: culture and education in the new millennium* (pp. 114-140). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Kanagawa, C., Cross, S.E., & Markus, H.R. (2001). "Who Am I?" The Cultural Psychology of the Self. *Society for Personality and Social Psychology, 27*(1), 90-103.

Kashima, Y., Siegel, M., Tanaka, K., & Kashima, E.S. (1992). Do people believe behaviors are consistent with attitudes? Toward a cultural psychology of attribution processes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 331,* 111-124.

Kemmelmeier, M., Burnstein, E., Krumov, K., Genkova, P., Kanagawa, C., Hirshberg, M.S., Erb, H.P., Wieczorkowska, G., & Noels, J.A. (2003). Individualism, collectivism, and authoritarianism in seven societies. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 34*(3), 304-322.

Komarraju, M. & Cokley, K.O. (2008). Horizontal and Vertical Dimensions of Individualism-Collectivism: A Comparison of African Americans and European Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 14*(4), 336-343.

Lee, W-N., & Choi, S.M. (2005). The role of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism in online consumers' response toward persuasive communication on the Web. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11*(1), article 15. http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue1/wnlee.html

Markus, H.R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Maslow, A.H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370-396.

Messmer, M. (2002). Boosting employee productivity on a tight budget. *Strategic Finance, 83*(10), 15-16.

Meyer, J.P., Becker, T.E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: a conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(6), 991-1007.

Meyer, J.P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace. Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review, 11*, 299-326.

Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*, 61-89.

Miller, J., Bersoff, D.M., & Harwood, R.L. (1990). Perceptions of social responsibilities in India and the United States: Moral imperative or personal decisions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 729-738.

Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M. (1982*). Organizational Linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Nelson, M.R. & Shavitt, S. (2002). Horizontal and vertical individualism and achievement values – a multimethod examination of Denmark and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*(5), 439-458.

Ng, T., Eby, L., Sorensen, K., & Feldman, D. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 58,* 367-408.

Ng, K.Y., & Van, D.L. (2001). Individualism-collectivism as a boundary condition for effectiveness of minority influence in decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 8*(2), 198-225.

Oishi, S., Schimmack, U., Diener, E., & Suh, E.M. (1998). The measurements of values and individualism-collectivism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24,* 117-1189.

Park, H., Rehg, M.T., & Lee, D. (2005). The influence of Confucian ethics and collectivism on whistle blowing intentions: A study of South Korean Public employees. *Journal of Business Ethics, 58*(4), 387-403.

Parker, P. (2008). Promoting employability in a "flat" world. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 45*, 2-13.

Paterson, J.M. & Cary, J. (2002). Organizational justice, change anxiety, and acceptance of downsizing: preliminary tests of an AET-based model. *Motivation and Emotion, 26*(1), 83-103.

Peterson, N., & Gonzalez, R.C. (2005). *The Role of Work in People's Lives.* Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.

QuestionPro Survey Software*. Demographic Questionnaire* (2011). Retrieved from http://www.questionpro.com/akira/showSurveyLibrary.do?surveyID=183105.

Roan, A., Lafferty, G., & Loudoun, R. (2002). Survivors and victims: a case study of organizational restructuring in the public health sector. *New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations, 27*(2), 151-168.

Robert, C., Lee, W.C., & C. K-Y., (2006). An Empirical Analysis of Measurement Equivalence with the INDCOL Measure of Individualism and Collectivism: Implications for Valid Cross-Cultural Inference. *Personnel Psychology,* 59, 65-99.

Rousseau, D.M. (1995). *Psychological Contracts in Organizations: Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 68-78.

Sargent, L.D., & Domberger, S.R. (2007). Exploring the development of protean career orientation: values and image violations. *Career Development International, 12*(6), 545-564.

Savickas, M.L. (2000). Renovating the psychology of careers for the twenty-first century. In

    R.A. Young & Collins (Eds.), *The future of career* (p. 53-68). New York, NY:

    Cambridge University Press.

Schultheiss, D.E.P. (2003). A relational approach to career counseling: Theoretical integration

    and practical application. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 81*, 301-310.

Singelis, T.M., Triandis, H.C., Bhawuk, D., & Gelfand, M.J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical

    dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement

    refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research, 29*, 240-275.

Sivadas, E., Bruvold, N.T., & Nelson, M.R. (2008). A reduced version of the horizontal and

    vertical individualism and collectivism scale: A four-country assessment. *Journal of*

    Business Research 61, 201-210.

Somers, M.J., & Birnbaum, D. (1998). Work-related commitment and job performance: it's also

    the nature of the performance that counts. *Journal of Organization Behavior, 19*(6), 621-

    634.

Snider, P.D. & Styles, I. (2005). Analysis of the Collectivism and Individualism Scale Using a

    Rasch Measurement Model. In Waugh, R.F. (Ed.) *Frontiers in Educational Psychology*

    (p. 311-332). Hauppauge: NY. Nova Science Publishers.

Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of Human Service Staff Satisfaction: Development of the Job

    Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13*(6), 693-713.

Strunk, D.R., & Chang, E.C. (1999). Distinguishing between fundamental dimensions of

    individualism-collectivism: relations to sociopolitical attitudes and beliefs. *Personality*

    and Individual Differences, 27, 665-671.

Sturges, J., Guest, D., Conway, N., & Mackenzie, D.K. (2002). A longitudinal study of the

    relationship between career management and organizational commitment among

    graduates in the first ten years at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational*

    Psychology, 9(3), 731-748.

Sullivan, S.E. & Arthur, M.B. (2006). The evolution of the boundaryless career concept:

    Examining physical and psychological mobility. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*(1),

    19-29.

Sullivan, S.E. (1999). The Changing Nature of Careers: A Review and Research Agenda.

    Journal of Management, 25(3), 457-484.

Trafimow, D. & Finlay, J. (1996). The importance of subjective norms for a minority of people:

    Between-subjects and within-subjects analyses. *Personality and Social Psychology*

    Bulletin, 22, 820-828.

Triandis, H.C. & Gelfand, M.J. (1998). Converging Measurement of Horizontal and Vertical

    Individualism and Collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(1),

    118-128.

Triandis, H.C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Tzafrir, S.S., Mano-Negrin, R., Harel, G.H., Rom-Nagy, D. (2006). Downsizing and the impact

    of job counseling and retraining on effective employee responses. *Career Development*

    International, 11(2), 125-144.

U.S. Census Bureau (2010). *U.S. Census Regions and Divisions.* Retrieved from

    http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/reps/maps/us_census.html.

Van Saane, N., Sluiter, J.K., Verbeek, J.H.A.M., & Frings-Dresen, M.H.W. (2003). Reliability

and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction – a systematic review.

Occupational Medicine, 53, 191-200.

Wagner, J.A. III (1995). Study of individualism-collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups.

Academy of Management Journal, 38(1), 152-170.

Walsh, W.B., Whiston, S., Hardin, E.E., Hartung, P.J., Savickas, M.L., & Fouad, N.A. (2010).

The Next Big Questions in Vocational Psychology. Symposium presented at the annual

meeting of the APA convention, San Diego, CA.

Yetim, U. (2003). The Impacts of Individualism/Collectivism, Self-Esteem, and Feeling of

Mastery on Life Satisfaction Among the Turkish University Students and Academicians.

Social Indicators Research, 61, 297-317.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

Review of the Literature

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History of Work

One's career plays a significant and constant role in people's lives across time and cultures. Work incorporates effort, energy, and completing tasks for the overall welfare of society. Friedman (2006) described three eras of the evolution of work. During the first era, people's lines of work were often determined by their parents' work. For example, a farming family would typically expect that their children grow up to continue the family business. Only the wealthy and privileged had the opportunity to expand their career search repertoire to areas such as politics or religious service.

As large cities and their factories began to thrive, many people then migrated there for work. Work was no longer bound solely by the family lineage (Savickas, 2000). This era defined the traditional career. In a traditional career, an individual looks to one or a few select employers for job security and the upward climb of the corporate ladder (Granrose & Baccili, 2006). Employees were then awarded for salary increases and other compensations. Job security and stability were the major factors in defining a successful career. Savickas (2000) described this career pursuit as the "grand career narrative".

The third and present era is marked with technological advances and the expansion of the free market around the world. Organizations and people alike were not necessarily restricted to geographical areas. This ushered in a whole new set of competition for work positions that frequently resulted in downsizing middle-level management and other positions that had been previously coveted as stable jobs (Friedman, 2006). The absence of guaranteed long-term job

security has been described as a shift in the nature of the psychological contract between an employer and his or her employee (Granrose & Baccili, 2006).

Globalization

As the world continues to change, there has been a noticeable integration between multiple cultures and societies. This integration, commonly known as globalization, is defined as "a process by which cultures influence one another and become more alike through trade, immigration and exchange of information and ideas" (Arnett, 2002, p. 774). The phenomenon of globalization encapsulates an array of issues and has been investigated from a number of disciplines such as economics, government relations, immigration, and media information (Coutino, et al., 2008). Globalization directly expanded economic competition from its limits of particular geographical locations to a global scale. This shift has driven business organizations and individuals alike to rethink their strategies and adapt to swifter competition. Although globalization exists, this phenomenon is not equally perceived around the world (Arnett, 2002). Technology accessibility and affordability is not available in all areas. However, globalization has and continues to shape people's lives both directly and indirectly through personal communication or professional restructuring.

Friedman (2006) identified three distinct eras of globalization. The first era of globalization, which lasted from 1492 to approximately 1800, was marked by geographical exploration, conquest, colonization, and international trade. The second era, from 1800 to roughly 2000, was characterized by the joint effort by multiple countries to establish an interchange of economical trade. This interchange influenced the development of the integration and interdependence of financial markets that stretches across the world today. Lastly, the third

era, which incorporates the time from 2000 to the present, ushers in a period where the individual himself is able to compete and collaborate on a global scale. This era has witnessed rapid technological advancements, most notably with the personal computer and the Internet. These advancements have allowed communication to occur beyond cultural and national lines (Parker, 2008).

The ease of transportation has drastically increased throughout time to allow for contact with other cultures. People are able to travel around the world at speeds that would have been deemed impossible in previous eras. However, one of the easiest and quickest ways to interact with people around the world is the usage of the media (Jenkins, 2004). The widespread usage of the television, radio, and the Internet has made instant communication possible. Companies maintain elaborate websites in multiple languages to market their products to global consumers. For example, Japanese films have made their way to fans within the United States while American fast food chains have opened up stores around Japan. These economic exchanges across nations produce a hybridization of cultures and a greater global culture.

Hybridization has been defined as "a phenomenon that results from the increased cultural connection around the world, entailing intercultural processes through which existing cultural practices are recombined to develop new ones" (Coutino et al., 2008, p. 8). Arnett (2002) has described a global identity that developed as a result of this hybridization. He postulates that this global identity instills "a sense of belonging to the worldwide culture and includes an awareness of events, practices, styles and information that are part of a global culture" (p. 777). However, along with the adoption of a global culture, individuals still uphold their local identity with their specific traditions and culture.

Globalization has had a significant effect on companies across the world. One particular effect is known as organizational downsizing. Tzafrir, Mano-Negrin, Harel, and Rom-Nagy (2006) defined downsizing as "the systematic reduction of a workforce through a set of activities by which organizations aim to improve efficiency and performance". To ensure that they remain competitive in an increasingly global market, organizations downsize to cut costs. Downsizing often occurs in organizations that are reacting to financial losses and can affect both individual employees and the entire organizational structure itself (Messmer, 2002; Paterson & Carey, 2002). Although downsizing clearly impacts employees who lose their jobs, those who survive the downsizing are often not left unscathed either. Studies have demonstrated that downsizing places a toll on employees' physical health and psychological functioning (Feldman, Leana, & Bolino, 2002; Roan, Lafferty, & Loudoun, 2002; Tzafrir et al., 2006).

Another example of globalization's effect is the concept of outsourcing (Parker, 2008; Savickas, 2000). Instead of paying premium prices for manufacturing and services in one's own nation, companies select workers from other developed or developing countries to take on these roles at a cheaper cost. Again, the outsourcing of jobs meant that positions that were previously reserved and secure were no longer readily available. There is demand for individuals to continually expand their skill sets and market their strengths. While some people have been able to experience more autonomy and ownership in their careers due to globalization, others have struggled to adapt to this change (Arnett, 2002).

Economic trends from the seventies to the mid-nineties have indicated that there is an enlarging gap of resources between those who have higher skills than those who are less skilled (Arnett, 2002; Coutino et al., 2008; Grantham, 2000). Those who were less skilled often were near the bottom of the wage distribution and experienced the least amount of financial increases.

The more highly skilled individuals were commonly found to be near the top of the wage distribution and also enjoyed more financial increases. The continued shift towards a global pool of potential employees leaves companies and organizations to focus their attention on more highly skilled people – leaving less skilled people with less or no employment options.

Tzafrir et al. (2006) postulated that changes in the nature of work have often left individuals unable to find meaning in their work. With the embracing of flexibility and no particular allegiance to an organization, he noted that there is a loss of social and personal connection to one's job. Increased mobility in the workforce such as working from home or living alone in furnished complexes on company property also changes the nature of work, leaving some isolated and struggling to find a sense of greater purpose.

Organizational Commitment

Traditional careers tend to have more implicit psychological contracts, which are subjective and may be perceived differently depending on the individual or organization (Granrose & Baccili, 2006; Hall & Moss, 1998). Violations to this expectation have led to these contracts becoming explicit, impacting the way an employer and an employee function with one another. Rousseau (1995) labeled the traditional contract as relational while the modern contract as transactional. The modern psychological contract between employer and employee has been altered to the point where some people may believe that loyalty to a company does not guarantee employment. This movement has likely promoted an "everyone for themselves" mentality, which has influenced the commitment to one's employing organization (Hall and Moss, 1998).

Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) defined commitment as "a force that binds an individual to a course of action that is of relevance to one or more targets" (p. 301). Studies have shown

that organizational commitment directly influences job performance, turnover, overall effectiveness and individual well-being (Fernandez & Enache, 2008; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Somers & Birnhaum, 1998).

One method of conceptualizing organizational commitment is called affective commitment, which Meyer and Allen (1991) defined as an individual's involvement, identification with, and emotional attachment to a particular organization. Affective commitment develops when employees become personally invested in the employing organization, recognize the merit of associating of that pursuit, and formulate an identity from the association.

Meyer, Becker, and Vandenberghe (2004) found that higher levels of affective commitment were associated with greater intrinsic motivation, more autonomy, and a stronger individual focus of achievement in today's worker. With a greater sense of autonomy, employees develop ownership of their vocational development and become more proactive in honing their skills. In turn, the modern employee abides by the transactional psychological contract by providing skills to the employer in exchange for continuous learning and marketability.

Career Self-Management

People who uphold protean or boundaryless career attitudes are thought to manage their careers guided by personal values and a strong sense of identity (De Vos and Soens, 2008). Career self-management is two-part: reflective and behavioral (Sturges, Guest, Conway, & Mackenzie, 2002). The reflective aspect of career self-management describes the employee's insight of personal values and the formulation of desired career goals. Thus, individuals are able to make purposeful choices. The subsequent behavioral aspect is the proactive self-driven effort to modify behaviors to achieve or obtain those goals, thus leading to a more flexible and mobile

mindset. Studies on career self-management have suggested that individuals who take an active stance on managing personal career goals and trajectories experience higher rates of overall vocational success (Arthur, et al., 2005; Ng, Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2005).

Relationship between Individualism and Collectivism

The dimensions of individualism and collectivism are often conceptualized as a "continuum that captures a cultural group's beliefs, norms, roles, and values regarding an individual's membership in a group as well as relationship with others" (Komarraju & Cokley, 2008, p. 336). These concepts have been studied and evaluated in many contexts such as politics (Singelis et al., 1995), morality (Miller, Bersoff, & Harwood, 1990), ideology (Dumont, 1986), religion (Bakan, 1966), economic development (Adelman & Morris, 1967), cultural patterns (Hsu, 1983), and the self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

The relationship between individualism and collectivism and its classification system has evolved from a single spectrum to one that is multi-dimensional. Historically, researchers conceptualized these dimensions to be antithetic and that all cultures could be labeled as one or the other (Hofstede, 1980; Wagner, 1995). However, given the impact of globalization, the notion of a homogeneous population may not be entirely accurate today (Lee & Choi, 2005). Although there is a tendency to view individualism and collectivism as dichotomous constructs, studies have shown that people form their personal characteristics and preferences under different situations (Chiou, 2001; Chirkov et al., 2005; Triandis, 1995). Therefore, not all members of an individualistic culture are individualists and all members of a collectivistic culture are collectivists (Lee & Choi, 2005).

The Concept of Self

A key component in I-C is the concept and the role of the self (Kanagawa, Cross, & Markus, 2001). Although the notion of "being yourself" is advised in both the United States and Japan, the meaning behind the phrase may be conceived differently. Studies suggest that implication of "be yourself" may be different due to the difference in how cultures and individuals conceptualize themselves and each other. Research has indicated that the concept of the self is formed through specific milieus and social interactions (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). In the United States, the self is perceived as an independent, closed, and private individual being. However, in Japan, the self is typically associated with openness, flexibility, and adaptation to the specific situation (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). This difference has helped research view the concept of self on a continuum of independence versus interdependence.

In many Western cultures, especially in the U.S., the self is defined as an "integrated whole composed of abilities, values, personality attributes, preferences, feeling states, and attitudes (Kanagawa et al., 2001, p. 91). This view, coined as the *independent self-construal* holds these traits to transcend specific situations or relationships (Hardin, Leong, & Osipow, 2001). In other words, the core representation of the self is presumed to be static over broad and contrasting situations. Since these traits are a prime determinant of the self, individuals who abide by the independent self-construal tend to highlight their strong positive attributes that set themselves apart from others while minimizing any negative attributes. Any deviation of the self is suggestive of hypocrisy or lacking maturity.

On the other hand, many East Asian cultures such as the Japanese uphold an *interdependent self-construal*, which regards the self as flexible, relational, and adaptive to

76

context-specific situations (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Those who see through the interdependent self-construal lens primarily view themselves as related to others rather than an individual and unique self. In contrast to distinguishing oneself from others, the prime focus is to recognize and maintain one's proper place in relation to others. Instead of an overt priority of stark individuality, people are seen to play a role within a larger framework. Any overemphasis on the individual's personal positive attributes is seen as immature. Unlike the independent self-construal, negative attributes of an individual are examined regularly for the purpose of creating and improving harmonious social relationships. Kanagawa et al. (2001) described a keen cultural difference between the U.S. and Japan in that while self-criticism is suggestive of low self-esteem in America, it is an integral component in both personal and professional development within Japanese culture.

APPENDIX B:

Participation Information Sheet

The Relationship of Job Satisfaction with Attitudes Towards
Protean & Boundaryless Career Theories and Individualism & Collectivism
Participation Information Sheet

You are invited to participate in an online study exploring the relationship between career attitudes, job satisfaction, and personal independence/interdependence. Proceeding with the web-based survey is your consent to participate in this study. Responses will be strictly voluntary and anonymous. Your participation will assist in exploring how one's attitude towards managing careers can influence overall career satisfaction.

All information collected in this study is strictly confidential. No one except the primary researcher and his dissertation advisor will have access to individual responses. No identifying information will be collected with the exception of an optional email address for participation in a raffle for a $25 Wal-Mart gift card. Email addresses will not be paired with individual responses and cannot be traced back to their specific questionnaires. To minimize any risks, the data will be stored securely with password-protected software. Only the primary researcher and his dissertation advisor will have the password. The data will be kept for one calendar year or until the data is fully analyzed. Furthermore, once the data is analyzed, it will be completely destroyed.

There is minimal risk involved for participation in this study. There are no known risks associated with this project that are greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life. If you are willing to participate in this study, your consent will be indicated by the completion of all questionnaires. If you choose to participate in the study, you will be asked to fill out several questionnaires that should take no more than 20-30 minutes to complete. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You can choose to discontinue the survey at any time without reprisal or penalty.

This study is part of a requirement for the primary researcher's completion of his Ph.D. If you have any questions concerning this study, please feel free to contact the primary researcher, Ren Hong, or his advisor, John Romans, Ph.D. at (405) 744-6040. If you have questions about your rights as a research volunteer, you may contact Dr. Shelia Kennison, IRB Chair, 219 Cordell North, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405-744-3377 or irb@okstate.edu. Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated.

Ren Hong, M.A.
Counseling Psychology Doctoral Candidate
Oklahoma State University

I have read and fully understand the consent form. I understand that my participation is voluntary. By clicking below, I am indicating that I freely and voluntarily and agree to participate in this study, and I also acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

It is recommended that you print a copy of this consent page for your records before you begin the study by clicking below.

APPENDIX C:

Script

Script

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am a doctoral student in the Counseling Psychology Ph.D. program at Oklahoma State University. I am inviting you to participate in a research study exploring the relationship between attitudes toward managing careers, job satisfaction, and cultural independence/interdependence with adults in the U.S. The study should require no more than 20-30 minutes.

Participation is completely voluntary, and answers are anonymous. You may quit the study at any time. No identifying information will be collected for the study. However, there is a completely optional raffle at the end of the surveys for a $25 Wal-Mart gift card, and to participate, you need to provide a valid email address so that you can be contacted should you win.

Your participation in the study can aid in research seeking to understand how people from different cultures respond to the changing nature of careers in the U.S. If you would like to participate in the study, please click on the following link: _____. You may also email me at ren.hong@okstate.edu.

Please also feel free to forward this email to working adults you know who may be interested in participating. Thank you very much for your assistance!

Ren Hong, M.A.
Counseling Psychology Doctoral Candidate
Oklahoma State University

APPENDIX D:

Protean Career Attitudes Scale

PROTEAN CAREER ATTITUDES SCALE

Please indicate the extent to which the following statements are true for you, using the following response scale. Please select your desired response.

To little or no extent	1
To a limited extent	2
To some extent	3
To a considerable extent	4
To a great extent	5

1. When development opportunities have not been offered by my company, I've sought them out on my own.

1	2	3	4	5

2. I am responsible for my success or failure in my career.

1	2	3	4	5

3. Overall, I have a very independent, self-directed career.

1	2	3	4	5

4. Freedom to choose my own career path is one of my most important values.

1	2	3	4	5

5. I am in charge of my own career.

1	2	3	4	5

6. Ultimately, I depend upon myself to move my career forward.

1	2	3	4	5

7. Where my career is concerned, I am very much "my own person."

1	2	3	4	5

8. In the past, I have relied more on myself than others to find a new job when necessary.

1	2	3	4	5

9. I navigate my own career, based on my personal priorities, as opposed to my employer's priorities.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

10. It doesn't matter much to me how other people evaluate the choices I make in my career.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

11. What's most important to me is how I feel about my career success, not how other people feel about it.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

12. I'll follow my own conscience if my company asks me to do something that goes against my values.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

13. What I think about what is right in my career is more important to me than what my company thinks.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

14. In the past I have sided with my own values when the company has asked me to do something I don't agree with.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

APPENDIX E:

Boundaryless Career Attitudes Scale

BOUNDARYLESS CAREER ATTITUDES SCALE

Please indicate the extent to which the following statements are true for you, using the following response scale. Please select your desired response.

To little or no extent	1
To a limited extent	2
To some extent	3
To a considerable extent	4
To a great extent	5

1. I seek job assignments that allow me to learn something new.

1	2	3	4	5

2. I would enjoy working on projects with people across many organizations.

1	2	3	4	5

3. I enjoy job assignments that require me to work outside of the organization.

1	2	3	4	5

4. I like tasks at work that require me to work beyond my own department.

1	2	3	4	5

5. I enjoy working with people outside of my organization.

1	2	3	4	5

6. I enjoy jobs that require me to interact with people in many different organizations.

1	2	3	4	5

7. I have sought opportunities in the past that allow me to work outside the organization.

1	2	3	4	5

8. I am energized in new experiences and situations.

1	2	3	4	5

9. I like the predictability that comes with working continuously for the same organization.

1	2	3	4	5

10. I would feel very lost if I couldn't work for my current organization.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

11. I prefer to stay in a company I am familiar with rather than look for employment elsewhere.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

12. If my organization provided lifetime employment, I would never desire to seek work in other organizations.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

13. If my ideal career I would work for only one organization.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

APPENDIX F:

Job Satisfaction Survey

JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

Please select the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it.

Disagree very much   1
Disagree moderately   2
Disagree slightly   3
Agree slightly   4
Agree moderately   5
Agree very much   6
Does Not Apply   DNA

1. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.
_____
1   2   3   4   5   6   DNA

2. There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.
_____
1   2   3   4   5   6   DNA

3. My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.
_____
1   2   3   4   5   6   DNA

4. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.
_____
1   2   3   4   5   6   DNA

5. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.
_____
1   2   3   4   5   6   DNA

6. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.
_____
1   2   3   4   5   6   DNA

7. I like the people I work with.
_____
1   2   3   4   5   6   DNA

8. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.
_____
1   2   3   4   5   6   DNA

9. Communications seem good within this organization.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

10. Raises are too few and far between.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

11. Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

12. My supervisor is unfair to me.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

13. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

14. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

15. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

16. I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

17. I like doing the things I do at work.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

18. The goals of this organization are not clear to me.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

19. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

20. People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

21. My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

22. The benefit package we have is equitable.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

23. There are few rewards for those who work here.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

24. I have too much to do at work.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

25. I enjoy my coworkers.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

26. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

27. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

28. I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

29. There are benefits we do not have which we should have.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

30. I like my supervisor.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

31. I have too much paperwork.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

32. I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

33. I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

34. There is too much bickering and fighting at work.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

35. My job is enjoyable.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

36. Work assignments are not fully explained.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DNA |

APPENDIX G:

Individualism-Collectivism Scale

INDIVIDUALISM-COLLECTIVISM SCALE

Please select the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it.

Strongly Disagree   1
Disagree   2
Slightly Disagree   3
Slightly Agree   4
Agree   5
Strongly Agree   6

1. I prefer to be direct and forthright when I talk with people.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

2. My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

3. I would do what would please my family, even if I detested that activity.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

4. Winning is everything.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

5. One should live one's life independently of others.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

6. What happens to me is my own doing.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

7. I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

8. It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

9. It is important to maintain harmony within my group.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

10. It is important that I do my job better than others.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

11. I like sharing little things with my neighbors.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

12. I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

13. We should keep our aging parents with us at home.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

14. The well-being of my co-workers is important to me.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

15. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

16. If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

17. Children should feel honored if their parents receive a distinguished award.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

18. I often "do my own thing".

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

19. Competition is the law of nature.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

20. If a co-worker gets a prize, I would feel proud.

1	2	3	4	5	6

21. I am a unique individual.

1	2	3	4	5	6

22. To me, pleasure is spending time with others.

1	2	3	4	5	6

23. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused.

1	2	3	4	5	6

24. I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it.

1	2	3	4	5	6

25. I like my privacy.

1	2	3	4	5	6

26. Without competition it is not possible to have a good society.

1	2	3	4	5	6

27. Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure.

1	2	3	4	5	6

28. I feel good when I cooperate with others.

1	2	3	4	5	6

29. I hate to disagree with others in my group.

1	2	3	4	5	6

30. Some people emphasize winning; I'm not one of them.

1	2	3	4	5	6

31. Before taking a major trip, I consult with most members of my family and many friends.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

32.   When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

APPENDIX I:

Demographics Form

DEMOGRAPHICS FORM

Gender:
- o Male
- o Female

Age:
_____ years

Marital Status:
- o Single
- o Married
- o Common law
- o Widowed
- o Separated
- o Divorced

Ethnicity:
- o Caucasian
- o African or African American
- o Asian/Pacific Islander
- o Latino/a
- o Native American (e.g. American Indian or Alaskan Native)

Nationality (What country do you consider home?):
_____

Current U.S. state of residence: _____

Length of time you have spent in U.S.: _____

Highest level of education obtained:
- o No diploma
- o High School or equivalent (e.g. GED)
- o Some college credit but no degree
- o Associate's Degree
- o Bachelor's Degree
- o Master's Degree
- o Professional or Doctoral Degree (e.g. J.D. or Ph.D.)

(If applicable) Is your degree related to your current job?
- o Yes
- o No

Career Field:
- o Agricultural, Forestry, Fishing, or Hunting
- o Arts, Entertainment, or Recreation
- o Broadcasting or Journalism
- o Education (College, University, or Adult)
- o Education (K-12th grade)
- o Construction
- o Finance and Insurance
- o Government and Public Administration
- o Healthcare and Social Assistance
- o Hotel and Food Services
- o Legal Services
- o Manufacturing
- o Military
- o Real Estate, Rental, or Leasing
- o Religious
- o Retail
- o Telecommunications
- o Transportation and Warehousing
- o Utilities
- o Wholesale
- o Other: _____

Role in Industry:
- o Upper management
- o Middle management
- o Junior management
- o Administrative staff
- o Support staff
- o Trained professional
- o Skilled laborer
- o Researcher
- o Self-employed
- o Other: _____

Position Title: _____

Employer Type:
- o Paid employee of a for-profit company or business
- o Paid employee of a non-profit, tax-exempt, or charitable organization
- o City, State, or Federal government employee (including U.S. Armed Forces)
- o Self-employed

Employment Status:
- o Full-time (40+ hours/week)
- o Part-time (<40 hours/week)

Approximate Annual income:
- o Unpaid volunteer
- o Less than $10,000
- o $10,000 to $19,999
- o $20,000 to $29,999
- o $30,000 to $39,999
- o $40,000 to $49,999
- o $50,000 to $59,999
- o $60,000 to $69,999
- o $70,000 to $79,999
- o $80,000 to $89,999
- o $90,000 to $99,999
- o $100,000 to $149,999
- o $150,000 or more

Total household income:
- o Unpaid volunteer
- o Less than $10,000
- o $10,000 to $19,999
- o $20,000 to $29,999
- o $30,000 to $39,999
- o $40,000 to $49,999
- o $50,000 to $59,999
- o $60,000 to $69,999
- o $70,000 to $79,999
- o $80,000 to $89,999
- o $90,000 to $99,999
- o $100,000 to $149,999
- o $150,000 or more

Average # of hours per week: (including work from home) _____

Optional: In order to be entered in the raffle for a $25 gift card to Wal-Mart, you must enter a valid email address where you can be contacted: _____

VITA

Re-An Ren Hong

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctorate in Philosophy

Dissertation: THE IMPACT OF CULTURAL INDIVIDUALISM & COLLECTIVISM ON

PROTEAN & BOUNDARYLESS CAREER ATTITUDES AND JOB

SATISFACTION

Major Field: Counseling Psychology

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Doctor in Philosophy degree with a major in Counseling Psychology at Oklahoma State University in July 2012.

Completed the requirements for the Master of Arts in Professional Counseling from Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas in December 2007.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Business Administration in Management Information Systems from The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas in May 2005.

Experience:

Employed at Oklahoma State University as a practicum counselor at the Student Counseling Center and as graduate teaching assistant; employed at NorthCare as a therapist; currently employed at the University of Delaware as a pre-doctoral intern at the Center for Counseling and Student Development.

Professional Memberships:

American Psychological Association, Asian American Psychological Association

Name: Re-An Ren Hong   Date of Degree: July 2012

Institution: Oklahoma State University   Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: THE IMPACT OF CULTURAL INDIVIDUALISM & COLLECTIVISM ON

     PROTEAN & BOUNDARYLESS CAREER ATTITUDES AND JOB

     SATISFACTION

Pages in Study: 101   Candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major Field: Counseling Psychology

Scope and Method of Study:

   Over the past several decades, new career theories have been developed in an attempt to explain the changing nature of work. No longer is one's career generally considered to be a lifelong commitment to one organization or even one career field, but the trajectory of a career is now considered to be self-driven and contingent on factors such as personal values and organizational mobility (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Hall, 1976). Additionally, the current research literature lacks in the application of these career theories to minority cultures in the U.S., particularly those that are traditionally collectivistic (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).
   The purpose of this exploratory study is to examine how identification with cultural individualism and collectivism influences participants' overall attitude towards protean and boundaryless career theories and overall job satisfaction. The data were collected from 203 working adults in the United States. Multiple regression analyses were then conducted to examine if identification with certain cultural dimensions is predictive of levels of job satisfaction and adherence to particular career theories.

Findings and Conclusions:

   Results indicated that several cultural variables within the individualism and collectivism constructs do have moderate predictive value in determining career attitudes and job satisfaction. The findings also supported previous research studies that sought to differentiate between the protean and boundaryless career attitudes (Briscoe et al., 2006; Granrose & Baccili, 2006). Implications of the present findings are then discussed.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: John S.C. Romans, Ph.D.