

Presenter Symposium
Sculptor or Sculpture?
Agency and Control in Career Development and Employability

Co-Organizers:

MIRIT K. GRABARSKI
 Ivey Business School
 Western University
 1255 Western Road
 London, Ontario CANADA N6G 0N1
mgrabarski.phd@ivey.ca

JENNIFER SHARON JONES-MORALES
 University of the West Indies, St. Augustine
 Department of Management Studies
 1, Solana Drive, Golden View
 El Dorado, Tunapuna, Trinidad and Tobago
jenjomo@gmail.com

Facilitator:

ALISON M. KONRAD
 Ivey Business School
 Western University
 1255 Western Road
 London, Ontario CANADA N6G 0N1
akonrad@ivey.uwo.ca

Presenters* and Co-Authors:

It's Not What You Know but Who You Know: Sources of Social Capital That Lead to Managerial Position

BATIA BEN-HADOR*
 Ariel University
 Department of Economics
 And Business administration
 65 Hagolan St.
 Ariel, Israel
batiabh@ariel.ac.il

EYAL ECKHAUS
 Ariel University
 Department of Economics
 And Business administration
 65 Hagolan St.
 Ariel, Israel
eyale@ariel.ac.il

Contextualizing Employability: The Role of Social Capital in Flemish Theater

JASPER DELVA*
 Department of Work and
 Organisation Studies
 KU Leuven
 Antwerp Carolus Campus,
 Korte Nieuwstraat 33, 2000
 Antwerpen, Belgium
jasper.delva@kuleuven.be

ANNELEEN FORRIER
 Department of Work and
 Organisation Studies
 KU Leuven
 Antwerp Carolus Campus,
 Korte Nieuwstraat 33, 2000
 Antwerpen, Belgium
anneleen.forrier@kuleuven.be

NELE DE CUYPER
 Occupational & Organisational
 Psychology
 and Professional Learning,
 KU Leuven
 Dekenstraat 2, 3000
 Leuven, Belgium
nele.decuyper@kuleuven.be

Social Class and Careers: The Roles of Preferences, Perceptions and Reality in Shaping Career Choice

CHERYL K. MCINTOSH*

Craig School of Business and Technology

Missouri Western State University

4525 Downs Drive, St. Joseph,

MO 64507 USA

cmcintosh@missouriwestern.edu

Sustaining Employability at an Early Career Stage: The Role of Context and Individual Agency

RICARDO RODRIGUES*

King's Business School

30 Aldwych

London WC2B 4BG

United Kingdom

ricardo.rodrigues@kcl.ac.uk

CHRISTINA L. BUTLER

Kingston Business School,

Kingston Hill Campus

Kingston-Upon-Thames, Surrey KT2 7LB

United Kingdom

Christina.butler@kingston.ac.uk

Career Empowerment: A New Perspective on Career Motivation

MIRIT K. GRABARSKI *

Ivey Business School

Western University

1255 Western Road

London, Ontario N6G 5E4

Canada

mgrabarski.phd@ivey.ca

MARIA MOURATIDOU

Department of Business, Law, Policing
and Social Science

University of Cumbria

Bowerham Rd, Lancaster LA1 3JD

United Kingdom

maria.mouratidou@cumbria.ac.uk

POTENTIAL SPONSORS:

Careers (CAR)

Human Resources (HR)

Gender & Diversity in Organizations (GDO)

ABSTRACT

While the early career theories (Holland, 1985; Law, 1981; Lent, Brown & Hackett, 1994; Super, 1990) focused on person-job fit, self-concept, and multiple roles that one can take in organizations, the new generation of theories (Boundaryless career theory, Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Protean career theory, Hall, 1976; Kaleidoscope model, Sullivan & Mainiero, 2007) is more dynamic and focused on individual career decisions across organizations and occupations. Yet, these theories assume that the individual is an active force who makes career decisions with full agency and do not consider the variation in mindsets. In addition, most of them have white-collar or knowledge workers in mind, overlooking large sectors of people whose employability might be limited by different factors, for example human capital or social status (Blustein, 2001). For contemporary career theories to be applicable to wider contexts, it is important that they be made more inclusive.

In addition to the abovementioned factors that may limit employability, it is important to explicitly address the ways individuals may limit themselves. In order to do so, scholars should not assume that individuals have full agency to control their careers. Recent findings suggest that the individual's ability to control their career is linked to their career outcomes (Guest & Rodrigues, 2015; Tams & Arthur, 2010). Being in control will likely lead to taking action, such as setting and pursuing various career goals, while powerlessness might lead to career entrenchment and frustration. The proposed symposium deals with factors with the potential to promote or inhibit career control and explores the link between career control and employability.

Keywords: Career Development, Career Management, Motivation, Control, Employability

OVERVIEW OF SYMPOSIUM

The most common metaphor for careers is a journey, or travel – with milestones, choice points and obstacles (Inkson, 2004). But who is steering the course? Does everyone fully control their careers, or do they go with the flow and let careers happen to them? Are we sculptors, sculptures, or maybe both? The new career theories have been developed to better reflect the dynamic reality of the work domain (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Hall, 1996; Sullivan & Mainiero, 2007), stressing the individual's control over their career development. However, these theories are limited by a common underlying assumption that the individual is quite proactive and makes career decisions with full agency. Ideas about agency and control are often implied in career theories, and over the last few decades there have been a few attempts to discuss their place and role in career development. A few models of personal control (Bell & Staw, 1979; Guest & Rodrigues, 2015) aim to link control to potential antecedents as well as career outcomes. Yet, a systematic investigation of perceptions of control – how perceived control is manifested, what are its antecedents, consequences and potential limitations – is yet to come.

The purpose of this symposium is to open an explicit conversation on the role of individual control in career development. The papers reflect different perspectives on the concept of control regarding individual careers, as well as discussing potential promotive and inhibitive factors. A few of the papers discuss the role of social capital and social class, as factors that can either increase or limit personal agency; another paper examines the interplay between agency and context in regard to employability, and the last paper presents initial findings regarding a promising new construct that embodies career motivation as manifested in cognitions of control. The potential contribution of this symposium is theoretical, adding insight to the role of individual

agency and control in career development and by that clarifying implicit assumptions in existing career theories; and practical, providing career practitioners with new ways to better understand their patrons.

The proposed symposium aims to shed light on the role of agency and control in career behaviors and outcomes with five studies conducted in different countries and regions of the world, using different methodologies. The set of papers addresses key considerations that surround the topic of agency and control.

- Testing how an aspect of personal agency - Personal Social Capital - affects promotion to a managerial role (Ben-Hador & Eckhaus)
- Showing how social capital can be a factor that constrains personal agency (Delva, Forrier & De Cuyper)
- Exploring the role of social class as an agency-limiting factor (McIntosh)
- Examining the interaction of agency and context in early career employability (Rodrigues & Butler)
- Proposing a new theoretical construct that explains career motivation as a cognition of personal agency (Grabarski & Mouratidou)

Altogether, this symposium brings together a set of diverse studies that employ a wide range of methodologies in order to investigate questions of both theoretical and practical importance.

Presentations

In the first paper, Ben-Hador & Eckhaus address the role of Personal Social Capital, an aspect of individual agency, in promotions to managerial positions. This study attempts to fill the research gap in personal career development and identify the

effect of the antecedents of Personal Social Capital on managerial positions. The authors employ Structural Equation Analysis (SEM) to test the relationships between different antecedents of personal Social Capital and following promotions. The study included 2230 Israeli respondents, of them 1795 were identified as managers. The study's findings show that connections with colleagues at work and with people with assets directly affect managerial positions. In addition, while a direct effect of Personal Social Capital derived from connections with neighbors on managerial position was not found, the relationship between the two variables was found significant through the mediation of age. Overall, the findings of this study explain how a specific aspect of personal agency, building Personal Social Capital, may be related to career outcomes, such as promotion.

In the second paper, Delva, Forrier & De Cuyper take a sociological perspective and look at factors that may limit personal agency in careers. Specifically, they question the role of agency in developing social capital and look at social capital as a factor that constrains agency, using Bourdieu's (1977, 1990) theory of practice. The authors will present findings from their qualitative study, in which they interviewed 32 Flemish theater actors. These findings shed light on the dark side of employability, as they show that the role of social capital in employability is not fully agentic and is rather contextual: social capital may enable employment opportunities, but under specific conditions, namely the position of the individual in the social space.

In the third paper, McIntosh continues the questioning of personal agency, with an exploration of the role of social class as a factor that may limit career choice. The qualitative study is based on semi-structured interviews with twenty participants (Black and White men and women spanning four generations in the U.S, raised in

upper, middle, and lower-class households), who shared their thoughts on how their ideal career aspirations compare to their actual career choices. The study identifies themes related to the way that participants chose their careers, including perceived opportunity, social connections, personal interests, and a sense of calling; when social class of origin had a role in the career choices that were made. This study draws on both the perceptions of the participants and on the literature on career choice to discuss the potential role of social class in shaping career choices.

The fourth paper investigates the role of confidence in employability, which is a dimension of personal control over a career. Rodrigues and Butler employ a longitudinal study to test a model in which perceived employability in Time 1 (prior to graduation) is associated with perception of personal agency and control in Time 2, which interacts with contextual factors and drives perceived employability in Time 3 (post-graduation). In general, the study's findings show how agency and context interact in shaping perceived employability over time and explore the role of agency in sustaining employability. An interesting finding of study was that a protean career orientation, rather than a boundaryless career orientation, played a role in perceived employability over time, which is suggested to be related to the unique characteristics of early career, when agency is manifested in active career development and not as much in inter-organizational mobility.

In the fifth and final paper, Grabarski and Mouratidou propose a new theoretical construct that redefines career motivation in terms of cognitions of control over one's career. The proposed construct is based on the concept of psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995), in which employees' motivation to perform job tasks is manifested in cognitions of control, and includes four dimensions: meaning, competence, impact and self-determination. Employing qualitative methodology, the

authors interviewed participants from various vocational backgrounds regarding their perception of control over their careers, as well as factors that made them feel in control, or made them feel disempowered. Thematic analysis showed how career motivation as manifested in perceptions of control; however, while some of the themes that emerged were equivalent to dimensions of psychological empowerment (namely, impact, meaning and competence), there were a few unique themes (namely learning and relationships) that may be related to existing career and motivation theories, but were not a part of the psychological empowerment construct. Overall, the study allows to rethink and revive the construct of career motivation, which was not explored enough over the last two decades.

RELEVANCE TO DIVISIONS

Careers (CAR)

The issues addressed in this symposium lie at the very heart of the content domain of CAR Division. By exploring factors that may enhance or constrain personal agency, as well as factors that interact with it in predicting career outcomes, we are looking ways to increase employability and career sustainability. Taking an agentic perspective to careers allows us to delve deeper into career theory, question its implicit assumptions and propose ways to reconcile and integrate different perspectives on career development.

Human Resources (HR)

The proposed symposium is also relevant to the HR division, since it targets factors that may explain individual career choices which impact the employability of job seekers. As human capital is the key to organizational success, employability is a major challenge that needs to be taken in consideration when recruiting and selecting candidates, as well as recommending employees for promotion and retaining talent.

The need to understand what might increase and/or limit individual agency in careers, and what are the consequences of such agency and control, is of interest to members of the HR division.

Gender & Diversity in Organizations (GDO)

Finally, the proposed symposium will contribute to the GDO domain, as it addresses factors that might affect diversity in organizations, by investigating populations that might be marginalized in existing careers research. Giving voice to people from lower social class, as well as people from diverse vocational backgrounds, will allow to increase diversity and make future career scholarship more inclusive. This is also in line with the all-academy theme of inclusive organizations. In addition, the proposed set of papers includes perspectives from multiple countries (UK, Israel, Netherlands, US and Canada), bringing together scholars from all over the world in a meaningful way,

PROPOSED FORMAT OF SYMPOSIUM

Length: 90 minutes

The facilitator will begin the symposium by presenting a brief introduction providing an overview of the topic. Each presenter will then report on their research, explaining their theoretical contributions to understanding of the role of agency and control in career development. The facilitator will invite two questions at the end of each presentation to focus on each of the studies individually. After completing the five presentations, the facilitators will open the floor to an integrative discussion of the authors' contributions.

Minutes 0-5: Welcome and introduction to the symposium: *Alison M. Konrad*

Minutes 5-75: Paper presentations (12 minutes each + 2 minutes for specific questions)

- It's Not What You Know but Who You Know – Sources of Personal Social Capital That Lead to Managerial Position. *Presented by Batia Ben Hador*
- Contextualizing Employability: The Role of Social Capital in Flemish Theater. *Presented by Jasper Delva*
- Social Class and Careers: The Roles of Preferences, Perceptions and Reality in Shaping Career Choice. *Presented by Cheryl K. McIntosh*
- Sustaining Employability at an Early Career Stage: The Role of Context and Individual Agency. *Presented by Ricardo Rodrigues*
- Career Empowerment: A New Perspective on Career Motivation. *Presented by Mirit K. Grabarski*

Minutes 75-90: Integrative discussion with entire audience

It's Not What You Know but Who You Know: Sources of Social Capital That Lead to Managerial Position

Batia Ben-Hador and Eyal Eckhaus

In recent years, the concept of personal control over career development (Chen, 2002) became commonplace (Guest & Rodrigues, 2015). One of the most important tools of personal career development is Social Capital (Bozionelos, 2015). It has an important role in the hiring process, promotion and even salary (Seibert et al., 2001), as well as subjective factors in career success such as satisfaction and sense of accomplishment (Boccuzzo et al., 2016). However, a research gap exists in evaluating the antecedents and mechanisms of the effect of Personal Social Capital on career development (Gibson et al., 2014). This research addresses this research gap by focusing on the effects of personal social capital that derive from sources inside and outside the organization.

The Concept of "Social Capital" refers to the benefits and the profits (i.e., the "capital") gained from social relationships. Putnam (1995) defined Social Capital as "networks, norms, and trust that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives". Mignone and Henley (2009) explained that SC is a property of the social environment that takes the form of a relational resource.

In organizations, Social Capital can be formed on 3 levels (Ben-Hador, 2017): 1) the personal level of each employee (Wingfield, 2014), 2) the intra-organizational level within and between units and work groups (Ben-Hador, 2016) and 3) external Social Capital of the entire organization (Nicholson et al., 2004).

In this study, we focused on the Personal Social Capital level, because that is one of the most important factors that affected promotion to a managerial role (Yu & Junshu, 2013).

Personal Social Capital relates to the individual's connections with others and the benefits derived from these connections (Ben-Hador & Eckhaus, 2018). This is the basic level of Social Capital, and it incorporates all the connections accumulated by each person such as friendships, family ties, acquaintances, and work contacts. Therefore, each employee has his/her own Personal Social Capital that is composed of social ties outside and inside of the organization.

Many benefits are derived from personal Social Capital at work; tangible rewards such as higher salary and financial rewards (Peters & Straungham, 2006), commitment of high-ranking officials and gaining status and power (Metz & Tharenou, 2001), promotion inside and outside of the organizations (Seibert et al., 2001) and career success (Parks-Yancy, 2012); as well as subjective rewards such as a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction from personal career (Boccuzzo et al., 2016). Personal Social Capital is also connected to managerial skills (Lampinen et al., 2015). Typically, managers have more friends inside and out of the organization; they belong to more clubs, societies, etc. (Carroll & Teo, 1996) and therefore their personal agency in career development is better than non-managers.

As was indicated, there are many sources for the personal Social Capital. In this study, we focused on three sources that may impact managerial position.

The first source that we explored is connections with colleagues. Colleagues are an important source of social capital at work (Johnson, 2012), the quality and quantity of collegial relationships has a positive impact on individual subjective well-being and life satisfaction (Aarstad et al., 2010), as well as promoting effective work-related outcomes (Jiang & Hu, 2016). In addition, colleagues have a substantial influence on promotion (Claussen et al., 2014). Therefore, we hypothesized that:

H1 – Personal Social Capital derived from colleagues inside the organization positively affects managerial positions.

The second source of Personal Social Capital that was investigated is connections with people who possess assets such as abundant social ties (Uzzi, 1999), high reputation and tangible assets or wealth, outside or inside the organizations (Ho & Tekleab, 2016). For example, Young (2005) points out that knowing people in key positions, who themselves have an abundance of Social Capital, is important for promotion to a management role. Consequently, the second hypothesis is that:

H2 – Personal Social Capital derived from contacts with people with Social Capital assets positively affects managerial positions.

The third source of Personal Social Capital, outside of the workplace, is connections with neighbors. Kerwin and Kline (2006) note that previous studies of Personal Social Capital have insufficiently emphasized the importance of interaction between the individual and neighbors, although Permentier et al. (2007) found that neighbors are important sources for Personal Social Capital. Moreover, previous studies found that interaction with neighbors reinforces economic success and social capital at work (Lundin et al., 2015) especially for managers (Elder et al., 2012). Therefore, we hypothesized that:

H3 –Personal Social Capital derived from neighbors positively affects managerial positions.

The study included 2230 Israeli respondents, 1795 of which were identified as managers. The Personal Social Capital questionnaire was comprised of the Personal Social Capital Scale (PSCS) by Chen et al. (2009), that was later shortened and refined by Wang et al. (2014) and a few demographic questions. The managerial

position variable is dichotomic, that is, differentiates between those who are managers and those who are not.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) followed by Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) for convergent and discriminant validity were conducted. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was employed for the analysis of the model's goodness-of-fit.

The results confirm that connections with colleagues at work and with people with assets directly affect managerial positions. However, a direct effect of Personal Social Capital derived from connections with neighbors on managerial position was not found. Nevertheless, the relationship between the two variables was found significant through the mediation of age.

The effects of connections with colleagues and with people with assets (such as reputation, wealth, status or broad connections with others) on managerial position are not trivial, and as important the effect of human capital on acceptance and promotion of managers (Dupray, 2001), although many managers and organizations ignore the importance of the social capital factors in career development.

No direct connection was found between neighbors and managerial position probably because neighbors are not directly involved in the work sphere and organizational life. Hence, it is reasonable to assume that another variable mediates the connection between these variables. Lin and Huang (2005) found age as the variable that "translates" human capital into social capital, and Nyqvist et al. (2016) claim that the older the person, the higher his/her sense of belonging to their neighborhood, implicating an age-based mediation connection.

Discussion:

This study attempts to fill the research gap in personal career development and identify the effect of the antecedents of Personal Social Capital on managerial positions.

Organizational behavior scholars have focused on developing a theoretical framework for the complex variable of Social Capital. In this study, we continued refining the Personal Social Capital variable in search of its sources and their influences. It was found that even though Personal Social Capital consists of connections from both inside and outside the organization, the latter connection (e.g., with neighbors) was not direct, but was mediated by manager age - thus, the older the person, the better the connectivity with neighbors and the higher the connections with managerial positions.

Practically, these findings are important for any employee who aspires to become a manager and to any manager who wants to be promoted. Gibson et al. (2014) claimed that creating Personal Social Capital must be goal-oriented. Hence, categorizing and evaluating the factors that impact managerial positions is very important and can assist in personal agency in career development by serving as a roadmap for employees seeking control and promotion to the managerial level.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that Personal Social Capital might have a "dark side". Promotion due to Personal Social Capital rather than human capital can be perceived by others as unfair. Using Personal Social Capital in career development can be attained by several activities, some wholly legitimate, but others can be the result of pushing oneself and political behaviors. The distinction between the perceptions of proper and improper use of Personal Social Capital in personal agency requires further research.

Contextualizing Employability: The Role of Social Capital in Flemish Theater

Jasper Delva, Anneleen Forrier & Nele De Cuyper

Introduction

Social capital is advanced as an important factor in increasing employment chances, commonly coined employability (Forrier & Sels, 2003). Yet, most studies have treated social capital in an agentic way (Forrier, Sels & Stynen, 2009). First, employability scholars suggest that knowing many people increases the individual's chance of employment (e.g. Fugate, Kinicki & Ashforth, 2004). This is built on the idea that social capital has universal value, regardless of the demand in a specific labor market (Dowd & Pinheiro, 2013). Second, employability research has mostly focused on those who have social capital: they are part of a network and associated advantages. Non-members are excluded from these benefits. Employability research has not devoted attention to these outsiders (Smith, 2010). This agentic perspective assumes that everybody has and can utilize their social capital, making employability a matter of individual effort. This may lead to the proverbial blaming-the-victim for those who are less employable (Crisp & Powell, 2017).

In response, our aim is to demonstrate how social capital enables or constrains employability beyond agency. To do so, we draw on the work of Pierre Bourdieu (1977, 1990): practice, as the doings of individual agents to obtain and maintain positions, is understood as the encounter between both structural and agentic elements. We achieve this aim through a qualitative study among theater actors for whom social capital is a critical employability resource.

Bourdieu's theory of practice

Bourdieu (1977) argues that people always act within a specific social space. This is shown in the key concepts of the theory: field, capital and habitus. The concept of *field* refers to this social space. A field is a space of positions in which individual agents try to advance their position relative to others. Practice refers to 'position-takings' (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 105), i.e. what people do to obtain or maintain a position in a field. In those position-takings, individual agents comply with the rules of functioning of a given field (Bourdieu, 1977: 164).

Position-takings are dependent upon the *capital* of individual agents, i.e. the resources available to them. Bourdieu (1986) recognizes four forms: economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital. Economic capital are financial resources, such as wages or any property (e.g., houses, cars, computers, internet access). Cultural capital consists of the skills and knowledge of an individual agent. Social capital refers to the network the individual agent has access to. The fourth form, symbolic capital, is related to the field: it is the portfolio of the other capitals that is socially recognized, legitimate and more valuable to compete for positions in a particular field (Bourdieu, 1977).

Moreover, position-takings are dependent upon individuals' understanding of the rules of a field. This understanding is embedded within their *habitus*, i.e. the system of dispositions that guides the thoughts, perceptions and actions of individual agents and is shaped by the internalization of experiences in the field (Bourdieu, 1977). The habitus gives individuals a sense of which things are done and how they are performed (Bourdieu, 1990). Habitus explains why actions are not the result of subjective intention nor of external structures. The way people think and act in a field is shaped by their history, experiences and trajectory in that field.

Together, this entails that social capital and the way it is used by individuals to obtain and maintain employment is inherently contextual. First, individuals require capital that is considered valuable and legitimate by the field. This is not different for social capital. Secondly, how people use and acquire their capital to get or change a position must be in accordance with the rules of the field. Individuals thus need an understanding of these rules, i.e. *habitus*.

Methodology

We conducted 32 interviews with Flemish theater actors based on a purposive and snowball sampling strategy. We took an interpretative stance rooted in a life history methodology (Jones, 1983). Interviews were in-depth and open-ended in order to allow participants to speak in their own voices and have space to introduce issues they perceive as relevant (Mishler, 1986). They also permitted the development of personal narratives (Cochran, 1990) which enabled interviewees to give valuable context to events.

Data analysis was on-going throughout the project. Initially the authors each took two transcripts and compared codes, agreed on which codes best reflected the data before analyzing two other scripts and comparing again. This iterative process led to a coding template of inductively generated categories (King, 2004). Once a final template had been agreed upon all transcripts were analyzed again.

The field of Flemish theater

The field of Flemish theater is a small field in which most people know each other. Yet, an important shift in the 1980's changed how individuals obtain and maintain employment. Until then, the field of Flemish theater was characterized by

organizations that had a permanent group of theater actors which were recruited through auditions (Janssens & Moreels, 2008). This closed shop, however, meant little artistic freedom for actors who were forced to work in the same constellation for every performance. As such, they started to question this restrictive structure (Vanhaesebroeck, 2012). Along with changes in the subsidies for theaters, this resulted in a more flexible and loosely coupled employment system. Theaters became open structures with project-based modes of production: individual actors are engaged for projects of mostly short periods (Siongers & Van Steendam, 2014), often in the form of contingent employment: temporary, part-time and/or self-employed (Bresseleers, 2012).

This change meant increased job insecurity. Social capital became a key mechanism to secure employment chances in the field of Flemish theater. Theater actors no longer become part of a performance through traditional recruitment systems of auditions (Van Steendam, 2012). As such, they need to know people in order to find and keep a job. Given that everybody knows everybody, one would expect this to be straightforward. Yet, the rules of the field dictate that theater actors need to be asked. This is because asking is seen as begging for employment, something theater actors should never do as they only engage in projects that fit their artistic oeuvre. Said differently, ‘l’art pour l’art’, not for employment. This field-specific way of utilizing one’s social capital has important implications in theater actors’ quest for employment.

Findings

Our results show that social capital is an important feature in obtaining and maintaining of employment in the field of Flemish theater. Yet, they also indicate that

it is not simply networking. How theater actors use their social capital for employability purposes depends on their position in the field, resulting in polarization: successful actors get more successful while unsuccessful actors struggle to remain in the field.

The ability of theater actors to use their social capital is governed by their position within the field. This position is determined by their cultural capital, i.e. being a good actor, and visibility within the field and results from their understanding of the rules to acquire symbolic capital embedded in their habitus. Being a ‘good’ theater actor entails being considered artistically relevant by peers. This is achieved by developing the right habitus through learning the relevant artistic questions. Visibility implies being in the mind of peers. This visibility is acquired by being on stage. Yet, these projects need to be artistically valuable and legitimate. As such, theater actors must learn which choices to make. Together, these two dimensions segregate theater actors in strong and weak positions.

This position consequently regulates whether theater actors can develop position-takings in which they utilize their social capital in a way that corresponds with the rules of the field. These rules dictate that theater actors should be asked to join a new project. They thus need connections to find and keep employment but cannot actively use them. But only those in a strong position are being asked. So, those in a weak position have to act against the rules of the field and actively seek for collaborations. Although this is often frowned upon by their peers, for example in not responding to calls or emails or even no longer considering them, it is the only way for these theater actors to force their way into employment.

This reveals a polarizing effect within the field of Flemish theater. On the one hand, theater actors in a strong position, are asked for many different projects by

many different people. This, in turn, allows them to remain artistically relevant and visible within the field and brings forward more and more employment opportunities. They are in a gain cycle (Hobfoll, 2011). On the other hand, theater actors in a weak position are forced to position-takings that negatively affect their future employment opportunities. As such, they find themselves in a loss cycle (Hobfoll, 2011), even to the point where they are forced to leave the field and change careers. Our results thus highlight a dark side of employability.

Conclusion

The overly agentic perspective on the role of social capital in today's research does not do justice to the complexity of employability. Rather, our study reveals that the role of social capital in employability is inherently contextual. Social capital does indeed enable employment opportunities but only if the individual is in a position where he or she can utilize it in accordance with the rules of the social space in which it is used. If this is not the case, the individual finds him- or herself constrained in obtaining and maintaining employment, thus revealing the dark side of employability.

Social Class and Careers: The Roles of Preferences, Perceptions and Reality in Shaping Career Choice

Cheryl K. McIntosh

Ample research in the social sciences demonstrates that social class is transmitted inter-generationally (Bourdieu, 1996; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Chetty, Hendren, Kline, Saez & Turner, 2014; Doob, 2013). Although social class may be defined in several ways, one key factor is career prestige. Although the literature assumes that people are free to select any career path, the entrenched nature of social class inheritance suggests limitations on career choice. This qualitative study explores the relationship between social class of origin and career choice. Semi-structured interviews are conducted with twenty participants raised in upper, middle, and lower class households to discuss how their ideal career aspirations compare to their actual career choices. Participants reflect on the reasons for their career choices. The sample includes Black and White men and women spanning four generations in the U.S. The study identifies themes related to the way that participants chose their careers, including personal interests, perceived abilities, and income considerations. How these themes differed between participants based on social class of origin is discussed. This study draws on both the perceptions of the participants and the literature on career choice to discuss the potential role of social class in shaping career choices.

With rising income inequality in the United States (Glassman, 2016), limited social mobility (Chetty et al., 2014), increased outsourcing of jobs, and rapid changes in technology shifting the employment landscape, career choices are more important than ever. Perceived career opportunities and navigation through the available options

determines whether career experiences lead to positive outcomes like motivation, performance, and satisfaction.

A key underlying assumption of research on career choice to date is that individuals have – and believe that they have - complete agency to shape their career paths. The protean career construct assumes that people have a wide degree of flexibility to make career choices (Briscoe & Hall, 2006; De Vos & Soens, 2008; Hall, 2004). Another modern approach, the boundaryless career construct, describes careers that are based on personal interests and shaped by the individual rather than organizations (Inkson, 2006; Sullivan, 1999; Sullivan, Cardon & Martin, 1998). Outside of the protean and boundaryless career research domains, research on careers focus mainly on the career ambitions and outcomes of college students and college-educated professionals. Non-college educated adults, including blue-collar workers, are underrepresented and rarely studied exclusively (Hennequin, 2007).

White and blue-collar careers, and the occupations that comprise them (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Schein, 1996), differ among and between each other in prestige. Career prestige is the level of respect associated with a career (Hauser & Warren, 1997), and by extension, those who occupy them. Career prestige is a subjective measure, based on perceptions that people have about careers (Nako & Treas, 1990). While some careers may be higher in prestige relative to social class, most correlate with it significantly (Hauser & Warren, 1997).

Research shows that people tend to choose careers that are similar in prestige to their parents' careers (Gottfredson, 2005). While this may relate to the finding that social class is transmitted from one generation to the next (Bourdieu, 1996; Chetty et al, 2014; Doob, 2013), it does not explain why. Several factors found in previous studies on careers may explain this continuity.

Personal preferences and interests factor into career choices (Ackerman & Beier, 2003; Wheeler & Mahoney, 1981). Perceived abilities also play a role in career choices (Barak, 1981; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). Preferences, interests, and abilities may be influenced by family background. While these are all valid contributors to career choice, financial considerations are overlooked as a key driver. People raised in lower social class households may make career decisions differently from others, based on financial needs (Rodrigues, 2013; Kohn, 1989). Differences in social class may be associated with different career choice considerations.

This study explores these proposed differences by conducting semi-structured interviews of twenty participants raised in lower, middle, and upper-class households. Eleven participants were raised in lower, seven in middle and two in upper class households. All were asked why they chose their careers.

Among lower social class respondents, financial constraints and limited opportunities were cited by nine of the eleven participants as key drivers of career choice. Half also considered factors like personal interests and perceived abilities. All of the participants raised in middle and upper-class households cited personal interests and perceived abilities as the factors driving career choice, which aligns with the findings of previous research. Only one of the participants raised in a middle-class household mentioned financial constraints as a factor in career choice. Neither of the participants from upper class households mentioned it. Respondents raised in upper class families described the most latitude in career decision making. These respondents reported substantial thought and planning related to career options that best fit them.

The study finds that people from lower social class backgrounds perceive their career choice agency is limited by their financial position. Participants from

lower social class backgrounds report selecting careers based on those that are readily available in their environments, in contrast to the participants from upper class backgrounds who report seeking careers that are personally fulfilling. The results support the existing research on career choice while suggesting that social class may moderate the relationship between factors like personal preferences, perceived abilities, income needs, and career choice.

This study underscores the need to research the career choice factors of adults raised in lower class families. Given their lower representation in college and professional careers, this implies a need to include understudied groups, such as blue-collar workers and non-professional white-collar workers. A greater understanding of the factors that people from lower social class backgrounds consider in career choice decision making would enable organizations and policy makers to develop programs that make career options more protean and boundaryless for everyone.

Sustaining Employability at an Early Career Stage: The Role of Context and Individual Agency

Ricardo Rodrigues and Christina L. Butler

Introduction


There have been recent calls for a new lens to capture the factors influencing the sustainability of contemporary careers in a context of high uncertainty and unpredictability (Van Der Heijden & De Vos, 2015). The perspective on sustainable careers aims to develop a holistic view of how individuals “remain healthy, productive, happy and employable” (De Hauw & Greenhaus, 2015: 224) across the lifespan by considering the interaction between their individual career preferences and agency and the contexts within which careers unfold. These contexts – what Van Der Heijden and De Vos (2015) describe as “social spaces” include, inter alia, the supply and demand for skills in the labour market, the role of organizational policies and practices in facilitating sustainable career development, and the interface between work and personal and family life.

In this paper we define a sustainable career as one where people find a healthy and desired balance between the individual resources they possess to pursue their career values and goals and the contextual demands required to craft such career pathways. One of the key resources highlighted in the literature on sustainable careers is employability (Van Der Heijden & De Vos, 2015). In a context of high uncertainty, career success is largely dependent on individuals’ ability to mobilize their social and human capital in order to remain employable and ensure continued access to desired career opportunities. We therefore propose and test features of a model of sustainable

careers by discussing and empirically exploring a range of factors that shape perceived employability over time.

Our model, depicted in figure 1, builds on Van Der Heijden and De Vos's (2015) call to investigate career sustainability at the interaction between the elements of time, social space, agency and meaning. First, we consider the element of time by following a cohort of graduates from the final year at university into the first two years of their careers. We chose to focus on individuals at an early career stage as this is a time when people “make many important career decisions (...) that are likely to have major consequences in their lives” (Akkermans, Brenninkmeijer, Blonk & Koppes, 2009: 672) including in the sustainability of their careers. Second, we take account of role of context and propose that a successful transition into the labour market (transition into employment rather than unemployment) and the organizational context in which individuals initiate their careers, captured by perceived organizational support and job quality (perceptions of overqualification) shape continued confidence in one's employability. Finally, we explore the role of individual agency. The case for sustainable careers acknowledges that contemporary careers are “more independent from organizations than they used to be in times of more predictability” (Van Der Heijden & De Vos, 2015: 4) and, as a result, they are increasingly driven by internal career orientations and idiosyncratic notions of career success. We argue that agency and meaning, reflected in protean and boundaryless career orientations, are positively associated with sustained perceptions of employability.

Figure 1. Model of Sustainable Employability



Sample and procedure

We followed a cohort of undergraduate students at a London-based university who were surveyed yearly between 2015 and 2017. 3398 final year undergraduate students across faculties were invited to participate in the study and to complete an online survey in March 2015, shortly before they graduated. 796 students completed the first wave of the study (23.4%). The mean age of respondents was 24.4 years. 51.4% were men, 64.6% were white. Respondents were asked to complete a follow-up questionnaire in June 2016, approximately one year after completing their degrees. 400 participated in this second wave (50.2%). Mean age was 26.2 years, 61.8% were men and 73% were white. Finally, all participants in the first wave of the study were invited to complete another follow-up questionnaire seeking to capture their most recent career experiences in May 2017, approximately two years after completing their degrees. 429 respondents (54%) completed this third-wave questionnaire.

Preliminary Findings

Our findings broadly support the role of context and agency in shaping perceived employability over time. Transitioning from university into employment is very important for graduates at the beginning of their careers. Our findings confirmed that those in employment one year after graduation reported higher confidence in their employability (see table 1). Evidence also indicated that finding a job minimizes the differences in perceptions of employability between those who felt more employable while at university when compared with those who felt less confident in their ability to find a job. By the same token, experiencing unemployment particularly affected the confidence of those who previously reported low levels of perceived employability.

We also explored how factors at the organizational level affect the sustainability of employability over time. Our findings indicated that POS was not significantly

associated with employability at time 3 (see table 2). However, it was important in sustaining confidence in employability among those who felt highly employable before transitioning into the labour market. In contrast, POS did not seem to have a positive effect in stimulating employability among those who had low confidence in their ability to find a job.

The second organizational factor we explored was job quality reflected in perceived over-qualification and, by implication, poor job quality for well-qualified graduates. Our findings showed that while over-qualification was negatively associated with perceived employability, feeling over-qualified seemed to increase confidence in employability among those who were more confident in their employability to start with (see table 3). These findings were unexpected.

Finally, at the individual level we explored the role of agency in sustaining employability. Our findings indicated that a protean career orientation, though not a boundaryless career orientation, mediated the link between perceived employability at times 1 and 3 (see table 4). This suggests, as expected, that career proactivity is important in sustaining one's employability but that at this early stage of a career it is manifested in active career development rather than inter-organizational mobility.

Table 1 – Hierarchical regression of perceived employability at time 1 and employment status at time 2 on perceived employability at time 3

Perceived Employability T3				
	B	p	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	1.0077	.1131	-.2410	2.2564
Employment Status T2	2.2074	.0004	1.0027	3.4122
Perceived Employability T1	.7672	.0000	.5552	.9793
Int. P. Employability T1 X Employment Status T2	-.5290	.0033	-.8794	-.1785
Ethnicity (1= BAME)	-.0653	.6392	-.3397	.2091
Gender (1 = Women)	-.0462	.6874	-.2722	.1798
Degree Classification	-.0127	.8865	-.1880	.1626
Age	-.0331	.0226	-.0616	-.0047
R²	.4294***			
R² change due to interaction	.0261**			

Note:***p<.00; **p < .01; *p < .05.

Table 2 – Hierarchical regression of perceived employability at time 1 and POS at time 2 on perceived employability at time 3

Perceived Employability T3				
	B	p	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	5.2731	.0136	1.1189	9.4272
POS T2	-1.0923	.0553	-2.2102	.0256
Perceived Employability T1	-1.4287	.0237	-2.6607	-.1967
Int. P. Employability T1 X POS T2	.4362	.0143	.0902	.7823
Ethnicity (1= BAME)	-.4023	.0429	-.7914	-.0132
Gender (1 = Women)	.1709	.3179	-.1680	.5098
Degree Classification	-.0445	.6866	-.2635	.1745
Age	.0675	.0140	.0141	.1209
R²	.2415**			
R² change due to interaction	.0706**			

Note:***p<.00; **p < .01; *p < .05.

Table 3 – Hierarchical regression of perceived employability at time 1 and perceived over-qualification at time 2 on perceived employability at time 3

Perceived Employability T3				
	B	p	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	5.0079	.0045	1.6065	8.4093
Over-qualification T2	-1.3059	.0064	-2.2318	-.3800
Perceived Employability T1	-1.4853	.0061	-2.5339	-.4368
Int. P. Employability T1 X over-qualification T2	.4568	.0016	.1786	.7349
Ethnicity (1= BAME)	-.0049	.9789	-.3761	.3662
Gender (1 = Women)	.0421	.7982	-.2849	.3690
Degree Classification	.0523	.6429	-.1716	.2762
Age	.0906	.0021	.0340	.1473
R²	.2637**			
R² change due to interaction	.1112**			

Note:***p<.00; **p < .01; *p < .05.

Table 4 – Hierarchical regression of perceived employability at time 1 protean and boundaryless career orientations at time 2 on perceived employability at time 3

Perceived Employability T3				
	B	p	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	.6162	.5249	-1.2992	2.5317
Boundaryless Career Orientation T2	-.1136	.2743	-.3184	.0913
Protean Career Orientation T2	.3142	.0061	.0915	.5369
Perceived Employability T1	.3193	.0092	.0808	.5578
Ethnicity (1= BAME)	.1174	.4848	-.2147	.4495
Gender (1 = Women)	.2608	.0876	-.0391	.5607
Degree Classification	-.0531	.5622	-.2340	.1279
Age	.0253	.3102	-.0239	.0746
Indirect effect of Employability T1 on employability T3	B	Boot SE	Boot LLCI	Boot ULCI
Total Indirect Effect	.1770	.0904	.0195	.3873
Boundaryless Career Orientation T2	.0627	.0725	-.0652	.2219
Protean Career Orientation T2	.1143	.0599	.0170	.2588

Note:***p<.00; **p < .01; *p < .05.

Career Empowerment: A New Perspective on Career Motivation

Mirit K. Grabarski and Maria Mouratidou

Introduction

Career motivation was previously defined by London (1983:620) as “the set of individual characteristics and associated career decisions and behaviors that reflect the person's career identity, insight into factors affecting his or her career, and resilience in the face of unfavorable career conditions”. However, research on career motivation as conceptualized by London (1983,1993) has not developed substantially in the last two decades, and recent views on career resilience suggest that this construct is separate from career motivation (Lyons, Schweitzer & Ng, 2015; Mishra & McDonald, 2017), thus questioning the construct validity of the concept. Having said that, the concept of career motivation can still be relevant, given the role of motivation in proactive behaviors. Here we suggest reviving the conversation on this promising topic with an alternative approach, based on the concept of psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995) which has produced a strong body of research in the field of organizational behavior and can be applied to develop career theory. The proposed application of psychological empowerment in the career domain aims to re-open and advance the discussion of motivation in careers, using the lens of individual agency and control.

The idea of psychological empowerment (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) refers to a “motivational construct manifested in four cognitions: meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact that...together reflect an active orientation of the employees to their work role” (Spreitzer, 1995:1444). In this framework, individual cognitions of one’s control

embody motivation which is then manifested in proactive behaviors in regard to a specific job. Based on this concept, career empowerment, defined here as the cognition of one's control over their career, is a mindset that embodies individuals' motivation for future action. Within this suggested framework, a person that feels in control of his or her career is more likely to be proactive, to take steps to pursue career goals and to initiate changes. On the other hand, a person that feels powerless in regard to his or her career is less likely to act, and any career related steps are likely to be reactive to the environment (for example following a layoff).

The current study is the first stage in a multi-study research program which aims to define and validate the construct of career empowerment, to explore its potential antecedents and to predict a wide range of career behaviors. The main goal of this study was to elicit factors that can represent the facets of the proposed construct named career empowerment. While the construct of psychological empowerment consists of four components, namely competence, meaning, self-determination and impact, it is applicable to specific job tasks, however, since the career empowerment concept applies to people who may or may not be employed at any time point, different and/or additional factors may emerge. A qualitative study based on interviews with people in different career stages from various backgrounds was intended to understand their sense of control over their career choices and serve as the basis for the next studies, by providing examples that can guide the item development for the proposed measure.

While conducting the interviews, it was important to keep in mind that in addition to the assumption that individuals take an active role in their career development, most of the existing career theories (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Hall, 1996; Savickas, 2002, 2005; Sullivan & Mainiero, 2007; Super, 1990) were written

with white-collar workers in mind. Hence, the application of these theories is often limited, as people who are not managers or knowledge workers, or those are limited by additional factors: refugees, immigrants, people with disabilities and more, were not included in their development. These groups, that have less access to continuous development, might experience needs for survival and security, and are often marginalized by theories that emphasize the desire for self-fulfillment and psychological outcomes in career-related decisions (Blustein, 2001). For the current study, a special effort was made to increase the inclusiveness of the theory by ensuring strategic sampling.

Methodology

The study was based on semi-structured interviews that allowed the participants to express their perceptions of the control they had over their careers and the factors that contributed to it and/or inhibited it. As the study is still in progress, the target is to reach 30 participants, data collection and analysis still continue; the current report is based on interim analysis of 15 interviews. This sub-sample consisted of 5 males and 10 females, mean age= 45, from various occupational backgrounds, including blue-collar, service and managerial occupations, from early career stages to retired and unemployed. Participants were recruited using the snowball method, strategic sampling was meant to ensure variety in terms of employment status and occupations. Using an open-ended question format, the participants were asked about their career experiences, their sense of control over their career and potential career enablers/ inhibitors. The interviews were audiotaped with the respondent's permission and later transcribed.

Data analysis was performed independently by two coders, following the Braun & Clarke (2006) guidelines: getting familiar with the data (initial reading);

generating initial codes; searching for themes; reviewing the themes, and finally, defining and naming the themes. Since the newly proposed construct was based on previous theory, the names for the themes follow the dimensions of psychological empowerment where applicable, however the initial coding and aggregation into themes were data-driven rather than theory-driven since the second rater was not familiar with the theory in order to minimize bias.

Preliminary Findings

The interviewees discussed their perception regarding their control over their career, when most people assumed some extent of control, usually not full. In some stories, control was taken after years in an undesirable career, due to what the participants called “lack of focus” or sometimes lack of courage. In a few cases, participants admitted being uncomfortable with the need to make career decisions by themselves and let the circumstances or other people to drive the process.

In regard to factors that may empower or disempower the individual throughout career decision, the data analysis yielded six main themes. Three of the themes, namely competence, meaning and impact, were similar to the dimensions of psychological empowerment. First, the participants expressed a desire to do something important, make an impact on the world, to lead changes and witness those changes. In terms of meaning, the participants mentioned that it is important to them that their career will be congruent with their personal values and interests, rather than satisfy social expectations. In addition, they sometimes referred to calling, or intuition, as guiding their vocational choices. Regarding competence, participants indicated relying on their abilities and skills for career advancement - doing what they know and what they are good at. Yet, an interesting aspect of competence was that

sometimes the existing skills held people back from doing what they really want, serving as disempowering factors, being described in terms of “sunk costs”.

An interesting finding that differentiates career empowerment from psychological empowerment is weak support for the fourth dimension - self-determination. Instead, a different prominent theme has emerged, which is the participants’ desire for constant challenges, learning, growth and development. Another theme that was not a part of psychological empowerment but was very salient in the career context is relations - with colleagues and clients but also with family members. Sometimes these relations empowered the individual in their career journey, by introducing to opportunities, or providing advice and emotional support. However, in some cases relationships appeared to be a disempowering factor, when the desire to make another person happy conflicted with personal meaning and desires, and constrained agentic career choices. Finally, an important theme that was mentioned by the participants was money, or financial security. While some career choices were driven by the need to make money, in order to provide for the family, or save for retirement, achieving financial stability allowed to exercise control and take more career risks.

Discussion

Overall, the interviewees shared both experiences of feeling empowered and powerless in different stages of their careers. While the analysis was data-driven, three of the most prominent themes mapped onto the factors that form psychological empowerment, providing support to the idea that the psychological empowerment concept can be applied to the domain of careers. Interestingly, the analysis also yielded three themes that are beyond the scope of psychological empowerment, calling for more attention to the way career empowerment should be conceptualized.

REFERENCES

- Aarstad, J., Haugland, S. A., & Greve, A. 2010. Performance spillover effects in entrepreneurial networks: assessing a dyadic theory of social capital. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34:1003-1020.
- Ackerman, P. L. & Beier, M. E. 2003. Intelligence, personality, and interests in the career choice process. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 11(2): 205-218.
- Akkermans, J., Brenninkmeijer, V., Blonk, R. W., & Koppes, L. L. 2009. Fresh and healthy? Well-being, health and performance of young employees with intermediate education. *Career Development International*, 14: 671-699.
- Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. 1996. *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- Bell, N. E., & Staw, B. M. 1989. People as sculptors versus sculpture: The roles of personality and personal control in organizations. In M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of career theory*: 232-251. New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press.
- Ben-Hador, B. 2016. How intra organizational social capital influences employee performance? *Journal of Management Development*, 35:1119-1133.
- Ben-Hador, B. 2017. Three levels of organizational social capital and their connection to performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 36:348-360.
- Ben-Hador, B., & Eckhaus, E. 2018 Impact of personal and intra-organizational social capital: The case of Enron. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 21(1): 28-47.
- Blustein, D. L. 2001. Extending the reach of vocational psychology: Toward an inclusive and integrative psychology of working. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(2): 171-182.
- Boccuzzo, G., Fabbris, L., & Paccagnella, O. 2016. Job-major match and job satisfaction in Italy. *International Journal of Manpower*, 37: 135-156.
- Bourdieu, P. 1996. Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In R. Brown (Ed.) *Knowledge, education, and cultural change*: 71-112. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bourdieu, P. 1986. The forms of capital. In Richardson, J.G. (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*: 241-258. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. 1990. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (Vol. 4; R. Nice, Trans.). London: Sage
- Bozionelos, N. 2015. Social capital and careers: Indisputable evidence and note for caution. In A. De Vos & B. I. J. M. Van der Heijden (Eds.), *Handbook of research on sustainable careers* :67-82. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2):77-101.
- Bresseleers, M. 2012. The job of a lifetime? Careers in subsidised arts organisations 2008-2010. In Flanders Arts Institute, *Artist: perspective – the position of individual artists in the performing arts in Flanders*: 65-80. Brussels: Flanders Arts Institute.
- Briscoe, J. P., & Hall, D. T. 2006. The interplay of boundaryless and protean careers: Combinations and implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69: 4-18.
- Carroll, G. R., & Teo, A. C. 1996. On the social networks of managers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39:421-441
- Chen, C. P. 2002. Integrating action theory and human agency in career development. *Canadian Journal of Counselling*, 36:121-35.
- Chetty, R., Hendren, N., Kline, P., Saez, E., & Turner, N. 2014. Is the United States still a land of opportunity? Recent trends in intergenerational mobility. *American Economic Review*, 104(5):141-47.
- Clarke, M. & Patrickson, M. 2008. The new covenant of employability. *Employee Relations*, 30: 121-41.
- Claussen, J., Grohsjean, T., Luger, J., & Probst, G. 2014). Talent management and career development: What it takes to get promoted. *Journal of World Business*, 49: 236-244.
- Cochran, L. R. 1990. Narrative as a paradigm for career research. In Young, R.A. & W.A. Borgen (Eds.), *Methodological approaches to the study of career*: 85-10. New York: Praeger.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. 1988. The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13: 471-482.

- Crisp, R. & Powell, R. 2016. Young people and UK labour market policy: A critique of 'employability' as tool for understanding youth unemployment. *Urban Studies*, 54: 1784-1807.
- De Hauw, S., & Greenhaus, J. 2015. Building a sustainable career: the role of work-home balance in career decision making. In A. De Vos & B. Van der Heijden (Eds.), *Handbook of research on sustainable careers*: 223-238. Cheltenham, UK/ Northampton, MA, USA: Edgar Elgar.
- De Vos, A., & Soens, N. 2008. Protean attitude and career success: The mediating role of self-management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73: 449-456.
- Doob, C. B. 2013. *Social inequality and social stratification in US society*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dowd, T.J. & Pinheiro, D.L. 2013. The ties among the notes: The social capital of jazz musicians in three metro areas. *Work and Occupations*, 40: 431-464.
- Dupray, A. 2001. The signalling power of education by size of firm and the long-term effects on workers' careers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 22: 13-38.
- Elder, S.D., Zerriffi, H. & Le Billon, P. 2012. Effects of fair trade certification on social capital: The case of Rwandan coffee producers. *World Development*, 40: 2355- 2367.
- Forrier, A. & Sels, L. (2003). The concept employability: a complex mosaic. *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management*, 3: 102-124.
- Forrier, A., Sels, L. & Stynen, D. 2009. Career mobility at the intersection between agency and structure: A conceptual model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82: 739-759.
- Fugate, M., Kinicki, A.J. & Ashforth, B.E. 2004. Employability: a psycho-social construct, its dimensions and applications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65: 14-38.
- Gibson, C., Hardy, J. H., III and Buckley, M.R. 2014. Understanding the role of networking in organizations. *Career Development International*, 19, 146-161.
- Glassman, B. 2016. *Income inequality over time: How choice of a metric matters*. US Census Bureau Working Paper. <https://www.census.gov/library/working-papers/2016/demo/SEHSD-WP2016-24.html>. Retrieved on 1/4/2019.
- Guest, D. E., & Rodrigues, R. 2015. Career control. In A. De Vos & B. I. J. M. Van der Heijden (Eds.), *Handbook of research on sustainable careers* : 205-222. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing
- Hall, D. T. 1996. Protean careers of the 21st century. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 10(4), 8-16.

- Hall, D. T. 2004. The protean career: A quarter-century journey. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65: 1-13.
- Hauser, R. M., & Warren, J. R. 1997. Socioeconomic indexes for occupations: A review, update, and critique. *Sociological Methodology*, 27: 177-298.
- Hennequin, E. 2007. What “career success” means to blue-collar workers. *Career Development International*, 12: 565-581.
- Ho, V.T., & Tekleab, A.G. 2016. A model of idiosyncratic deal-making and attitudinal outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31: 642-656.
- Hobfoll, S. 2011. Conservation of resource caravans and engaged settings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84: 116-124.
- Inkson, K. 2004. Images of career: Nine key metaphors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65: 96-111.
- Inkson, K. 2006. Protean and boundaryless careers as metaphors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69: 48-63.
- Janssens, J. & Moreels, D. 2008. *Survival in de podiumjungle* [Survival in the performancejungle]. Brussels: Flanders Arts Institute.
- Jiang, Z., & Hu, X. 2016. Knowledge sharing and life satisfaction: The roles of colleague relationships and gender. *Social Indicators Research*, 126: 379-394.
- Johnson, W. 2012. Never underestimate the value of connections: social capital's strength lies in expertise, reciprocity, and relevance. *Journal of Staff Development*, 33(1): 38-41.
- Jones, G. 1983. Life history method. In Morgan, G. (Ed.), *Beyond method: strategies for social research*: 147-158. Beverley Hills: Sage.
- Kerwin, K.C., & Kline, P. 2006. Relational costs and the production of social capital: Evidence from carpooling. *The Economic Journal*, 116: 581-604.
- King, N. 2004. Using templates in the thematic analysis of texts. In Cassell, C. & Symon, G. (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods*: 11-22. London: Sage.
- Kohn, M. 1989. *Class and conformity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lampinen, M., Viitanen, E.A., & Konu, A.I. 2015. Sense of community and job satisfaction among social and health care managers. *Leadership in Health Services*, 28: 228-244.

- Larson, M., & Luthans, F. 2006. Potential added value of psychological capital in predicting work attitudes. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 13(1), 45-62.
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. 1994. Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 45: 79-122.
- Lin, S. C., & Huang, Y. M. 2005. The role of social capital in the relationship between human capital and career mobility: Moderator or mediator? *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 6: 191-205.
- London, M. 1983. Toward a theory of career motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 8:620-630.
- London, M. 1993. Relationships between career motivation, empowerment and support for career development. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66(1), 55-69.
- Lundin, M., Oberg, P., & Josefsson, C. 2015. Learning from success: Are successful governments role models? *Public Administration*, 93:733-752.
- Lyons, S. T., Schweitzer, L., & Ng, E. S. 2015. Resilience in the modern career. *Career Development International*, 20: 363-383.
- Metz, I., & Tharenou, P. 2001. Women's career advancement: The relative contribution of human and social capital. *Group & Organization Management*, 26: 312-342.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. 1993. Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78:538-551.
- Mignone, J., & Henley, H. 2009. Impact of information and communication technology on social capital in aboriginal communities in Canada. *Journal of Information, Information Technology, and Organizations*, 4: 127-145.
- Mishler, E. 1986. *Research interviewing: context and narrative*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mishra, P., & McDonald, K. 2017. Career resilience: An integrated review of the empirical literature. *Human Resource Development Review*, 16: 207-234.
- Nako, K. & Treas, J. 1990. *Computing 1989 occupational prestige scores* (GSS Methodological Report No. 70). Retrieved from <http://gss.norc.umd.edu/Documents/reports/methodological-reports/MR070.pdf>.
- Nicholson, G. J., Alexander, M., & Kiel, G. C. 2004. Defining the social capital of the board of directors: An exploratory study. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 10(1): 54-57.

- Nyqvist, F., Victor, C.R., Forsman, A.K. & Cattán, M. 2016. The association between social capital and loneliness in different age groups: a population-based study in Western Finland. *BMC Public Health*, 16(542): 1-8.
- Parks-Yancy, R. 2012. Interactions into opportunities: Career management for low-income, first-generation African American college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 53: 510-523.
- Permentier, M., Maarten, V.H., & Bolt, G. 2007. Behavioral responses to neighborhood reputations. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 22: 199-213.
- Peters, B.L., & Straungham, E. 2006. No booze? Why lose? Why drinkers earn more money than nondrinkers, *Journal of Labor Research*, 27: 411-428.
- Putnam, R.D. 1995. Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. *Political Science & Politics*, 28:664-683.
- Rodrigues, R. Guest, D. & Budjanovcanin, A. 2013. From anchors to orientations: Towards a contemporary theory of career preferences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83: 142-152.
- Savickas, M. L. 2002. Career construction: A developmental theory of vocational behavior. In D. Brown (Ed.), *Career choice and development*, 4th ed.: 149–205. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Savickas, M. L. 2005. The theory and practice of career construction. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career development and counselling: Putting theory and research to work*:42–70. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Schein, E. 1996. Career anchors revisited: Implications for career development in the 21st century. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 10(4): 80–88.
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden, R. C. 2001. A social capital theory of career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 219-237.
- Siongers, J. & Van Steen, A. 2014. *Acteurs in de spotlight: een onderzoek naar de inkomens en sociaaleconomische positie van professionele Vlaamse acteurs* [Actors in the spotlight: An inquiry on the incomes and social-economic position of professional Flemish actors], accessed November 11, 2018, from <https://www.vlaanderen.be/nl/publicaties/detail/acteurs-in-de-spotlight>.
- Smith, V. 2010. Enhancing employability: Human, cultural, and social capital in an era of turbulent unpredictability. *Human Relations*, 63: 279-300.
- Spreitzer, G. M. 1995. Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 1442-1465.

- Sullivan, S. E. 1999. The changing nature of careers: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 25: 457-484.
- Sullivan, S. E., & Mainiero, L. A. 2007. The changing nature of gender roles, alpha/beta careers and work-life issues: Theory-driven implications for human resource management. *Career Development International*, 12: 238-263.
- Sullivan, S. E., Carden, W. A., & Martin, D. F. 1998. Careers in the next millennium: Directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 8(2), 165-185.
- Super, D. E. 1990. A life-span, life-space approach to career development. In: D. Brown & L. Brooks (Eds.) *Career choice and development: Applying contemporary theories to practice*, 2nd ed.:197-261. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Tams, S., & Arthur, M. B. 2010. New directions for boundaryless careers: Agency and interdependence in a changing world. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31: 629-646.
- Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. 1990. Cognitive elements of empowerment: An “interpretive” model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15: 666-681.
- Uzzi, B. 1999. Embeddedness in the making of financial capital: How social relations and networks benefit firms seeking financing. *American Sociological Review*, 64: 481-505.
- Van der Heijden, B., & De Vos, A. 2015. Sustainable careers: Introductory chapter. In A. De Vos & B. Van der Heijden (Eds.), *Handbook of research on sustainable careers*:1-19. Cheltenham, UK/ Northampton, MA, USA: Edgar Elgar.
- Van Steendam, L. 2012. Protheus, or the new career myth for actors. In Flanders Arts Institute, *Artist: perspective – the position of individual artists in the performing arts in Flanders*: 81-96. Brussels: Flanders Arts Institute.
- Vanhaesebroeck, K. 2012. Give me a Greek, and I will play a Doric column: The theater-maker as intangible worker. In Flanders Arts Institute, *Artist: perspective – the position of individual artists in the performing arts in Flanders*: 11-25. Brussels: Flanders Arts Institute.
- Wang, P., Chen, X., Gong, J. & Jacques-tiura, A. 2014. Reliability and validity of the personal social capital scale 16 and personal social capital scale 8: Two short instruments for survey studies. *Social Indicators Research*, 119:1133-1148.
- Wheeler, K. G. & Mahoney, T. A. 1981. The expectancy model in the analysis of occupational preference and occupational choice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 19: 113-122.

- Wingfield, A. H. 2014. Crossing the color line: Black professional men's development of interracial social networks. *Societies*, 4:240-255.
- Young, C. 2005. Top management teams' social capital in Taiwan: The impact on firm value in an emerging economy. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 6(2): 177-190.
- Yu, C., & Junshu, D. 2013. A literature review of the effects of social capital from the personal network perspective. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(12): 251-259.