

## **Proactive Career Behaviors and Subjective Career Success: The Moderating Role of National Culture**

Adam Smale  
(corresponding author)  
University of Vaasa, P.O. Box 700  
65101 Vaasa, Finland  
+358 29 449 8446

Silvia Bagdadli  
Bocconi University  
Via Sarfatti, 25  
Milan, Italy

Rick Cotton  
University of Victoria  
3800 Finnerty Rd.  
Victoria, BC V8P 5C2, Canada

Silvia Dello Russo  
Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)  
Av. das Forças Armadas  
1649-026 Lisbon, Portugal

Michael Dickmann  
Cranfield University  
School of Management, College Road  
Cranfield MK43 0AL, UK

Anders Dysvik  
BI Norwegian Business School  
Nydalsveien 37  
0478 Oslo, Norway

Martina Gianecchini  
University of Padova  
Via del Santo 33  
35123 Padova, Italy

Robert Kaše  
University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Economics  
Kardeljeva ploščad 17  
1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

Mila Lazarova  
Simon Fraser University  
Beedie School of Business  
500 Granville Street  
Vancouver, BC, V6C 1W6, Canada

Astrid Reichel  
University of Salzburg  
Kapitelgasse 4-6  
5020 Salzburg, Austria

Paula Rozo  
Los Andes University  
Cra 1 N° 18A- 12 Bogotá, Columbia

Marijke Verbruggen  
KU Leuven  
Naamsestraat 69  
3000 Leuven, Belgium

## **Abstract**

Whilst career proactivity has positive consequences for an individual's career success, studies mostly examine objective measures of success within single countries. This raises important questions about whether proactivity is equally beneficial for different aspects of subjective career success, and the extent to which these benefits extend across cultures. Drawing on Social Information Processing theory, we examined the relationship between proactive career behaviors and two aspects of subjective career success – financial success and work-life balance – and the moderating role of national culture. We tested our hypotheses using multilevel analyses on a large-scale sample of 11,892 employees from 22 countries covering nine of GLOBE's ten cultural clusters. Whilst we found that proactive career behaviors were positively related to subjective financial success, this relationship was not significant for work-life balance. Furthermore, career proactivity was relatively more important for subjective financial success in cultures with high in-group collectivism, high power distance and low uncertainty avoidance. For work-life balance, career proactivity was relatively more important in cultures characterized by high in-group collectivism and humane orientation. Our findings underline the need to treat subjective career success as a multidimensional construct, and highlight the complex role of national culture in shaping the outcomes of career proactivity.

**Keywords:** Proactive career behaviors, career success, career self-management, national culture

# **Proactive Career Behaviors and Subjective Career Success: The Moderating Role of National Culture**

## **Introduction**

In conjunction with employment relationships becoming shorter and more flexible, the planning and managing of careers has become more self-directed (Sullivan & Baruch, 2009). At the same time, traditional conceptualizations of careers as ‘a job for life’ (Simons, Goddard, & Patton, 2000) or ‘upward progression within one or two organizations’ (Eby, Butts, & Lockwood, 2003) have become less salient. In order to achieve career success, employees in this more dynamic, boundaryless career context are thus being advised – and expected – to manage their careers proactively (Direnzo & Greenhaus, 2011; Verbruggen & Sels, 2010).

Proactive behaviors refer to behaviors that are self-initiated, future-oriented and change-inducing (Grant & Ashford, 2008). They can take a variety of forms such as voice, personal initiative, feedback seeking, and issue selling (Parker & Collins, 2010). This study focuses on one set of proactive behaviors – proactive career behaviors – which refer to self-directed activities individuals engage in to manage their careers (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001).

Research shows that proactive career behaviors are positively related to career success (DeVos, Dewettinck & Buyens, 2009; Verbruggen, Sels, & Forrier, 2007). However, this research comprises a small number of studies demonstrating the positive effect of career initiatives (Seibert et al., 2001), career enhancing strategies (Nabi, 1999) and career self-management (Abele & Wiese, 2008) on objective career success (e.g. salary, promotions). In contrast, studies on the effects of proactive career behaviors on subjective career success (e.g. perceived career success, career

satisfaction) are scarce, inconclusive and do not acknowledge the multidimensionality of the subjective career success concept.

Subjective career success, which ‘capture(s) individuals’ subjective judgments about their career attainments’ (Ng, Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2005, p.368), has emerged as an important variable in careers research. Objective career success, such as promotions and increases in salary, is often not available to everyone in organizations, especially since organizations have become flatter and careers less hierarchical and predictable. Therefore, other evaluation criteria – how personally meaningful careers are and how one experiences one’s own career success – have become more salient (Ng & Feldman, 2014). Furthermore, satisfaction with one’s career has been shown to be important in understanding people’s life satisfaction, more important than job satisfaction for example (Erdogan, Bauer, Truxillo & Mansfield, 2012). For both of these reasons, it is beneficial for organizations to understand how employees feel about their subjective career success and what affects it.

Individuals from different cultures are likely to use different means and to be led by different values and norms when evaluating how successful various aspects of their careers have been (Dries, Pepermans, & Carlier, 2008). It is thus problematic that the vast majority of studies on proactive career behaviors have been conducted in single countries, predominantly the US (Seibert et al., 2001; Shockley et al., 2016) and Western Europe (e.g., DeVos et al., 2009; Verbruggen et al., 2007). Since these countries mostly reflect the WEIRD perspective – Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic countries (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010) – where a strong emphasis on self-management is more prevalent (Inkson, Gunz, Ganesh, & Roper, 2012) – the positive consequences of proactive career behaviors may not be surprising. Whilst this research has contributed to our understanding of the effects of career proactivity, the lack of cross-

country research has meant that we are unable to draw conclusions about whether these effects are generalizable across cultures (cf. Shockley et al., 2016; Pan & Zhou, 2016).

Collectively, important questions remain regarding whether proactive career behaviors are equally beneficial for different aspects of an individual's subjective career success, and the extent to which these benefits vary across cultures. We focus on the relationship between proactive career behaviors and the perceived achievement of two inherently different meanings of subjective career success that have been shown to be consistently important yet are sensitive to cultural differences (Briscoe, Hall, & Mayrhofer, 2012; Chudzikowski et al., 2012) – subjective financial success and work-life balance. This study thus sets out to address the following research questions: *Are proactive career behaviors associated with higher levels of subjective career success in the form of financial success and work-life balance, and to what extent are these relationships influenced by national culture?* Based on a multi-country dataset, we develop and test hypotheses on the relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective financial success and work-life balance, as well as the moderating role of five dimensions of culture (in-group collectivism, humane orientation, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and performance orientation).

The study seeks to contribute to the literature in two main ways. First, by investigating career proactivity and two different dimensions of subjective career success, the study contributes to the careers literature by shedding light on the extent to which the positive outcomes of proactive career behaviors extend beyond the objective measures of career success to include different personal meanings of subjective career success. And second, by examining the moderating role of culture across a large number of western and non-western countries, the study contributes to the general proactivity literature by revealing how the cultural context, within which individuals enact their proactive behaviors and form assessments about their subjective career success, influences the relationship between proactivity and attitudinal outcomes.

## **Theoretical Model and Hypotheses**

### *Proactive Career Behaviors and Subjective Career Success*

Proactive career behaviors in the careers literature have included individual career management (Sturges, Guest, Conway & Davey, 2002; Verbruggen et al., 2007), career self-management (Abele & Wiese, 2008; DeVos & Soens, 2008), and career enhancing strategies (Nabi, 2003), all generally referring to the self-directed activities employees display with respect to managing their careers (Seibert et al., 2001). These behaviors allow individuals to make a realistic self-assessment of their capabilities in light of organizational career opportunities, and include concrete actions undertaken to realize these ambitions (Sturges et al., 2002). In this study, we focus on an individual's behavioral proactivity in the form of Enacted Managerial Aspirations (EMA), which includes career planning, skill development, and consultation with more senior colleagues (Tharenou & Terry, 1998). Despite what this label suggests, these behaviors are important regardless of whether one aspires to be a manager or not (Parker & Collins, 2010).

Compared to studies on objective career success, empirical work concerning the effects of career proactivity on subjective perceptions of success are scarce and inconclusive. For instance, whilst subjective career success is positively affected by career strategies such as networking (Nabi, 1999), creating opportunities (Park, 2010) and career planning (Murphy & Ensher, 2001), Nabi's study (1999) also points to the negative influence of individual efforts at developing skills useful for future promotions. Similarly, in terms of career satisfaction, there is evidence for both positive (Abele & Wiese, 2008; Raabe, Frese, & Beehr, 2007) and insignificant (DeVos & Soens, 2008) effects of self-directed career behaviors.

Potential explanations for these mixed findings are that subjective career success has not been treated as a multidimensional concept, and the studies have been conducted in different single-

country settings. Regarding the former, the scale validation study by Shockley et al. (2016) provides strong evidence that subjective career success, like job satisfaction, should be considered as an aggregate, multi-dimensional construct (Law, Wong & Mobley, 1998). Although one can thus examine subjective career success as a global construct, their study's relative importance analyses strongly support the need to study the individual dimensions in order to provide more nuanced explanations.

Here we focus on two dimensions of subjective career success: a sense of achieving financial success, and sense of achieving work-life balance. We define subjective financial success as how happy individuals are with their level of achievement in terms of financial rewards (e.g. money, incentives, bonuses), with an emphasis on perceived wealth accumulation rather than financial security (Kets de Vries, 2010). It is important to note that subjective financial success is related to but not the same as objectively defined financial success, as individuals consider a range of factors when evaluating (subjectively) their own financial success. For instance, although career satisfaction has been shown to be positively associated with indicators of objective career success such as salary (see Ng et al.'s (2005) meta-analysis), research has also suggested that "within each level of wealth and occupational status, some people view their careers as much more (or less) successful than do others" (Heslin, 2005a: 377). Our second dependent variable, perceived work-life balance, is defined as how happy individuals are with their level of achievement in finding a balance between work on the one hand and non-work/family life on the other (Guest, 2002).

These two dimensions of subjective career success were chosen since they have a long tradition in careers research (Arthur, Khapova & Wilderom, 2005) and have been used in most of the studies that were part of a recent review of career success research from the past 30 years (Shockley et al., 2016). In addition, cross-cultural careers research has shown that these two meanings of career success can be found among employees in countries all around the world



(Briscoe, et al., 2012; Zhou et al., 2013), yet their salience differs in accordance with cultural and institutional variations (Khapova, Briscoe & Dickmann, 2012; Chudzikowski et al., 2012). There have been various attempts to categorize the different meanings of subjective career success. In the selection of our two dependent variables, we opted for financial success and work-life balance since these meanings of career success have been shown, in qualitative studies, to belong to different categories. Subjective financial success is the more traditional notion of career success and is related to the ‘person’ (Demel et al., 2012) and their self-oriented ‘material concerns’ (Mayrhofer et al., 2016). Work-life balance, on the other hand, is related to an individual’s ‘interaction with the environment’ (Demel et al., 2012) and their other-oriented ‘social relations’ (Mayrhofer et al., 2016). Focusing on these two dimensions thus offers the possibility to analyze the association between career proactive behaviors and two different yet core meanings of subjective career success. It also allows us to examine proactive career behaviors and two dimensions of career success that are both identifiable in different country contexts, yet are likely to be influenced by national culture in different ways.

In developing our hypotheses, we draw on arguments from the proactivity literature (Parker & Collins, 2010; Seibert et al., 2001) regarding why an individual’s proactive career behaviors contribute to subjective career success. Based on social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), which suggests that an individual’s attitudes are also going to be shaped by the informational and social context within which their behaviors are carried out, we go on to argue how certain dimensions of national culture are likely to moderate this relationship. Figure 1 presents our conceptual model.

-----  
Insert Figure 1 about here  
-----

The proactivity literature characterizes proactive career behaviors as involving three core components, namely taking control, anticipation, and information retrieval (Parker & Collins, 2010; Seibert et al., 2001). First, proactive behaviors involve taking control, implying that employees engaging in proactive career behaviors consciously take control of their careers. Proactive career behaviors are likely to be experienced as volitional and self-endorsed, which should satisfy the basic need for autonomy (Broeck, Ferris, Chang, & Rosen, 2016; Gagné & Deci, 2005). This can, in turn, induce feelings of personal success and accomplishment (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004), where one emphasizes the self as the locus of causality for one's own behaviors (deCharms, 1968). In support of this, feeling in control of one's career has been associated with higher levels of subjective career success (Raabe et al., 2007; Seibert et al., 2001), since through proactivity one can achieve personally valued goals which enhance career satisfaction (Barnett & Bradley, 2007).

Turning to anticipation, acting in advance of a future situation – here, the aspired realization of one's personal career goals – has been shown to be positively related to subjective career success (Verbruggen & Sels, 2010). It is even suggested that working on one's goals can be more important for achieving satisfaction than actually realizing one's goals (Lent & Brown, 2008; Amabile & Kramer, 2011). This is partly attributable to the fact that behaviors people are committed to tend to induce positive attitudes via a behavioral rationalization process (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978).

In terms of information retrieval, proactive career behaviors should facilitate access to relevant career information and resources that will help individuals to improve the fit between their aspired and perceived current career position (e.g., Forret & Dougherty, 2004; Heslin, 2005a; Ng et al., 2005). Information retrieval can be seen as an important form of feedback seeking, which can also improve an individuals' reputation and influence within the organization (DeVos & Soens,

2008; Sturges, Conway, Guest, & Liefoghe, 2005), which in turn influences career satisfaction (Judge & Bretz, 1994).

These three mechanisms underlying proactive behaviors suggest that proactive individuals who pursue their goals will derive greater satisfaction, including feelings of career success, from the actions they undertake to this end (Parker & Liao, 2016). As reflected in extant research, we expect that these powerful mechanisms will extend across different dimensions of subjective career success, in this case both subjective financial success and work-life balance. We therefore present the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 1:* An individual's proactive career behaviors are positively related to subjective career success (CS) in the form of (a) financial success, and (b) work-life balance.

#### *Moderating Role of National Culture*

Social information processing theory posits that the relationship between individuals' behaviors and their attitudes depends on the social context, because individuals, as adaptive organisms, adjust their attitudes to the informational and social environment within which their behaviors are embedded (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). We argue that a central aspect of the social context that will affect the relationship between proactive career behaviors and career attitudes is national culture. Although there are points of contention regarding the conceptualization and measurement of culture (Caprar, Devinney, Kirkman, & Caligiuri, 2015), we adopt the frequently used definition of culture as a system of values, practices, attitudes and behavioral norms that are shared by members of a societal group and are passed on from generation to generation (Thomas & Peterson, 2015).

Culture has emerged as ‘a primary candidate’ for a ‘source for [career] differences and peculiarities’ (Briscoe et al., 2012, p.7). Culture can influence careers by affecting individual perceptions, attitudes and beliefs, and through the societal legitimization of career practices, values and norms (Khapova et al., 2012; Thomas & Inkson, 2007). These cultural influences, in turn, can affect various individual career behaviors and attitudes (Ollier-Malaterre, Valcour, Den Dulk & Kossek, 2013). Studies have thus started to explore the role of culture in career success (Mayrhofer et al., 2016), career transitions (Chudzikowski et al., 2009), career meanings (Claes & Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1994), and career commitment (Noordin, Williams & Zimmer, 2002).

Drawing upon the social information processing framework and the three core components of proactivity, we argue that culture will affect the baseline relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective career success in different ways. First, culture exerts a social influence on the extent to which proactive career behaviors are seen as expected by significant others in a given social context (e.g., boss, colleagues, family), and therefore the degree to which individuals who engage in these behaviors are likely to experience them as volitional. Specifically, if the behavior is congruent with the social context, i.e. when ‘social guidance’ provides sufficient external justification for engaging in a certain behavior (Vaux, Riedel & Stewart, 1987), individuals will experience the behavior as less volitional and the attitudes associated with proactive behaviors generally will be less positive.

Second, culture will affect how people interpret their own needs and values and, thus, which career goals they are likely to focus on (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). In this way, national culture can affect the anticipation component of proactive behavior. According to social information processing theory, individuals understand and shape their needs, values, and perceptions based on interactions with others, and this social influence provides a lens through which individuals make evaluations of their work and career environment (Bhave, Kramer & Glomb, 2010). For instance,

a culture in which financial success is highly valued may lead individuals to believe that financial success *should be* important to them, and that they should direct their career goals towards achieving financial success. Consequently, when individuals engage in anticipatory, proactive career behaviors, these behaviors are likely to be oriented towards achieving financial success. These behaviors are then likely to be more strongly related with individuals' feelings of financial success either because of this emphasis or via a behavioral rationalization process (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978).

Third, culture will affect the kind of information and resources people are likely to obtain in a certain context – and thus the information retrieval component of proactive behavior. Social information processing theory suggests that the informational environment affects an individual's attentional processes towards the most salient aspects of that context (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Therefore, the information and resources people obtain through their proactive career behaviors are likely to be in line with the most salient aspects of their culture. This is likely to contribute to individuals achieving those career goals that are most congruent with the prevailing values and norms of that culture.

When considering the dimensions of culture, like Rabl et al. (2014) we followed the advice of Zaheer et al. (2012) and focused on carefully selected dimensions that extant research shows to be the most relevant in understanding how proactive career behaviors might be differentially effective in different parts of the world.<sup>1</sup> Taken from the GLOBE studies framework (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004), we thus examine the moderating roles of five cultural dimensions ('practices') that have been shown to have important contextual effects on careers or career proactivity: In-Group Collectivism (e.g. Spector et al., 2007), Humane Orientation (e.g. Ollo-López & Goñi-Legaz, 2017), Power Distance (e.g. Ramaswami, Huang & Dreher, 2014),

Uncertainty Avoidance (e.g. Claes & Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1998), and Performance Orientation (e.g. Gentry, Weber & Sadri, 2008).

### *In-Group Collectivism*

The GLOBE studies (House et al., 2004) define in-group collectivism as the degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations or families. In individualistic societies (i.e. low on in-group collectivism), individuals view themselves as relatively independent and free to pursue behaviors that benefit them without extensive consideration of the consequences for the larger collective. They exhibit greater preference for social recognition, career advancement and merit-based promotions, and are more motivated by competition and report lower normative and affective commitment (Khapova et al., 2012). Individuals in collectivist societies (i.e. high on in-group collectivism) view themselves as interdependent with members of the group(s) to which they belong, are concerned about the consequences of their behaviors for their reference group(s), and are more likely to sacrifice personal interests for the benefit of the larger collective. In collectivistic countries, people tend to prioritize common goals, including family ones, over personal needs (Haar et al., 2014).

Accordingly, we argue that societies that differ on this dimension are likely to view financial success and work-life balance differently in terms of legitimacy. This will also affect how salient subjective financial success and work-life balance are to individuals within a culture. In cultures high on in-group collectivism the pursuit of individual financial success can be seen as a challenge to group harmony (Noordin et al., 2002). At the same time, a greater number of important social referents (employer, family) will be advocating the pursuit of work-life balance. The social information processing perspective would suggest that in an environment that endorses work-life balance as a more legitimate goal to pursue and discourages the pursuit of financial success, it will

be easier for individuals to rationalize their proactive career behaviors as being instrumental for their feelings of greater work-life balance, but not for feelings of financial success. Further, individuals are more likely to direct their proactive career behaviors in such a way that they can obtain resources, support and information that advances their pursuit of work-life balance rather than the pursuit of subjective financial success. This leads us to the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 2a:* In countries higher on in-group collectivism, the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective financial success will be weaker.

*Hypothesis 2b:* In countries higher on in-group collectivism, the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and work-life balance will be stronger.

#### *Humane Orientation*

Humane orientation is defined as “the degree to which an organization or society encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, friendly, generous, caring and kind to others” (House et al., 2004: 569). Societies high on humane orientation are characterized by a shared understanding that the interests of others are important. Behaviors that promote the well-being of others (e.g. family, colleagues) are expected and people are motivated by a sense of affiliation and belonging (House et al., 2004), with equality and non-discrimination as important underlying values. Individuals are expected to be motivated by a desire to be friendly and caring towards others rather than by a drive to advance one’s own interests. In such societies, the pursuit of one’s own interests for the purposes of accumulating material possessions will not be seen as important or legitimate (Khapova et al., 2012).

In line with social information processing logic, we therefore argue that in countries with a higher humane orientation, the prevailing cultural practices will make it difficult for individuals to construct a meaning for their enhanced sense of financial success as due to their proactive career

behaviors. However, in such countries, where cultural practices make affiliation, generosity and the well-being of others both more salient and expected of individuals, the achievement of greater work-life balance is likely to be seen as a socially legitimate reason for career proactivity and thus more likely to strengthen this positive relationship. We thus propose the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 3a:* In countries higher on humane orientation, the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective financial success will be weaker.

*Hypothesis 3b:* In countries higher on humane orientation, the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and work-life balance will be stronger.

#### *Power Distance*

Power distance (PD) concerns society's views about individual status and the degree to which it accepts that there is an unequal distribution of power and authority. High PD cultures are characterized by strong hierarchies and control mechanisms, less communication among organizational levels and limited upward social mobility (Hofstede, 1993). In contrast, in low PD cultures, organizations are decentralized, employees expect to be consulted, and authority figures are viewed as resourceful democrats (Hofstede, 1993). In high PD countries, power is seen as providing social order and information access is often restricted (House et al., 2004). Superiors in high PD cultures are particularly influential career 'gatekeepers' (King, 2004), requiring individuals to look to their superiors for guidance in their pursuit of subjective career success. In such cultures, financial success is a material and visible representation of one's personal status, and as such, it is highly respected and valued, and its pursuit is both legitimate and socially endorsed. Achieving work-life balance, on the other hand, is likely to be seen as a comparatively lower priority and its pursuit not actively encouraged.



In such settings, employees are more likely to channel their career proactive behaviors in ways that can enhance their feelings of financial achievement rather than in ways that could contribute to their perceived work-life balance. They will also be more likely to develop a rationalization for their proactive behaviors as being instrumental for their pursuit of subjective financial success, which is viewed as a legitimate, even expected, course of action. Thus:

*Hypothesis 4a:* In countries higher on power distance, the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective financial success will be stronger.

*Hypothesis 4b:* In countries higher on power distance, the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and work-life balance will be weaker.

#### *Uncertainty Avoidance*

Project GLOBE defines uncertainty avoidance (UA) as the way people in a given society deal with unforeseen events and change. Countries that score low on UA tend to be better at accepting change, are more willing to take risks and favor informal interactions instead of regulating situations with predetermined norms (House et al., 2004). Countries that score high on UA tend to be more change-averse and resistant, take only minimal risks, and set up a number of rules and procedures to manage the unpredictability of the future. High UA cultures tend to create detailed plans, seek feedback, and enforce rules, attempting to minimize the likelihood and impact of unforeseen events. Given this emphasis on predictability and formal rules that can be seen as imposing restraints on individual initiative, high UA cultures are unlikely to signal to individuals that career proactivity is an expected or socially legitimate behavior. Instead, it views proactivity as being of limited use relative to the formal procedures and collectively held norms that are in place (Fischer, 2008).

However, unlike the previous dimensions we have presented, the literature does not provide grounds to suggest that cultures characterized by high UA will place a greater value on the pursuit of financial success over work-life balance, or vice versa. Formal rules are perhaps more easily identifiable at the workplace, but strong informal norms are likely to act as ‘social guidance’ on what individuals are encouraged to pay attention to outside of work as well. We expect that in high UA cultures the pathways to greater perceptions of financial success as well as work-life balance would be constructed as previously defined by existing rules, societally endorsed norms, and established ways of doing things, rather than as attributable to individual taking control, anticipation and information retrieval (Ollo-López & Goñi-Legaz, 2017). We therefore posit that UA has a similar negative moderating influence on the relationship between proactive career behaviors and the two facets of subjective career success. Hence:

*Hypothesis 5a:* In countries higher on uncertainty avoidance, the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective financial success will be weaker.

*Hypothesis 5b:* In countries higher on uncertainty avoidance, the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and work-life balance will be weaker.

### *Performance Orientation*

Countries that score high on Performance Orientation (PO) value competitiveness, individual achievement, feedback that supports performance improvements and what one has done (achieved status) over who one is (ascribed status) (House et al., 2004). Conversely, countries low on PO value harmony, quality of life, belongingness and societal/family relationships, and view behaviors that may jeopardize this harmony in a negative light, considering them as a potential source of conflict. High PO societies will place more value on seeking performance improvements and on personal achievement (i.e. achieved status). In such contexts, materialism and the pursuit of

financial success are more likely to be socially legitimized compared to prioritizing work-life balance.

In line with social information processing theory, individuals in high PO cultures will be more sensitized towards pursuing financial success and will attach less salience to achieving work-life balance, which one might associate more with low PO cultures. In light of this, it will be easier for individuals to view proactive career behaviors as having returned a greater sense of achievement in the pursuit of financial success, which will not be the case for the pursuit of work-life balance. Our final set of hypotheses is thus:

*Hypothesis 6a:* In countries higher on performance orientation, the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective financial success will be stronger.

*Hypothesis 6b:* In countries higher on performance orientation, the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and work-life balance will be weaker.

## **Method**

### *Sample and Data Collection*

Our individual-level data is from a large, multi-country, cross-cultural research project which builds on earlier qualitative work from this same project (Shen et al., 2015). The questionnaire was translated and back-translated to the local languages of all participating countries following standard procedures (Brislin, 1970). Data was collected during 2014-2015 by national representatives of the research collaboration using pre-determined screening criteria to achieve heterogeneous within-country samples (cf. Cook & Campbell, 1979) with regard to relevant respondents' demographic characteristics (i.e., work experience, occupation, age).<sup>2</sup> Each national sample includes individuals who have at least two years of post-educational work experience, close to equal, tripartite age distribution (under 30; 30-50; over 50 years), and is gender balanced. The

target was at least 400 respondents per country with 100 from each of the following occupational categories: managers, professionals, clerical/service workers, and skilled workers.<sup>3</sup>

The final sample comprised 11,892 participants from 22 countries (Argentina, Austria, China, Finland, Germany, Greece, India, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Korea, Switzerland, and the US), representing 9 of GLOBE's 10 cultural regions (all but the Middle East cluster). The average age of the respondents was 40 years, they had an average of 16 years of work experience, and were positioned, on average, in the middle of their organizational hierarchy (5.56 on a 10-point scale). Gender distribution was equal at 50%, with 34% categorizing themselves as professionals, 26% as managers, 24% as clerical/service, and 16% as skilled workers. In terms of highest educational level achieved, 11% of participants had lower secondary education or below, 35% had upper secondary, post-secondary or short-cycle tertiary education, and 54% had tertiary education.

### *Measures*

#### **Subjective Career Success**

Since our research is cross-cultural we used a newly developed, culturally-invariant scale of subjective career success (Briscoe et al., 2014). The scale is multi-dimensional and captures the achievement and importance aspects of different dimensions of subjective career success (cf., Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990; Gunz & Heslin, 2005). In this study we used the achievement aspect of subjective career success. For each career dimension, participants were asked to report on a 5-point scale (from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'), 'in regard to this career aspect, I have achieved a level I am happy with'. *Financial Success* was measured with respect to (1) wealth, (2) receiving incentives, perks or bonuses, and (3) steadily making more money ( $\alpha=0.74$ ; CR=0.75). *Work-Life Balance* (WLB) was measured in the same way in regard to

(1) achieving a satisfying balance between work and family life, (2) having time for non-work interests, and (3) achieving balance between work and non-work activities ( $\alpha=0.79$ ;  $CR=0.79$ ). Both scales were examined for measurement equivalence with the alignment procedure for establishing metric and scalar invariance (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014). The overall non-invariance was 15.0% for WLB and 18.17% for financial success, which is below the 25% threshold set by Muthén and Asparouhov (2014: 3). Confirmatory factor analyses showed convergent and discriminant validity for both measures.

### **Proactive Career Behaviors**

Proactive career behaviors were operationalized using Tharenou and Terry's (1998) scale for Enacted Managerial Aspirations (EMA). Due to the factor loading of one of the items in the original validation study, and in line with previous research (Parker & Collins, 2010), we used five of the six original EMA items which were reported on a 7-point scale ranging from *never* to *very frequently*: (1) I have discussed my career prospects with someone with more experience in the department/organization; (2) I have discussed my aspirations with a senior person in the department/organization; (3) I have engaged in career planning; (4) I have sought feedback on my performance; and (5) I have updated my skills in order to be more competitive for promotion ( $\alpha=0.85$ ;  $CR=0.85$ ). This scale was also examined for measurement invariance: 12.0% of item-country combinations were non-invariant, which is again below the suggested threshold (Muthén & Asparouhov, 2014: 3).

### **National Culture**

For country-level data on cultural dimensions we used the published country scores from the GLOBE project (House et al., 2004). The cultural measures used reflect reported practices ("as is")

and indicate the perceptions of each culture (as opposed to cultural aspiration values, “should be”). Aspiration values refer to the society’s ideal values, while practical values measure the society’s actual engagement in a particular value. Although the GLOBE study is not without critics (e.g., Hofstede, 2006), the use of the GLOBE measures is widely accepted in cross-cultural research and cross-cultural management scholars commonly use cultural practices when attempting to investigate the effects of societal culture on performance and other outcomes (for a review see Tung & Verbeke, 2010). The country data for our targeted cultural dimensions (i.e., in-group collectivism, humane orientation, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and performance orientation) was available for 17 of our 22 countries, so the remaining 5 countries (Malawi, Norway, Pakistan, Serbia, and Slovakia) were excluded from the analyses testing the cultural moderation hypotheses (H2a-H6b).

### **Control Variables**

We included a number of relevant controls based on the meta-analysis of career success antecedents by Ng et al. (2005). These included: *age* in years, *gender* (1=male, 0=female), and *educational level* (1=primary education, 2=lower secondary, 3=upper secondary, 4=post-secondary non-tertiary or short-cycle tertiary, 5=bachelor’s degree, 6=master’s degree, 7=doctorate). Since seniority is likely to affect perceptions of financial success and work-life balance, we also included *hierarchical level* and whether the respondent was currently a *manager* of others in their organization (1=yes, 0=no). To measure hierarchical level participants were asked to use a number between 1 and 10 to depict their position in the organization’s hierarchy (1=highest level (CEO or President), 10=lowest level).

Since subjective career success is likely to be the result of both organizational and individual career management (De Vos et al., 2009; Sturges et al., 2005), we included two further

controls to capture organizational career support: *perceived investment in employee development (PIED)*, and *size of the organization*. PIED was measured based on a scale by Lee and Bruvold (2003) and further developed by Kuvaas and Dysvik (2009), which consisted of 7 items on a 5-point scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’. Example items include, ‘by investing resources in employee development, my organization demonstrates that it actually invests in its employees’, and ‘my organization invests heavily in employee development’ ( $\alpha=0.92$ ; CR=0.92). The size of the organization – a proxy for the amount of resources an organization has to distribute to its employees (Whitely, Dougherty & Dreher, 1991) – was measured in six classes ranging from ‘less than 10 employees’ to ‘more than 5,000’. Lastly, to control for country-level effects in cross-level interaction analyses, we included a robust indicator of the general development of a country. We used the Human Development Index (HDI) – the United Nations’ composite statistic of life expectancy, education, and per capita income indicators. We used the levels reported for 2015.

#### *Confirmatory factor analysis and test of common method variance*

We first assessed our measurement model using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). As our data for latent, multi-item variables was nested within countries, we first assessed independence. The ICC (1) for items of our latent variables had the following ranges: EMA (0.071 to 0.131), WLB (0.033 to 0.056), and financial success (0.057 to 0.14). We controlled for the nesting of observations without explicitly modeling factors at individual and country level by using Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Satorra, 1995). The CFA results demonstrated an adequate fit of our measurement model with the data (RMSEA=0.025; CFI=0.955; TLI=0.946; SRMR=0.028).<sup>4</sup>

Given the cross-sectional nature of our data we examined the possibility that our results were affected by common method variance (CMV). We thus performed an additional CFA,

allowing all items to load on a single factor. The results of this measurement model indicated a poorer fit with our data (RMSEA=0.08; CFI=0.528; TLI=0.465; SRMR=0.143). We then used a common latent factor and marker variable technique (cf. Williams, Hartman, & Cavazotte, 2010) to examine the amount of variance due to CMV. Our analyses showed that the variance ranged between 16.2 % (marker variable) and 17.9 % (common factor), which is well below the 50% threshold (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). Thus, although we cannot rule out CMV, it does not appear to represent a serious threat to our results.

### *Analytical Procedure*

Our analytical strategy involved incorporating our hypothesized cross-level interactions, while also taking into account that our data was nested, skewed and that we had some missing data. Since we had constructs at two levels, and the ICC(1) levels of our dependent variables indicated that variance existed at both levels of analyses (ICC(1) for financial success was 0.114 and for WLB was 0.054 respectively), we utilized multilevel modeling in Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2016). To reduce the number of estimated parameters and to accommodate for the estimation of interaction effects across levels, we calculated the simple means of our items as manifest variables. We used the full information likelihood procedure (FIML) to resolve the missing data problem and we used robust maximum likelihood (MLR) estimators wherever possible in our analyses to address the issue of skewed data.

We carried out our multilevel modeling by first estimating an intercept only (null) model, followed by two random intercept models to estimate the fixed effects of individual-level variables. For models where cross-level interactions were examined (i.e., those including the moderation by each cultural dimension), we adopted random intercept and slope models. Consistent with our theoretical approach all independent variables were grand-mean centered before model estimation.



We estimated two series of empirical models. One series of models (1-3 and 7-11) predicted CS in the form of subjective financial success, while the other series (4-6 and 12-16) predicted CS in the form of subjective work-life balance. For all multilevel models we report fixed and random effects, deviance, deviance change to respective models (and their significance), and Pseudo R<sup>2</sup>. Reports of random effects for random intercept models feature residual variance between and within countries, while reports for random intercept random slope models additionally include residual slope variance between countries and residual covariance between intercept and slope across countries.

## Results

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations and bivariate correlations) of the variables used at both levels.

-----  
Insert Table 1 about here  
-----

In Hypotheses 1a and 1b we argued that an individual's proactive career behaviors would be positively related to her/his subjective career success in the form of financial success (H1a) and WLB (H1b). Model 3 in Table 2 shows that the relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective financial success was positive and statistically significant ( $\gamma = 0.094, p < 0.001$ ). Model 6 in Table 3 shows that the relationship between proactive career behaviors and WLB was positive, but not statistically significant ( $\gamma = 0.037, p = .126$ ). Hence, Hypothesis 1a was supported, while Hypothesis 1b was not.

-----  
Insert Tables 2 & 3 about here  
-----

The next set of hypotheses concerned the cross-level interactions of the national culture dimensions and proactive career behaviors in predicting subjective financial success and WLB. Hypotheses 2a and 2b predicted that the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and financial success (H2a) will be weaker and the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and WLB (H2b) stronger in countries with higher in-group collectivism. Model 7 in Table 4 and Model 12 in Table 5 present the respective results. While the estimation for subjective financial success ( $\gamma = 0.038$ ) was not statistically significant ( $p < 0.10$ ), the positive relationship for WLB was ( $\gamma = 0.054, p < 0.05$ ). Figure 2 plots the interaction effects. In countries with higher

in-group collectivism, the relationship between proactive career behaviors and WLB was *stronger* (the slope was steeper) than in those with lower in-group collectivism. Thus, H2b was supported while H2a was not.

-----  
Insert Tables 4 & 5 and Figure 2 about here  
-----

Hypotheses 3a and 3b predicted that the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and financial success (H3a) will be weaker and that the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and WLB (H3b) will be stronger in countries higher in humane orientation. Model 8 in Table 4 and Model 13 in Table 5 present the results. While the estimation for subjective financial success was not statistically significant ( $\gamma = 0.029, p = 0.381$ ), the estimation for WLB was ( $\gamma = 0.081, p < 0.001$ ). Figure 3 plots this interaction effect. In countries with higher humane orientation, the relationship between proactive career behaviors and WLB was *stronger* (the slope was steeper) than in those with lower humane orientation. Thus, H3b was supported while H3a was not.

-----  
Insert Figure 3 about here  
-----

Hypotheses 4a and 4b predicted that the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective financial success (H4a) will be stronger and the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and WLB (H4b) will be weaker in countries with higher power distance. The results are presented in Model 9 in Table 4 and Model 14 in Table 5. While the estimation for WLB was not statistically significant ( $\gamma = 0.079, p < 0.10$ ), the estimation for subjective financial success was ( $\gamma = 0.070, p < 0.05$ ). Figure 4 plots the interaction effects. In

countries with higher power distance, the relationship between proactive career behaviors and financial success was *stronger* (the slope was steeper) than in those with lower power distance. Thus, H4a was supported while H4b was not.

-----  
Insert Figure 4 about here  
-----

Hypotheses 5a and 5b stated that the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective financial success (H5a) and WLB (H5b) will be weaker in countries with higher uncertainty avoidance. Model 10 in Table 4 shows that the interaction term predicting financial success was, as hypothesized, significantly negative ( $\gamma = - 0.024, p < 0.05$ ). The interaction term is illustrated in Figure 5. In countries higher in uncertainty avoidance the relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective financial success was *weaker* (the slope was flatter) than in those lower in uncertainty avoidance. As shown in Model 15 in Table 5, for WLB the respective interaction term was also negative, but not statistically significant ( $\gamma = - 0.028, p = 0.114$ ). Thus, H5a was supported while H5b was not.

-----  
Insert Figure 5 about here  
-----

Finally, Hypotheses 6a and 6b predicted that the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and subjective financial success (H6a) will be stronger and the positive relationship between proactive career behaviors and WLB will be weaker in countries with higher performance orientation. As Model 11 in Table 4 and Model 16 in Table 5 demonstrate, we found a negative effect for financial success and a positive effect for WLB. However, none of the

estimators reached a statistically significant level ( $\gamma = -0.029, p = 0.213$  and  $\gamma = 0.027, p = 0.342$ ).

Thus, neither H6a nor H6b were supported.

## **Discussion and Conclusion**

This study set out to examine whether proactive career behaviors are associated with higher levels of subjective career success in the form of financial success and work-life balance, and the extent to which these relationships are influenced by national culture. Based on a multi-country dataset, the study firstly contributes to the careers literature by showing how the positive outcomes of proactive career behaviors extend beyond the more objective measures of career success to include subjective measures of career success. In this regard, our findings revealed that proactive career behaviors were significantly related to perception of financial success, but not of work-life balance, and were differentially important for these two dimensions of subjective career success depending on the kind of culture to which an individual belongs.

Collectively, this study provides further grounds for the differential treatment of the individual dimensions of subjective success and our results emphasize the need for future research to examine specific dimensions rather than treat subjective career success as an aggregate construct (Gunz & Heslin, 2005; Shockely et al., 2016). Contrary to expectations, career proactivity was not significantly associated with perceptions of greater work-life balance as it was with subjective financial success. One potential explanation for this is that our measure of career proactivity (EMA) focused on workplace proactivity and did not include other non-work domain forms of proactivity such as seeking out the expectations and feedback of family members, which is common to theories on work-life boundaries (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000) and border management (Clark, 2000). Especially if one's work-life boundary is permeable (i.e. psychological or behavioral aspects from one domain easily enter the other), proactivity at the workplace but not outside of it may have

a weaker effect on achieving a sense of work-life balance. On the other hand, how much perceived organizational support an individual feels he/she is receiving may be more important than what the individual is proactively doing for feelings of work-life balance.

Alternatively, given the number and variety of external-to-work stakeholders that are likely to affect perceptions of work-life balance, feelings of control and the ability to act in advance of future situations may be more difficult to achieve than expected. Similarly, more feedback via information retrieval may not lead to greater satisfaction if this feedback is viewed across different stakeholders as contradictory and involves big trade-offs. Lastly, this insignificant relationship may be attributable to differing levels of career salience (Greenhaus, 1974) among our respondents in terms of the relative importance they attach to work and non-work activities. Whilst some aspects of career salience may be reflected in one's level of career proactivity, this is also likely to affect one's degree of satisfaction with the balance between work and non-work domains (Chi-Ching, 1995).

The study's second main contribution is to the general proactivity literature by revealing that cultural context matters in the relationship between proactivity and individual outcomes. Based on multilevel analyses across a large number of western and non-western countries, career proactivity was relatively more important for subjective financial success in cultures with high power distance and low uncertainty avoidance. For perceptions of work-life balance, career proactivity was relatively more important in cultures characterized by high in-group collectivism, high humane orientation and, marginally, high power distance. We interpret these results in light of social information processing theory, which regards the social context as a primary source of information in shaping one's attitudinal and behavioral responses (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Accordingly, the values, practices and behavioral norms shared by individuals in the broader national context are likely to offer cues on how to interpret their career achievements.

As suggested by the main effects, our results indicate that views on proactivity in the pursuit of subjective financial success are more universally accepted, while legitimization of proactive behaviors towards greater work-life balance is more culturally contingent. While we find no main effect for career proactivity on work-life balance, we provide evidence to suggest that career proactivity's relationship with work-life balance changes depending on cultural values, with different slopes in different cultural contexts. We interpret this as evidence that how members of a culture view the goals of individual proactivity plays an important role in explaining attitudinal outcomes.

Unexpectedly, however, career proactivity was also more strongly related to subjective financial success in cultures high in in-group collectivism, albeit only marginally. One explanation might be that in-group collectivist societies assume individuals will use their financial success for the benefit of their own group rather individualistic or self-centered goals. When considering countries such as China, for example, an emphasis on individual achievement and financial success can be seen as legitimate and co-exist with strong collectivistic cultural practices. Indeed, in collectivist cultures, people tend to view work-family conflict as an inevitable cost in the pursuit of financial stability for the family and family well-being (Aryee, Luk, Leung, & Lo, 1999). Also unexpected was the finding that career proactivity was more important for work-life balance in countries with high power distance, as revealed by a marginally significant coefficient. A possible explanation is that since work-life balance in these contexts is likely to be a lower priority and not necessarily granted by those further up the hierarchy, individual proactive behaviors may be needed in order to approach those who are in a position to help one achieve it. Therefore, all other things equal, individuals may be happier with their level of achievement on this dimension of subjective career success.

Nevertheless, whilst we found moderating effects for at least one aspect of subjective career success for four out of the five cultural dimensions, the lack of support for the remaining hypotheses demonstrate that the role of culture was still not as strong as expected. As mentioned above, and as evidenced in the small effect sizes for several of the interactions, this might be due to the benefits of career proactivity being more universal than we anticipated. Alternatively, although we controlled for perceived organizational support, the role of the organization and immediate supervisor (Wayne, Liden, Kraimer & Graf, 1999) – the more immediate context within which proactivity takes place and where key career ‘gatekeepers’ reside (King, 2004) – may represent an important part of the missing link. And whilst we controlled for age, we cannot rule out completely the effects of age, generation and career stage, which may not only determine how invested individuals are in their culture’s normative values, but also the meanings and salience they attach to financial success and work-life balance.

#### *Limitations and Future Research*

This study is subject to certain limitations, which themselves present opportunities for interesting future research. Firstly, whilst CMV does not appear to be significantly present in our data, the study was nevertheless cross-sectional and based on single respondents, which limits our ability to make causal inferences. This, together with our unexpected findings, reinforces the need for more longitudinal and qualitative research that examines individual proactive behaviors and how joint self- and organization-career management interacts and unfolds over time (e.g., Feij, Whitely, Peiró, & Taris, 1995) in different cultural settings. This is especially important when one could argue for reverse causality insofar as subjective career success may drive career proactivity.

Secondly, we focused on several cultural dimensions and a large number of countries in order to seek broadly generalizable findings regarding the role of culture with respect to our focal



variables. Whilst we controlled for HDI (Human Development Index) scores, our results did not shed light on other potentially significant country differences. Echoing some of the recent international careers research (e.g., Briscoe et al., 2012b; Mayrhofer et al., 2016), our understanding of career proactivity and its benefits around the world could be further improved via a more fine-grained understanding of national career systems and institutional arrangements grounded in institutional theory. This could be achieved by adopting a country comparative approach to careers (Dany, Mallon, & Arthur, 2003; Mayrhofer, Meyer, & Steyrer, 2007) with an emphasis on institutional context and structure to counterbalance the actor-centric tendency in proactivity and careers research. This could include questions around what ‘proactivity’ means in different cultures and how it is perceived by others – seeking feedback on your performance from your supervisor may be a modest step in some cultures, but a very bold step in others. Similar to cultural differences in, for instance, the propensity for employee voice due to power distance (e.g., Huang, van Vliert, & van der Vegt, 2005), we believe there is scope for emic research to examine more closely the cultural meanings attached to career proactivity and how these might affect career behaviors and outcomes.

Thirdly, the relatively small effect sizes in our models indicate a great deal of unexplained variance. At the individual level, one could examine the relative importance of proactive career behaviors compared to other proactive person-environment fit behaviors such as job change negotiation (Parker & Collins, 2010), influence tactics such as networking, ingratiation and enhancing one’s visibility (Judge & Bretz, 1994; King, 2004), or individual attributes such as age/generation (Van der Heijden, de Lange, Demerouti & Van der Heijde, 2009) and work/goal orientation (Heslin, 2005b). At the organizational level, there are likely to be important variables capturing the work context that will help future researchers to understand the effects of agentic career proactivity and their inter-play, such as supervisor support and sponsorship (Ng et al., 2005),

developmental network support at work (e.g., Higgins & Kram, 2001), or the existence of mentoring cultures (e.g., Ragins & Scandura, 1999).

And lastly, we suggest future research integrate the other lesser-studied individual dimensions of subjective career success. Of particular interest from a proactivity perspective that were not studied here, and in light of individuals increasingly looking for meaning, purpose, and values compatibility in their self-directed career choices (e.g., Briscoe & Hall, 2006), the dimensions of ‘Positive Impact’ (Briscoe et al., 2014), ‘Meaningful Work’ and ‘Authenticity’ (Shockley et al. 2016) would be timely inclusions in future careers research. What the relationships between proactivity and these different kinds of subjective career success look like around the world and across different occupations (e.g. nurses versus blue-collar workers) would also help in understanding which relationships are more universalistic and which are more country and occupational context dependent.

### *Implications for Practice*

Understanding what contributes to individuals’ subjective career success is important for at least two reasons. First, it is important for individuals themselves since it is associated with greater life satisfaction and psychological wellbeing (Nicholson & DeWaal-Andrews, 2005; Rain, Lane, & Steiner, 1991); and second, it is important for organizations since subjective career success can lead to lower turnover intentions and more support for organizational change (Nauta, Vianen, Van der Heijden, Dam, & Willemsen, 2009). Our findings present interesting implications for these two careers’ stakeholders, who today are expected to share the responsibility for career success, having to make difficult decisions about how much to invest in supportive organizational practices (Human Resource Development, supervisor support) on the one hand, and how much to encourage proactive career self-management on the other (DeVos et al., 2009; Jung & Takeuchi, 2018).

For the individual careerist, our findings suggest that proactive career behaviors generally pay off on a psychological level in terms of intrinsic success criteria like subjective financial achievement, irrespective of cultural context. Such proactivity, which itself can contribute to career resilience and adaptability (Seibert, Kraimer & Heslin, 2016), will be especially beneficial for employees in high power distance and low uncertainty avoidance cultures. Regarding more wellbeing-related criteria like work-life balance, career proactivity may not automatically translate into a greater sense of achievement, but is more likely to do so in cultures characterized by high in-group collectivism and humane orientation. Even in countries where heightened proactivity might not be the norm, such behaviors are advisable as there is certainly no evidence in this study to suggest that greater proactivity is associated with more negative feelings about one's career. One may just need to keep in mind how the culture one is in may influence the kind of career goals held as important, and how this is likely to influence how individuals construct interpretations about the importance of being proactive.

For organizations, the results suggest that encouraging and supporting employees to become more proactive in managing their careers is likely to improve their subjective career success. Whilst the positive effects of our control variable concerning the organization's perceived investment in employee development suggest that the organization still has an important role to play in the joint responsibility for career management, directing some of this support towards creating an enabling environment that supports and rewards proactivity could be beneficial to both parties, provided that organizations can at the same time promote employee loyalty and contributions to the organization. For organizations that are 'managing' careers across countries and cultures (e.g., multinational firms), this approach may not need to be adjusted extensively to cater for cultural differences, but would nevertheless benefit from understanding how a given culture views and influences proactive behaviors and different kinds of career goals.

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> We thank an anonymous reviewer for suggesting the examination of Humane Orientation as a potentially useful moderator.

<sup>2</sup> We intentionally utilized stratified purposive sampling (Kothari, 2004; Orcher, 2016) as our sampling strategy in this multi-country study as a-priori research has shown that different strata of workforce respondents may have unique, different or important perspectives (Kothari, 2004; Trost, 1986) not just by work country but also by occupation and age (Ng, et al., 2005; Seibert, Kraimer & Liden, 2001; Sturges, 1999). Additionally, given the increasingly widespread long-term trend of greater numbers of women in the workforce in developed and developing countries (Beck, 2014), we sought to peg each country's sample as close to a 50/50 male/female split to ensure representation for this demographic variable. In these ways, we sought a cross-contextual sample (Robinson, 2014) where the heterogeneity of the sample was such that any commonality found across such a diverse set of cases would be more likely to be a widely generalizable theoretical phenomenon versus a commonality found among a more homogeneous set of cases (Kothari, 2004; Orcher, 2016).

<sup>3</sup> The cultural representativeness of the respondents was ascertained post-hoc by conducting supplemental descriptive analyses which indicated that country-level aggregation of the self-perceived importance of financial success and work-life balance showed consistencies with GLOBE clustering (House et al., 2004) for scores on performance orientation and human orientation respectively.

<sup>4</sup> Based on the CFA we also calculated Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and Composite Reliability (CR) (cf. Fornell & Larcker, 1981). AVE was above the 0.5 threshold for all constructs: 0.54 for EMA, 0.55 for WLB and 0.5 for financial success. This is an indication of the convergent validity of our measures. Finally, we calculated the square root of AVE for all latent variables and compared these values to correlations with other latent variables. All square roots of AVE were higher than the respective correlations, demonstrating support for the claim that our latent variables are distinct.

## References

- Abele, A. E., & Wiese, B. S. (2008). The nomological network of self-management strategies and career success. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *81*(4), 733–749. doi:10.1348/096317907X256726
- Amabile, T., & Kramer, S. (2011). *The progress principle: Using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity at work*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Arthur, M. B., Khapova, S. N., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2005). Career success in a boundaryless career world. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(2), 177–202. doi:10.1002/job.290
- Aryee, S., Luk, V., Leung, A., & Lo, S. (1999). Role stressors, interrole conflict, and well-being: The moderating influence of spousal support and coping behaviors among employed parents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *54*(2), 259–278. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1998.1667
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work. Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*, 472–491. doi:10.5465/AMR.2000.3363315
- Asparouhov, T. & Muthén, B. (2014). Multiple-group factor analysis alignment. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *21*(4): 495–508. doi:10.1080/10705511.2014.919210
- Baard, P. P., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *34*(10), 2045–2068. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02690.x
- Barnett, B. R. & Bradley, L. (2007). The impact of organisational support for career development on career satisfaction. *Career Development International*, *12*(7), 617–636.
- Bhave, D. P., Kramer, A., & Glomb, T. M. (2010). Work–family conflict in work groups: Social information processing, support, and demographic dissimilarity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(1), 145.
- Briscoe, J. P., & Hall, D. T. 2006. The interplay of boundaryless and protean careers: Combinations and implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *69*(1): 4–18
- Briscoe, J. P., Hall, D. T., & Mayrhofer, W. (Eds.). (2012). *Careers around the world: Individual and contextual perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Briscoe, J.P., Kaše, R., Dries, N., Dysvik, A., Unite, J., Övgü Çakmak-Otluoğlu, K., Adeeye, I., Apospori, E., Bagdadli, S., Cerdin, J-L., Fei, Z., Gianecchini, M., Ituma, A., Kim, N., Mayrhofer, W., Mishra, S.K., Reichel, A., Saxena, R., Shen, Y., Supangco, V., & Verbruggen, M. (2014). A cross-culturally generated measure of perceived career success: results of a three-stage study. In J. Humphreys (Eds). *2014 Best Paper Proceedings*, 74th Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.
- Broeck, A. V. d., Ferris, D. L., Chang, C.-H., & Rosen, C. C. (2016). A review of self-determination theory's basic psychological needs at work. *Journal of Management*, *42*(5), 1195–1229. doi:10.1177/0149206316632058
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *1*(3), 185–216. doi:10.1177/135910457000100301
- Caprar, D. V., Devinney, T. M., Kirkman, B. L., & Caligiuri, P. (2015). Conceptualizing and measuring culture in international business and management: From challenges to potential

- solutions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 46(9), 1011–1027. doi:10.1057/jibs.2015.33
- Chi-Ching, Y. (1995). The effects of career salience and life-cycle variables on perceptions of work-family interfaces. *Human Relations*, 48(3), 265-284. doi:10.1177/001872679504800303
- Chudzikowski, K., Demel, B., Mayrhofer, W., Briscoe, J. P., Unite, J., Bogićević Milikić, B., Hall, D. T., Las Heras, M., Shen, Y. & Zikic, J. (2009). Career transitions and their causes: A country-comparative perspective. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(4), 825-849.
- Chudzikowski, K., Ogliastri, E., Briscoe, J. P., Ituma, A., Reichel, A., Mayrhofer, W., & Khapova, S. N. (2012). Culture and context: understanding their influence upon careers. In J. P. Briscoe, D. T. Hall & W. Mayrhofer (Eds.), *Careers around the world. Individual and contextual perspectives* (pp.147–165). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Claes, R., & Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A. (1994). Initial career and work meanings in seven European countries. *Career Development Quarterly*, 42(4), 337–352. doi:10.1002/j.2161-0045.1994.tb00517.x
- Claes, R., & Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A. (1998). Influences of early career experiences, occupational group, and national culture on proactive career behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52(3), 357-378. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1997.1626.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770. doi:10.1177/0018726700536001
- Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: design and analysis issues for field settings*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Dany, F., Mallon, M., & Arthur, M. (2003). The odyssey of career and the opportunity for international comparison. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(5), 705–712. doi:10.1080/0958519032000080758
- DeCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Demel, B., Shen, Y., Las Heras, M., Hall, D. T. & Unite, J. (2012). Career success around the world: Its meaning and perceived influences in 11 countries. In J. P. Briscoe, D. T. Hall, & W. Mayrhofer (Eds.), *Careers Around the World: 59-87*. New York and London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- DeVos, A., Dewettinck, K., & Buyens, D. (2009). The professional career on the right track: A study on the interaction between career self-management and organizational career management in explaining employee outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 18(1), 55–80. doi:10.1080/13594320801966257
- DeVos, A., & Soens, N. (2008). Protean attitude and career success: The mediating role of self-management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73(3), 449–456. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2008.08.007
- Direnzo, M. S., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2011). Job search and voluntary turnover in a boundaryless world: A control theory perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(3), 567-589. doi: 10.5465/amr.2009.0333
- Dries, N., Pepermans, R., & Carlier, O. (2008). Career success: Constructing a multidimensional model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73, 254–267. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2008.05.005

- Eby, L. T., Butts, M., & Lockwood, A. (2003). Predictors of success in the era of the boundaryless career. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(6), 689–708. doi:10.1002/job.214
- Erdogan, B., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., & Mansfield, L. R. (2012). Whistle while you work: A review of the life satisfaction literature. *Journal of Management*, 38: 1038-1083.
- Feij, J. A., Whitely, W. T., Peiró, J. M., & Taris, T. W. (1995). The development of career-enhancing strategies and content innovation: A longitudinal study of new workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 46(3), 231–256. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1995.1017
- Fischer, R. (2008). Rewarding seniority: exploring cultural and organizational predictors of seniority allocations. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 148(2), 167–186. doi:10.3200/SOCP.148.2.167-186
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39–50. doi:10.2307/3151312
- Forret, M. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (2004). Networking behaviors and career outcomes: Differences for men and women? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 419–437. doi:10.1002/job.253
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331–362. doi:10.1002/job.322
- Gentry, W. A., Weber, T. J., & Sadri, G. (2008). Examining career-related mentoring and managerial performance across cultures: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(2), 241-253.
- Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 3–34. doi:10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.002
- Greenhaus, J. H. (1974). Career salience as a moderator of the relationship between satisfaction with occupational preference and satisfaction with life in general. *The Journal of Psychology*, 86(1), 53-55. doi:10.1080/00223980.1974.9923883
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 64–86. doi:10.2307/256352
- Guest, D. (2002). Perspectives on the study of work-life balance. *Social Science Information*, 41(2), 255-279. doi:10.1177/0539018402041002005
- Gunz, H. P., & Heslin, P. A. (2005). Reconceptualizing career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 105–111. doi:10.1002/job.300
- Haar, J. M., Russo, M., Suñe, A., & Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2014). Outcomes of work–life balance on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and mental health: A study across seven cultures. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85(3), 361-373.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5<sup>th</sup>). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *The Behavioral and brain sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83; discussion 83-135. doi:10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

- Heslin, P. A. (2005a). Experiencing career success, *Organizational Dynamics*, 34(4), 376–390. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2005.08.005
- Heslin, P. A. (2005b). Conceptualizing and evaluating career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(2), 113–136. doi:10.1002/job.270
- Higgins, M. C., & Kram, K. E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: a developmental network perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 264–288. doi:10.5465/AMR.2001.4378023
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7, 81–94. doi:10.2307/4165110
- Hofstede, G. (2006). What did GLOBE really measure?: Researchers' minds versus respondents' minds. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(6), 882–896. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400233
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CAL.: Sage.
- Huang, X., van Vliert, E. de, & van der Vegt, G. (2005). Breaking the silence culture: Stimulation of participation and employee opinion withholding cross-nationally. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(03), 459–482. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8784.2005.00023.x
- Inkson, K., Gunz, H., Ganesh, S., & Roper, J. (2012). Boundaryless careers: Bringing back boundaries. *Organization Studies*, 33(3), 323–340. doi:10.1177/0170840611435600
- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1994). Political influence processes and career success. *Journal of Management*, 20, 43–65. doi:10.1177/014920639402000103
- Jung, Y., & Takeuchi, N. (2018). A lifespan perspective for understanding career self-management and satisfaction: The role of developmental human resource practices and organizational support. *Human Relations*, 71(1), 73-102. doi: 10.1177/00187267177115075
- Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (2010). The many colors of success: What do executives want out of life? *Organizational Dynamics*, 39(1), 1–12. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2009.10.005
- Khapova, S. N., Briscoe, J. P., & Dickmann, M. (2012). Careers in cross-cultural perspective. In J. P. Briscoe, D. T. Hall, & W. Mayrhofer (Eds.), *Careers around the world. Individual and contextual perspectives* (pp. 15–38). New York, NY: Routledge.
- King, Z. (2004). Career self-management: Its nature, causes and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65(1), 112–133. doi:10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00052-6
- Kuvaas, B., & Dysvik, A. (2009). Perceived investment in employee development, intrinsic motivation and work performance. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19(3), 217-236. doi:10.1111/j.1748-8583.2009.00103.x
- Law, K.S., Wong C., & Mobley, W.H. 1998. Toward a taxonomy of multidimensional constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 741-755.
- Lee, C. H., & Bruvold, N. T. (2003). Creating value for employees: Investment in employee development. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(6), 981–1000. doi:10.1080/0958519032000106173



- Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2008). Social cognitive career theory and subjective well-being in the context of work. *Journal of Career Assessment, 16*(1), 6–21.  
doi:10.1177/1069072707305769
- Mayrhofer, W., Briscoe, J. P., Hall, D. T., Dickmann, M., Dries, N., Dysvik, A., Kaše, R., Parry, E., & Unite, J. (2016). Career success across the globe: Insights from the 5C project. *Organizational Dynamics, 45*(3), 155–270. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2016.07.005
- Mayrhofer, W., Meyer, M., & Steyrer, J. (2007). Contextual issues in the study of careers. In H. P. Gunz & M. A. Peiperl (Eds.), *Handbook of career studies* (pp. 215–239). London: Sage.
- Murphy, S. E., & Ensher, E. A. (2001). The role of mentoring support and self-management strategies on reported career outcomes. *Journal of Career Development, 27*(4), 229–246.  
doi:10.1023/A:1007866919494
- Muthén, B. O., & Asparouhov, T. (2014). IRT studies of many groups: the alignment method. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*(978), 1-7. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00978
- Muthén, B. O., & Satorra, A. (1995). Complex sample data in structural equation modeling. *Sociological Methodology, 25*, 267–316. doi:10.2307/271070
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2016). *Mplus user's guide* (7<sup>th</sup> edition). Los Angeles: Muthén & Muthén.
- Nabi, G. R. (1999). An investigation into the differential profile of predictors of objective and subjective career success. *Career Development International, 4*(4), 212–225.  
doi:10.1108/13620439910270599
- Nabi, G. R. (2003). Situational characteristics and subjective career success. *International Journal of Manpower, 24*(6), 653–672. doi:10.1108/01437720310496148
- Nauta, A., Vianen, A., Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M., Dam, K., & Willemsen, M. (2009). Understanding the factors that promote employability orientation: The impact of employability culture, career satisfaction, and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 82*(2), 233–251. doi:10.1348/096317908X320147
- Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2014). Subjective career success: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 85*(2), 169-179.
- Ng, T. W. H., Eby, L. T., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 367–408.  
doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00515.x
- Nicholson, N., & DeWaal-Andrews, W. (2005). Playing to win: Biological imperatives, self-regulation, and trade-offs in the game of career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(2), 137–154. doi:10.1002/job.295
- Noordin, F., Williams, T., & Zimmer, C. (2002). Career commitment in collectivist and individualist cultures: A comparative study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 13*(1), 35–54. doi:10.1080/09585190110092785
- Ollier-Malaterre, A., Valcour, M., Den Dulk, L., & Kossek, E. E. (2013). Theorizing national context to develop comparative work–life research: A review and research agenda. *European Management Journal, 31*(5), 433-447.
- Olló-López, A., & Goñi-Legaz, S. (2017). Differences in work–family conflict: Which individual and national factors explain them? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28*(3), 499–525. doi:10.1080/09585192.2015.1118141.

- Pan, J., & Zhou, W. (2015). How do employees construe their career success: An improved measure of subjective career success. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 23(1), 45–58. doi:10.1111/ijsa.12094
- Park, Y. (2010). The predictors of subjective career success: An empirical study of employee development in a Korean financial company. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 14(1), 1–15. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2419.2009.00337.x
- Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking stock: integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 36(3), 633–662. doi:10.1177/0149206308321554
- Parker, S. K., & Liao, J. (2016). Wise proactivity: How to be proactive and wise in building your career. *Organizational Dynamics*, 45(3), 217–227.
- Raabe, B., Frese, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2007). Action regulation theory and career self-management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(2), 297–311. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2006.10.005
- Rabl, T., Jayasinghe, M., Gerhart, B., & Kuhlmann, T. M. (2014). A meta-analysis of country differences in the high-performance work system-business performance relationship: the roles of national culture and managerial discretion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(6), 1011–1041. doi:10.1037/a0037712
- Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1999). Burden or blessing?: Expected costs and benefits of being a mentor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(4), 493–509. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199907)20:4<493::AID-JOB894>3.0.CO;2-T
- Rain, J. S., Lane, I. M., & Steiner, D. D. (1991). A current look at the job satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: Review and future considerations. *Human Relations*, 44(3), 287–307. doi:10.1177/001872679104400305
- Ramaswami, A., Huang, J. C., & Dreher, G. (2014). Interaction of gender, mentoring, and power distance on career attainment: A cross-cultural comparison. *Human Relations*, 67(2), 153–173.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23(2), 224–253. doi: 10.2307/2392563.
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. (2001). What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(4), 845–874. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00234.x
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Heslin, P. A. (2016). Developing career resilience and adaptability. *Organizational Dynamics*, 45(3), 245–257.
- Shen, Y., Demel, B., Unite, J., Briscoe, J. P., Hall, D. T., Chudzikowski, K., Mayrhofer, W., Abdul-Ghani, R., Bogicevic Milikic, B., Colorado, O., Fei, Z., Las Heras, M., Ogliastri, E., Pazy, A., Poon, J. M. L., Shefer, D., Taniguchi, M., & Zikic, J. (2015). Career success across 11 countries: implications for international human resource management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(13), 1753–1778.
- Shockley, K. M., Ureksoy, H., Rodopman, O. B., Poteat, L. F., & Dullaghan, T. R. (2016). Development of a new scale to measure subjective career success: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(1), 128–153. doi:10.1002/job.2046
- Simons, R., Goddard, R., & Patton, W. (2000). Measuring vocational interests: A call for multi-sample norms. *Career Development International*, 5(7), 351–360. doi:10.1108/13620430010361604

- Spector, P.E., Allen, T.D., Poelmans, S.A., Lapiere, L.M., Cooper, C.L., Michael, O.D., Sanchez, J.I., Abarca, N., Alexandrova, M., Beham, B. & Brough, P. (2007). Cross-national differences in relationships of work demands, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions with work–family conflict. *Personnel Psychology*, *60*(4), 805-835.
- Sturges, J., Conway, N., Guest, D., & Liefoghe, A. (2005). Managing the career deal: the psychological contract as a framework for understanding career management, organizational commitment and work behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(7), 821–838. doi:10.1002/job.341
- Sturges, J., Guest, D., Conway, N., & Davey, K. M. (2002). A longitudinal study of the relationship between career management and organizational commitment among graduates in the first ten years at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *23*(6), 731–748. doi:10.1002/job.164
- Sullivan, S. E., & Baruch, Y. (2009). Advances in career theory and research: A critical review and agenda for future exploration. *Journal of Management*, *35*(6), 1542-1571. doi: 10.1177/0149206309350082.
- Tharenou, P., & Terry, D. J. (1998). Reliability and validity of scores on scales to measure managerial aspirations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *58*(June), 475–492. doi:10.1177/0013164498058003008
- Thomas, D. C., & Inkson, K. (2007). Careers across cultures. In H. Gunz & M. Peiperl (Eds.), *Handbook of career studies* (pp. 451–471). Los Angeles et al.: Sage.
- Thomas, D. C., & Peterson, M. B. (2015). *Cross-cultural management: Essential concepts* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Tung, R. L., & Verbeke, A. (2010) Beyond Hofstede and GLOBE: Improving the quality of cross-cultural research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *41*(8), 1259-1274. doi:10.1057/jibs.2010.41
- Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M., de Lange, A. H., Demerouti, E., & Van der Heijde, C. M. (2009). Age effects on the employability–career success relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *74*(2), 156-164. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2008.12.009
- Vaux, A., Riedel, S., & Stewart, D. (1987). Modes of social support: The social support behaviors (SS-B) scale. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *15*(2), 209-232. doi: 10.1007/BF00919279.
- Verbruggen, M., & Sels, L. (2010). Social-cognitive factors affecting clients’ career and life satisfaction after counseling. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *18*(1), 3–15. doi:10.1177/1069072709340516
- Verbruggen, M., Sels, L., & Forrier, A. (2007). Unraveling the relationship between organizational career management and the need for external career counseling. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *71*(1), 69–83. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2007.03.003
- Wayne, S. J., Liden, R. C., Kraimer, M. L., & Graf, I. K. (1999). The role of human capital, motivation and supervisor sponsorship in predicting career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *20*(5), 577–595. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199909)20:5<577::AID-JOB958>3.0.CO;2-0
- Whitely, W., Dougherty, T. W., & Dreher, G. F. (1991). Relationship of career mentoring and socioeconomic origin to managers’ and professionals’ early career progress. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*(2), 331-350. doi:10.2307/256445

- Williams, L. J., Hartman, N., & Cavazotte, F. (2010). Method variance and marker variables: A review and comprehensive CFA marker technique. *Organizational Research Methods, 13*(3), 477–514. doi:10.1177/1094428110366036
- Zaheer, S., Schomaker, M. S., & Nachum, L. (2012). Distance without direction: Restoring credibility to a much-loved construct. *Journal of International Business Studies, 43*(1), 18–27. doi:10.1057/jibs.2011.43
- Zhou, W., Sun, J., Guan, Y., Li, Y., & Pan, J. (2013). Criteria of career success among Chinese employees: Developing a multidimensional scale with qualitative and quantitative approaches. *Journal of Career Assessment, 21*(2), 265-277.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics: means, standard deviations (SD) and bivariate correlations among variables

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Level 1</i>											
1 Gender	0.50	0.50									
2 Age	39.89	10.79	.024**								
3 Education	4.48	1.39	.004	-.084**							
4 Manager	0.43	1.39	.146**	.113**	.154**						
5 Hierarchical level	5.56	2.29	-.067**	-.124**	-.228**	-.271**					
6 PIED	3.11	0.94	.035**	-.022*	.047**	.133**	-.097**				
7 Size of organization	3.67	1.56	.052**	.032**	.167**	.037**	.084**	.105**			
8 Proactive Career Behaviors	3.97	1.47	.079**	-.248**	.191**	.170**	-.101**	.264**	.089**		
9 Work-life Balance	3.64	0.85	-.034**	.082**	-.068**	-.001	-.053**	-.044**	.049**	.196**	
10 Financial Success	3.29	0.89	.081**	.088**	.022*	.193**	-.152**	.027**	.168**	.365**	.363**
<i>Level 2</i>											
1 In-group Collectivism	5.12	0.66									
2 Humane Orientation	3.93	0.36	.437								
3 Power Distance	5.27	0.29	.536*	-.116							
4 Uncertainty Avoidance	4.32	0.64	-.440	.017	-.624**						
5 Performance Orientation	4.09	0.45	-.220	.300	-.488*	.611**					
6 HDI	0.83	0.11	-.675**	-.580*	-.439 <sup>+</sup>	.041	.050				

Notes: \*p<.05; \*\*p<.01; \*\*\*p<.001; Level 1 (n=11,445 to 11,892); Level 2 (n=17). PIED (Perceived Investment in Employee Development); HDI (Human Development Index)

Table 2. Multilevel models predicting subjective financial success

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Intercept</i>	10.791 (1.497)***	13.248 (1.772)***	13.337 (1.848)***
<i>Level 1</i>			
Manager		.093 (.018)***	.084 (.018)***
Gender		.044 (.012)***	.040 (.012)**
Size of organization		-.005 (.018)	-.012 (.021)
Age		.094 (.017)***	.117 (.016)***
Education		-.006 (.022)	-.017 (.023)*
Hierarchical level		-.065 (.038) <sup>+</sup>	-.059 (.037)
PIED		.334 (.025)***	.315 (.023)***
Proactive Career Behaviors			.094 (.021)***
<i>Variance components</i>			
Residual Variance (Within)	.716 (.037)***	.607 (.031)***	.602 (.030)***
Residual Variance (Between)	.092 (.026)***	.057 (.015)***	.057 (.015)***
Deviance (FIML)	29748	26497	26377
Deviance change		3521***	120***
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0	.109	.113

Notes: Standardized coefficients reported for fixed effects with standard errors in parentheses; unstandardized coefficients reported for random effects (variance components); deviance change significance determined by using the Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square (Model 2 is compared to Model 1, Model 3 is compared to Model 2); <sup>+</sup> p<.10 \*p<.05; \*\*p<.01; \*\*\*p<.001; n(Level 1) = 11,282 to 11,844; n(Level 2) = 22; average cluster size from 512.8 to 538.4. PIED (Perceived Investment in Employee Development); FIML (full information likelihood procedure)

Table 3. Multilevel models predicting work-life balance

	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
<i>Intercept</i>	18.280 (3.673)***	22.461 (4.819)***	22.729 (4.924)***
<i>Level 1</i>			
Manager		-.056 (.014)***	-.060 (.012)***
Gender		-.030 (.009)**	-.031 (.009)***
Size of organization		-.046 (.011)***	-.049 (.011)***
Age		.086 (.013)***	.095 (.014)***
Education		-.057 (.017)**	-.062 (.016)***
Hierarchical level		-.032 (.013)*	-.030 (.012)*
PIED		.180 (.018)***	.173 (.017)***
Proactive Career Behaviors			.037 (.024)
<i>Variance components</i>			
Residual Variance (Within)	.685 (.038)***	.650 (.037)***	.649 (.037)***
Residual Variance (Between)	.039 (.015)*	.027 (.011)*	.027 (.011)*
Deviance (FIML)	29320	27264	27225
Deviance change		2056***	39***
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0	.070	.071

Notes: Standardized coefficients reported for fixed effects with standard errors in parentheses, unstandardized coefficients reported for random effects (variance components); deviance change significance determined by using the Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square (Model 5 is compared to Model 4, Model 6 is compared to Model 5); + p<.10 \*p<.05; \*\*p<.01; \*\*\*p<.001; n(Level 1) = 11,290 to 11,892; n(Level 2) = 22; average cluster size from 513.182 to 540.545. PIED (Perceived Investment in Employee Development); FIML (full information likelihood procedure)

Table 4. Multilevel models with cross-level interactions predicting subjective financial success

<i>Cultural dimension</i>	Model 7 <i>In-group collectivism</i>	Model 8 <i>Humane orientation</i>	Model 9 <i>Power distance</i>	Model 10 <i>Uncertainty avoidance</i>	Model 11 <i>Performance orientation</i>
<i>Intercept</i>	3.161 (.052)***	3.148 (.055)***	3.160 (.051)***	3.170 (.046)***	3.155 (.049)***
<i>Level 1</i>					
Manager	.135 (.036)***	.135 (.036)***	.135 (.036)***	.135 (.036)***	.135 (.036)***
Gender	.069 (.023)**	.069 (.023)**	.070 (.023)**	.070 (.023)**	.069 (.023)**
Size of organization	-.001 (.011)	-.001 (.011)	-.001 (.011)	-.001 (.011)	-.001 (.011)
Age	.010 (.001)***	.010 (.001)***	.010 (.001)***	.010 (.001)***	.010 (.001)***
Education	-.002 (.016)	-.002 (.016)	-.002 (.016)	-.002 (.016)	-.002 (.016)
Hierarchical level	-.022 (.016)	-.022 (.016)	-.022 (.016)	-.022 (.016)	-.022 (.016)
PIED	.285 (.027)***	.285 (.027)***	.284 (.027)***	.284 (.027)***	.284 (.027)***
Proactive Career Behaviors	.057 (.013)***	.061 (.015)***	.058 (.015)***	.057 (.015)***	.061 (.016)***
<i>Level 2</i>					
HDI	-.796 (.654)	-.134 (.443)	-.680 (.505)	-.421 (.465)	-.433 (.446)
Cultural dimension	-.119 (.089)	.146 (.219)	-.256 (.179)	.112 (.063) <sup>+</sup>	.152 (.118)
<i>Cross-level interaction</i>					
Proactive Career Behaviors*Cultural dimension	.038(.021) <sup>+</sup>	.029 (.033)	.070 (.035)*	-.024 (.011)*	-.029 (.024)
<i>Variance components</i>					
Residual Variance (Within)	.603 (.018)***	.603 (.018)***	.603 (.018)***	.603 (.018)***	.603 (.018)***
Residual Variance (Between)	.037 (.012)**	.039 (.011)**	.037 (.012)**	.034 (.010)**	.036 (.010)**
Slope Variance	.002 (.001)*	.003 (.002) <sup>+</sup>	.003 (.002)	.003 (.002) <sup>+</sup>	.003 (.002) <sup>+</sup>
Intercept-Slope Covariance	.000 (.003)	-.001 (.003)	-.001 (.002)	.000 (.003)	.000 (.003)
Deviance (FIML)	20842	20845	20843	20843	20844
Deviance change	49***	46***	48***	48***	47***
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	.12429	.12417	.12426	.12428	.12424

Notes: Unstandardized coefficients are reported with standard errors in parentheses, deviance change significance determined by using the Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square (the comparative model for Models 7-11 is a country-number-adjusted variant of Model 3); <sup>+</sup> p<.10 \*p<.05; \*\*p<.01; \*\*\*p<.001; n(Level 1) = 8,900; n(Level 2) = 17; average cluster size 523.5. PIED (Perceived Investment in Employee Development); HDI (Human Development Index); FIML (full information likelihood procedure)



Table 5. Multilevel models with cross-level interactions predicting work-life balance

	Model 12	Model 13	Model 14	Model 15	Model 16
<i>Cultural dimension</i>	<i>In-group collectivism</i>	<i>Humane orientation</i>	<i>Power distance</i>	<i>Uncertainty avoidance</i>	<i>Performance orientation</i>
<i>Intercept</i>	3.650 (.041)***	3.653 (.044)***	3.664 (.036)***	3.660 (.041)***	3.652 (.047)***
<i>Level 1</i>					
Manager	-.122 (.023)***	-.123 (.023)***	-.122 (.023)***	-.122 (.023)***	-.122 (.023)***
Gender	-.048 (.018)**	-.048 (.018)**	-.048 (.018)**	-.048 (.018)**	-.048 (.018)**
Size of organization	-.025 (.006)***	-.025 (.006)***	-.026 (.006)***	-.026 (.006)***	-.026 (.006)***
Age	.007 (.001)***	.007 (.001)***	.006 (.001)***	.007 (.001)***	.007 (.001)***
Education	-.044 (.009)***	-.043 (.009)***	-.044 (.009)***	-.043 (.009)***	-.044 (.009)***
Hierarchical level	-.011 (.005)*	-.011 (.005)*	-.011 (.005)*	-.011 (.005)*	-.011 (.005)*
PIED	.156 (.015)***	.156 (.015)***	.155 (.014)***	.156 (.015)***	.156 (.015)***
Proactive Career Behaviors	.027 (.013)*	.031 (.016)*	.030 (.016) <sup>+</sup>	.029 (.016) <sup>+</sup>	.035 (.017)*
<i>Level 2</i>					
HDI	-.692 (.492)	-.448 (.333)	-.851 (.386)*	-.579 (.356)	-.557 (.342)
Cultural dimension	-.067 (.085)	.024 (.087)	-.289 (.165) <sup>+</sup>	.047 (.045)	-.036 (.074)
<i>Cross-level interaction</i>					
Proactive Career Behaviors*Cultural dimension	.054 (.019)*	.081 (.021)***	.079 (.043) <sup>+</sup>	-.028 (.017)	.027 (.029)
<i>Variance components</i>					
Residual Variance (Within)	.680 (.031)***	.680 (.031)***	.680 (.031)***	.680 (.031)***	.680 (.031)***
Residual Variance (Between)	.018 (.009)*	.019 (.011) <sup>+</sup>	.015 (.006)*	.018 (.009) <sup>+</sup>	.019 (.010) <sup>+</sup>
Slope Variance	.003 (.002)*	.004 (.002) <sup>+</sup>	.004 (.002) <sup>+</sup>	.004 (.002) <sup>+</sup>	.004 (.002) <sup>+</sup>
Intercept-Slope Covariance	-.002 (.004)	-.003 (.004)	-.002 (.003)	-.002 (.004)	-.003 (.005)
Deviance (FIML)	21905	21906	21904	21908	21909
Deviance change	67***	66***	68***	64***	63***
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	.07885	.07877	.07887	.07872	.07867

Notes: Unstandardized coefficients are reported with standard errors in parentheses, deviance change significance determined by using the Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square (the comparative model for Models 12-16 is a country-number-adjusted variant of Model 6); <sup>+</sup> p<.10 \*p<.05; \*\*p<.01; \*\*\*p<.001; n(Level 1) = 8,905; n(Level 2) = 17; average cluster size 523.8. PIED (Perceived Investment in Employee Development); HDI (Human Development Index); FIML (full information likelihood procedure)