Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

The Career Perceptions of Educational Psychology Students and Professionals

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Educational Psychology

at Massey University, Albany,

New Zealand

Jacqueline N. Seymour

2016

Abstract

Contemporary career literature indicates that careers are becoming less traditional. Two new careers concepts are that of the boundaryless and protean career orientations. Career adaptability is also essential for individuals to maintain personal flexibility and the ability to cope. The current study used an online survey to investigate whether or not these new concepts of career applied to educational psychology students and practicing educational psychologists. Quantitative results from the survey indicated that both students and professionals held boundaryless and protean attitudes. Late-career psychologists and psychologists working outside the Ministry of Education held more boundaryless attitudes. A high degree of career adaptability was also found, especially in terms of career agency, and with students reporting higher levels of perceived support than did professionals. Quantitative data from the survey were consistent with these findings. Overall, it appeared that participants combined contemporary career attitudes with aspects of the traditional career. They understood the hierarchical opportunities available to them but also favoured innovative new endeavours.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to my thesis supervisor, Professor Tom Nicholson, and my second supervisor, Terence Edwards, for their advice and contribution toward this study. I would like to express my gratitude to the students and psychologists who participated in the study, without whom this research would not have been possible. I am also grateful for the support of my family and friends, who have made it possible for me to go on this journey.

Table of Contents

Abstract……ii

Acknowledgements……iii

Contents page……iv

List of tables……vii

List of appendices……viii

Chapter 1 - Introduction……1

Focus and rationale for the study……1

Changing theories of nature and career……1

The boundaryless career……2

The protean career……3

Career adaptability……3

The nature of the present study……4

Chapter 2 - Literature review……6

A new kind of contract……7

New definitions of the world of work……8

The boundaryless career……9

The protean career……12

Similarities between protean and boundaryless career orientations……15

Career adaptability……16

New Zealand context……17

Career research on students and psychologists……19

The value of the present study……19

Research questions……19

Chapter 3 – Constructs……21

The measure of boundaryless and protean career attitudes……21

The measure of career adaptability……24

Chapter 4 – Methodology……27

Participants……27

Selection of research method……29

Measures……30

Qualitative questions……34

Ethics approval, recruitment, and informed consent……34

Procedure……35

Data analysis method……36

Summary of methodology……37

Chapter 5 – Results……38

Research question 1……38

Research question 2……42

Qualitative data……45

Career plans……50

Summary of results……52

Chapter 6 – Discussion……53

Research question 1……54

Research question 2……63

Limitations……66

Future research……67

Conclusions……68

References……71

Appendices……81

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Protean and boundaryless career combinations……..…22

2. Student and psychologist numbers……..27

3. University of attendance for students……28

4. Place of employment for psychologists……...28

5. Years of employment for psychologists……28

6. Protean and boundaryless career scale items……..32

7. Career adaptability scale items……33

8. Student and psychologist scores for boundaryless and protean attitudes……39

9. Boundaryless and protean scores compared by psychologists' workplace……39

10. Boundaryless and protean scores compared by length of time as a psychologist…...40

11. Participant results according to the eight profiles of Briscoe and Hall (2006)……..41

12. Student and psychologist adaptability scores……43

13. Adaptability scores for Ministry of Education and other psychologists……44

14. Adaptability scores for early and late-careerpsychologists……..44

15. Question 7: Student and psychologist responses……46

16. Question 23: Student and psychologist responses……47

17. Question 35: Student and psychologist responses……49

18. Respondents' career plans……51

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix Page

A. Complete questionnaire……81

B. Participant letter……90

Chapter 1

Introduction

Focus and Rationale for the Study

The focus of the present study was on the career concepts of educational psychology students and practicing educational psychologists. The rationale for the research was that career concepts are changing in the modern world, yet we do not know very much about the career values, goals, and behaviours of this important group working in the field of education.

Changing Theories of the Nature of Career

Theorists such as Cappelli (1999) and Friedman (2007) have suggested that the world of work is changing to such an extent that the kinds of work people do and the way they are doing it have been transformed, indicating that graduates today are entering a different kind of workforce than in the past. It is thought that long-term job security is less common, and that there are less predictable prospects for internal advancement (Cappelli, 1999). In addition, opportunities for development and compensation may come from the outside market rather than from inside a company, leading employees to look across organisations, as opposed to within them, for opportunities (Cappelli, 1999). The psychological contract between employees and employers has also changed, supporting more transactional, short-term employment (Rousseau, 1995) in which career actors may use psychological success as a criterion of success more than in the past (Hall, 2002).

Many of the observed changes in career are associated with shifting economic, political, technological, and socio-cultural environments (Buchner, 2007) which have altered

to have a profound effect on how people make sense of their careers (Rousseau, 1995). Writers such as Friedman (2007) suggest that the world is changing and, 'becoming flat.' Globalisation and technological advances mean that any activity that can be digitized may be done anywhere in the world; many companies today outsource functions to China and India. In response, people in advanced economies have to find different ways to move up the value chain, by having special skills that can make them competitive. The importance of higher education for economic growth is increasingly being recognised, as universities strive to produce graduates who are able to think critically and communicate effectively, work in teams and in different functions, use new technology, and understand the global environment and the cultural diversity it entails (Oblinger & Verville, 1998).

Hall (2002) argued that a person's concept of career is tied up with their experiences of work over their lifetime and implies a focus on what happens during the career, rather than the speed of advancement or ability of the individual to manage it. It suggests that it is a person's perception of their career that is important, rather than the opinions of others. Lastly, the definition perceives the career to be a process; a series of work-related experiences in which all work, paid or unpaid, is understood to make up the career.

Against this background of a rapidly changing economy and society, researchers have been developing new models to explain the career attitudes of workers today. This has given rise to the boundaryless and protean career concepts as two ways of describing how people make sense of their career.

The Boundaryless Career

The boundaryless outlook can be described by what it is not. Stoltz, Wolff, Monroe, Mazahreh, and Farris (2013) suggest that it is not a confined, rigid mind-set toward

organisation or career. DeFilippi and Arthur (1994) write that individuals with this attitude transcend psychological and/or physical boundaries looking for opportunities and jobs with other organisations and colleagues, in contrast to the traditional idea of a single employer for life (Sullivan & Arthur, 2006).

The Protean Career

Closely related to the concept of a boundaryless career is the protean career attitude. Hall first described the protean career in 1976, as he observed a shift away from traditional careers to a new orientation (Hall, 2004). He described the protean career as a process which the individual, rather than their employer, is managing, involving all of a person's varying experiences (such as education, training, and work in different fields). Importantly, the criterion of success in this orientation is internal (psychological success) rather than external. Career and life success in this orientation is determined by inner feelings of fulfilment, self-actualisation, and satisfaction rather than predominantly through external factors such as income or status (Baruch, 2006). It is thought that two elements are central to the protean career concept; values-driven and self-directed orientations toward career management (Briscoe & Hall, 2006; Briscoe, Hall, & Frautschy DeMuth, 2006; Inkson, 2006; Sargent & Domberger, 2007). Personal values such as identity and self-awareness are thought to enable individuals to choose careers which reflect their interests, and having a values-driven attitude supports an individual to find meaning in their own career (Richardson, 2000).

Career Adaptability

Adaptability means being able to change fairly easily to fit new or changed circumstances. According to Hall (2004) and Inkson (2006), individuals who endorse the

boundaryless and protean career attitudes cannot afford to overlook career adaptability, as dismissing this construct could lead to an inappropriate implementation of career attitudes. For example, a person who has high self-awareness but low adaptability could avoid taking all actions and find themselves in a state of self-analysis paralysis.

The Nature of the Present Study

Educational psychologists in New Zealand are primarily employed by the Ministry of Education (Bourke & Dharan, 2015). The range and type of activities they are involved in varies throughout the country depending on the needs of the local community and the government initiatives that are in place in different regions (Bourke & Dharan, 2015). In February 2016, there was a total of 203 educational psychologists working for the Ministry of Education, with 183 full time equivalent positions held (Carter, personal communication, March 29, 2016). Employment numbers for educational psychologists tend to increase slowly; there are only 23 more practitioners in 2016 than there were in 2010 (Hornby, 2010). Part of the reason for this is that entry to the internship programme is limited to approximately 16 students per year at each of the two universities offering educational psychology training, restricting the flow of new graduates from the complete three-year pathway to registration.

Of the Masters students who are not accepted into the internship or do not apply at all, career options are limited or not in psychology at all. As an example, the website of one university states that a Master of Educational Psychology could lead to employment as a behaviour support worker, community support worker, child advocate, or special education coordinator. For graduates who do gain employment as educational psychologists for the Ministry of Education, there are said to be issues such as bureaucracy, diminution of the

professional identity due to being merged with other education specialists, ethical confusion over the activities of under-qualified people, and prevention from working with some groups of students (Coleman & Pine, 2010). These challenges could lead some workers to consider other options. However, there is some research to indicate that educational psychologists are generally satisfied with their work situation, according to a study by Jimerson, Annan, Skokut, and Renshaw (2009), in which 65 educational psychologists answered a survey about the training, roles, activities, research, preferences, and challenges experienced in work.

The present study focuses on the career attitudes of educational psychology students and practicing educational psychologists. The Masters students were at different stages of completion of the qualification, were enrolled either full time or part time, and may or may not have been intending on applying for enrolment into the internship year. Students in the internship year were engaged full time in completing the requirements of a Postgraduate Diploma in Educational Psychology.

In the present study an online survey was used to determine if educational psychology students and professionals endorsed boundaryless and protean career attitudes and career adaptability. Quantitative data were analysed using SPSS and qualitative responses were coded according to emerging themes.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Universities, according to Oblinger and Verville (1998), have long been associated with the development of a well-educated society. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) analysed many studies from the 1970s through to the present time and found that gaining academic qualifications is associated with better career opportunities and greater financial freedom, key factors in long-term quality of life. Evidence such as this explains why in the recent past, many people considered a university degree to be the best avenue to a lifelong career. Brown, Lauder, and Ashton (2011) however, argue that the world of work is less stable than it once was, due to higher tertiary education participation rates, a quality-cost revolution, and increased competition for the best jobs. As a result, the value of University education has decreased.

Guruz (2008) argues that while most jobs in the global knowledge economy require tertiary education, as well as the continuous upgrading of skills and learning of new skills, jobs are also disappearing, required abilities are changing, and new jobs are appearing which require new competencies. This instability of the modern work environment and the decrease in impact of a University qualification in terms of ensuring a career has led some theorists to argue that career concepts have to change. Cappelli (1999) and Guruz (2008) have proposed that people are engaging in work and thinking about careers differently than in the past and that organisations and employees must find balance in their relationships, against a background of accelerated change and increased instability.

Over the last thirty years, scholars such as Sullivan (1999) have described a marked change in the fundamental nature of careers. While traditional careers were once confined

to one or two organisations, today's workers are breaking through barriers and designing careers through numerous companies, locations, divisions, and even industries (Sullivan, 1999). DiRenzo (2010) has argued that the careers of yesterday, guided by the organisation and characterised by vertical and internal growth, are giving way to self-directed and independently managed livelihoods. Cappelli (1999) has also argued that workers today no longer expect long-term employment with a single organisation, due to an increasingly volatile global economy. Globalisation and technological advancement have made organisational flexibility essential, forcing organisations to become leaner to adapt in an unsettled economic environment (DeFillippi & Arthur, 1994). Cappelli (1999) has written that firms are restructuring and removing managerial layers, outsourcing some business functions, and relying more on self-managed teams and collaborative work groups. In addition, because companies need to remain flexible, Greenhaus, Callanan, and DiRenzo (2008) have written that firms have become hesitant to offer long-term contracts to employees, whose particular skills may not be needed by the organisation in the future.

A New Kind of Contract

As flexibility has become more valued, the psychological contract between organisations and workers has changed (Granrose & Baccili, 2006). Within the traditional career, contract loyalty was traded for job security, but some organisations today often favour short-term, transactional contracts which offer employees the opportunity to develop career competencies in exchange for individual productivity (Hall & Moss, 1998; Mirvis & Hall, 1994). Nowadays, workers expect to be employed by numerous companies throughout their careers, as they gain more experience to remain employable and increase their marketability. According to Inkson and Baruch (2008), changes to the traditional career

and psychological contract have been followed by scholarly interest in individuals as “agents of their own career destinies” (p. 217), and the associated ideas of boundaryless and protean career attitudes. These new ideas about career may be especially relevant to graduate students. Hall and Mirvis (1996) suggested that graduates at that time would be “the first in history to fail to exceed the economic success of their parents” (p.19). King (2003) proposed that graduates were likely to have non-traditional careers as the supply and demand of graduates and graduate positions had become unbalanced. In response to these changes, new perceptions of career have been established which reflect both the instability of modern work arrangements and the opportunities this has created for independent career management.

New Definitions of the World of Work

Many of the changes in the world of work have been ascribed to constantly transforming economic, political, socio-cultural, and technological environments. These environments have changed significantly to have a profound effect on how individuals define the world of work today (Buchner, 2007). Additionally, these trends have recently accelerated (Baruch, 2005) to create a world of increasing complexity (Hall, 2002). While these developments require organisations to become more flexible, employers are still pressed to attract and retain talented employees (De Vos & Meganck, 2009). However, this can be difficult because these employees focus on marking their own career path rather than exercising organisational loyalty; an inclination which results in increased rates of voluntary turnover (Cappelli, 2001). Employability is an important factor in protean and boundaryless ideas of career, relating to psychological contracts in which employees seek

market sustainable employability and organisations require high work commitment rather than job loyalty (Horowitz, Chan Teng, & Quazi, 2003).

The Boundaryless Career

Arthur and Rousseau (1996) argue that in these fast-changing times, career actors may face more choices in creating their career path, as both they and their current or potential employers are forced to become more flexible. One way of conceptualising the behaviours some individuals may use to respond to the heightened need for flexibility is the boundaryless career. The boundaryless career does not describe a single career form, but rather a range of possible forms which are different to those found in the organisational career. The boundaryless career can be understood as a departure from the organisational career in that it is not tied to a single company, may not involve an orderly sequence of progression, and involves less stability and vertical coordination (Arthur & Rosseau, 1996). Mirvis and Hall (1996) write that career development in the boundaryless career may be cyclical, involving cycles of upskilling, and involve more lateral than upward moves. Arthur and Rousseau (1996) outline the specifics of the boundaryless career as six emphases in which the meaning lies. A career agent enacting a boundaryless career may:

1) Move across boundaries of different employers
2) Draw marketability and validation from outside the present employer
3) Sustain their career by external networks or information
4) Break organisational career boundaries
5) Reject current work opportunities for personal or family reasons, or
6) Believe they have a boundaryless future despite the existence of structural constraints.

According to Saxenian (1996), evidence for the existence of the boundaryless career comes from many sources. Silicon Valley and the Hollywood independent film industry are often cited as examples in the literature, as learning in these contexts requires movement between companies and the acquisition of new skills and experiences. These industries also involve project-based employment, in which individuals are responsible for gaining skills and finding opportunities while working on temporary, short-term projects (Skilton & Bravo, 2008). Jones (2002) writes that the saying “you’re only as good as your last job” (p. 64) is evident in the project-based industry, where reputation is important and useful connections can offer specific kinds of opportunities and information.

Sturges (2008) argues that due to the reduced availability of long-term positions across industries, organisations increasingly expect employees to manage their own careers; while at the same time, the boundaries between work and personal life are becoming more blurred (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000). In addition, according to Busemeyer (2012) transferability of skills is crucial as globalisation sees more white-collar, mid-level jobs transferred to countries such as China and India as a consequence of technological developments in communication and information technologies. These types of factors have led to the development of boundaryless attitudes, founded on the belief that in a new economy strongly affected by changing technology, opportunities, flexibility, and insecurity, previous boundaries constraining individuals’ careers are becoming permeable or disappearing (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996).

Shifters, stickers, switchers, and settlers.

Bradley and Davadson (2008) carried out a survey of a group of 1,103 young adults from Bristol. Four patterns of employment trajectory were identified: *Shifters* were defined

as people who moved between jobs rapidly, possibly experiencing periods of unemployment, training, travel, or domestic labour. The defining characteristic of shifters was that they had not yet found a career that they were committed to in the long term. *Stickers* were people who had chosen a career goal immediately or very soon after finishing full-time education and stayed with one occupation or organisation, starting to move up the job ladder. *Settlers* were people who entered a shifting pathway after full-time education but had made a conscious decision at some point to devote themselves to a new career or job. The smallest group was the *switchers*, who began on a pathway as a sticker but had made a conscious choice to change, either to study, travel, or to begin a new career. These results suggest that both traditional and boundaryless attitudes were present, indicating the importance of both older and newer career attitudes.

Boundary-crossing versus boundaryless.

Some researchers consider the idea of a boundaryless career problematic. Baruch (2006) states that many firms still apply well-established management practices, and that even in the traditional mode, psychological contracts were not completely rigid. Inkson (2006) suggests the term 'boundary-*crossing* career' as a more accurate alternative to 'boundaryless career'. This would be especially relevant for some worker groups, such as women, for whom some occupational boundaries are still unavoidable (Cortini, Tanucci, & Morin, 2011). Hall and Moss (1998) argue that the long-term, relationship-based employment which defined the old contract was not the norm in United Stated companies. It is suggested that the old contract was used only in those U.S. organizations with policies that favoured long-term employment and strong internal labour markets. Companies such as IBM, Sears, AT&T, and Proctor & Gamble were immensely successful organisations that

were relatively stable during changes in the economy. Many other firms that were equally successful, such as General Motors, were more strongly affected by economic fluctuations, and periodic dismissals became a part of doing business. Companies that were smaller had even less financial ability to keep workers employed during times of economic downturn. Hall and Moss (1998) estimate that in 1975, fewer than 5 percent of U.S. employees worked under any implicit agreement of long-term job security.

Hall (2002) concludes that modern careers are not completely boundaryless and Baruch (2006) suggests that the quality of being boundaryless is best presented on scale, ranging between two extremes; total order and total chaos. From this perspective, it could be suggested that ideas about career are shifting along the continuum, but will never reach either extreme, as both organisational and boundaryless ideas will always be relevant.

The Protean Career

What protean means.

Hall (1976) used the legend of Proteus, the Greek sea god who could change shape at will, to create the metaphor of a protean career in which people adjust to new conditions by adapting. Hall and colleagues (Hall, 1996; Hall & Moss, 1998; Mirvis & Hall, 1996) described the protean career as being driven by the individual rather than the company, involving individually created goals encompassing one's whole life, and being motivated by psychological success rather than external markers of accomplishment. To this end, the protean career involves understanding success as developing as a whole person, rather than viewing performance as the main criterion. Other emphases also exist in the literature, such as career as an ongoing reinvention of oneself (Inkson, 2006), involving a personal identification with meaningful work (Bridgstock, 2005), and requiring adaptability for

learning demands and performance (Briscoe & Hall, 2006). It has been suggested that the protean career consists of all of an individual's experiences in training, education, work, and movements between jobs (Hall & Moss, 1998), supporting the idea that the protean career requires a shift of focus from 'work self' to 'whole self' (Hall & Chandler, 2005). The protean person's search for self-fulfilment and personal career decisions are therefore the integrative elements of their life. Briscoe and Hall (2006) suggest that a person's perception of their career can involve a greater or lesser degree of protean orientation, similar to an attitude. In this way, the protean career can be understood as a mind-set, reflecting self-direction, freedom, and choice-making based on personal values. Due to the emphasis on self-direction in the search for psychological success, some scholars have suggested that the protean career in fact involves a contract between oneself and one's work, rather than with the organisation (Hall & Moss, 1998).

Briscoe, Hall and Frautschy DeMuth (2006) designed scales measuring protean and boundaryless career attitudes. Using these scales as well as the Career Insight Scale (London, 1993), De Vos and Soens (2008) found that people with a protean career attitude reported higher levels of perceived employability and career satisfaction. Their study of 297 Belgian employees who had received career counselling found a positive relationship between protean career attitude and self-management behaviours. Baruch and Quick (2007) used a questionnaire designed and validated by Baruch, Bell, and Gray (2005) to study 334 retired army admirals, and found a relationship between protean career orientation and career satisfaction.

Sargent and Domberger (2007) investigated the nature of personal values that contribute to the protean career, using semi-structured interviews with 19 individuals who

were in the last semester of their university study, and who were all actively engaged in graduate recruitment. Several of the participants reported that they felt in charge of their careers, interpreting their future career path as being determined by their own actions. However some respondents reported feeling that future career success would be influenced by luck or organisational structures. Sargent and Domberger (2007) found evidence that decisions were guided using personal values, consistent with the protean career orientation, with two important themes found to be engaging in work that made a social contribution, and having a work-life balance.

Evidence for both new and old career attitudes was found in Tiechler's (2007) questionnaire project, which surveyed 36,000 people across 11 European countries. It was found that ninety percent of the graduates in all the included countries rated personal development as important or very important, and that having a balance between work and family time was rated as important by three quarters of the graduates, with varied social life and making money quoted by two thirds of respondents. Academic inquiry (56%) and social prestige (37%) were less frequently emphasised.

Walton and Mallon (2004) found that participants use criteria of the traditional career to make meaning, such as the need to advance in a company. Although boundaryless ideas were not expressed by the participants, they appeared to be redefining the boundaries of career behaviour.

Bradley and Devadason's (2008) household survey of 1,103 young adults in Bristol found that people from a variety of class situations could be labelled careerless, or working in jobs with limited prospects. They reported that statistics from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) showed that 38% of new graduates in 2003 were employed in non-

graduate employment, and only 12% were in traditional graduate jobs, such as teaching and medicine. The situation may be similar in New Zealand, with findings collected by Dupuis, Inkson, and McLaren (2005) indicating that in relation to 1594 jobs, in 862 cases, individuals reported that their job was not related at all or not closely related to their qualification (however qualification area information was not supplied). A related finding of Bradley and Devadason's (2008) was the low level of reported income, a crucial determinant of financial independence. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents reported estimated income levels of less than £12,000 per year, and only 21 percent earned over £18,000. The results are evidence that this generation is part of a low-wage labour force.

Similarities Between Boundaryless and Protean Career Orientations

From this discussion of the boundaryless and protean attitudes, it is clear that the two orientations are different, but overlapping. Baruch (2006) suggests that the protean career flourishes in the boundaryless career environment, whereas it was supressed in the traditional career system. The protean career is thought to relate to self-direction, adaptability, and identity and values, while the boundaryless career relates to proactive boundary-crossing, knowing-why, knowing-how, and knowing-whom.

Briscoe and Hall (2006) view the protean and boundaryless career orientations as independent, yet related constructs. For example, an individual could hold protean attitudes and make inner-directed choices, yet not wish to engage in cross-boundary collaboration; or an individual could have a boundaryless attitude, yet depend on one organisation to develop their career. Briscoe and Hall (2006) therefore propose that the protean and boundaryless mindset and preferences will be distinct, yet correlated.

Career Adaptability

Adaptability means being able to change fairly easily to fit new or changed circumstances. Career adaptability is essential for individuals in all stages of their career because in a non-linear and fluid work context, individuals are required to hold personal flexibility and the ability to cope with changing work environments and other life transitions. Career adaptability is also a focal point in career counselling theory and practice (van Vianen, De Pater, & Preenan, 2009), and plays an important part in graduates' career development (Zhang, 2010).

Career planning and career decision making.

Planning and decision making are thought to be the main elements of career adaptability. Planfulness refers to an awareness that vocational and educational decisions must be made eventually, and an inclination to prepare for these decisions (Savickas, 1991). This involves having an exploratory attitude, and actively using environmental resources and opportunities to learn more about preferred occupations and the world of work in general. Career decision making involves being an agent for oneself, by gaining new knowledge and engaging in an environment rich with opportunities and new challenges, where self-efficacy in decision making is required to adapt in a fast changing world (Herman, 2001). It has been suggested that individuals should focus on developing a positive and flexible view of themselves and their environment through using planful attitudes, exploration of self and environment, and informed decision making (van Vianen et al., 2009).

Savickas (1997) defined adaptability as voluntarily changing to fit with one's environment. With a planful attitude and informed decision making, career adaptability

supports individuals to continuously reflect on how they fit within their work environment, and make changes as necessary (van Vianen et al., 2009).

New Zealand Context

Several studies about employment contexts in New Zealand have been carried out. Arthur, Inkson, and Pringle (1999) explored the boundaryless career through the experiences of 75 people over 10 years, and found that individuals may take lateral, diagonal, or even downward shifts to adapt to changing situations. In addition, most moves were voluntary, involving people guiding their own careers rather than responding to corporate or economic forces. Arthur et al. (1999) suggested that non-linear careers appear to be the rule rather than the exception.

Dupuis et al. (2005) found evidence for high organisational mobility in their survey study. When participants were asked to state how many jobs they had had, including full-time, part-time, permanent, temporary, and self-employment, responses showed a high degree of inter-job mobility. Participants under 20 years of age had held a median number of two jobs, participants aged 20-24 four, those aged 25-29 six, and those aged 30-34 eight. These findings confirm data earlier in the study suggesting that median job duration is less than two years. When asked “Have all these (jobs) been in the same occupation as you are in now?” (p. 53), answers indicated that only 25 percent of respondents had had all their jobs in the same occupation, again showing occupational mobility.

Zhang (2010) surveyed 337 recent Massey University graduates’ career attitudes, career adaptability, and career self-management behaviours. The online survey used items designed by Briscoe, Hall, and Frautschy DeMuth (2006) to measure protean and boundaryless career attitudes, and items by Diemer and Blustein (2007), Smith et al. (2008),

Chiaburu, Baker, and Pitariu (2006), Rottinghaus, Day, and Borgen (2005), Stumpf, Colarelli, and Hartman (1983), King (2003), and Sturges, Guest, and Davey (2000) to measure career adaptability. Zhang (2010) examined whether demographic variables such as gender, age, ethnicity, highest qualification, college, and location influenced participants' career self-management behaviours. No significant difference was found between female and male participants, and differences between age groups were small to moderate. Participants' ethnicity was found to have a small effect on organisational mobility, with NZ European people scoring highest on this factor. Significant differences were not found between people holding different levels of qualifications, people who graduated from different colleges, and people who lived in different locations.

Zhang's (2010) results suggested that this group endorsed the boundarlyess mindset and held a preference for organisation mobility. In terms of protean and/or boundaryless career attitudes, the respondents largely scored above average in each factor, yet they still held strong traditional career orientations. Zhang's (2010) findings support the idea suggested by Briscoe et al. (2006) that career orientations cannot be understood as extremely traditional or extremely contemporary, but rather as a combination of both with overlap between the two ways of understanding. Respondents from Zhang's (2010) study also endorsed career adaptability, with results indicating that they are concerned with their future paths and enjoy making career plans. The study also found that managing boundaries between work and non-work was a priority for the participants, as shown in their reported dislike of working outside work hours. The findings did not support previous literature suggesting that young people may compromise their personal lives for career progression in the early stages of their career (Sturges, 2008).

Career Research on Educational Psychology Students and Practicing Psychologists

Research in vocational guidance has made important developments regarding students' interests and decisions when choosing a tertiary course (Borges, Savickas, & Jones, 2004), however research has revealed concerns about the lack of studies focusing on the career choices made by students already in higher education (Cassin, Singer, Dobson, & Altmaier, 2007). There is also limited empirical research investigating career adaptability, particularly in regard to university graduates (Duffy, 2010). Few studies focus on professional guidance and the interests of students transitioning from undergraduate to graduate studies, particularly in areas such as psychology and medicine (Ferreira, Rodrigues, & da Costa Ferriera, 2016). Understanding the perspectives of students in a field can help to ensure that newly qualified professionals are being trained in a way that prepares them for success (Benes & Mazerolle, 2014). Moreover, graduate students, particularly those nearing graduation, offer a unique perspective because they are getting ready to enter the workforce but have yet to experience the potential difficulties of a limited job market (Fitzpatrick, Monda, & Wooding, 2015).

The Value of the Present Study

There is a vast amount of research into career attitudes and adaptability, however there is little research that looks specifically at psychology graduate students and educational psychologists, especially in relation to new career models such as the boundaryless and protean careers. Understanding the career attitudes and adaptability of educational psychology students and psychologists could provide important insights for the Ministry of Education, designers of educational psychology qualifications, prospective students of the programmes, and graduate students and psychologists themselves.

Research Questions

Question 1: To what extent do postgraduate educational psychology students and educational psychology professionals hold boundaryless and/or protean career attitudes?

Question 2: To what extent do postgraduate educational psychology students and professionals endorse career adaptability?

Chapter 3

The Career Constructs Used in the Present Study

The Measure of Boundaryless and Protean Career Attitudes

Two important empirical models have been created to measure boundaryless and protean career attitudes, which have influenced the development of measurement methods for the constructs. Sullivan and Arthur (2006) designed a model which focuses on career mobility in terms of psychological and physical continua. Four quadrants make up different types of career profiles, ranging from low to high psychological and physical mobility.

In contrast, the model designed by Briscoe and Hall (2006) uses protean and boundaryless scales to depict eight main types of career profile. These models have provided an instrument for subsequent empirical research measuring career attitudes, and will be used in the present study to determine how participants fit the categories. Studies indicate that individuals cannot be simply described as boundaryless or not, or protean or not; rather, individuals can hold both traditional and new career attitudes which can be depicted on a scale (Baruch, 2006; Briscoe & Hall, 2006; Briscoe et al., 2006). Balance is still required; in the same way that individuals will not fall at each end of the boundaryless/protean career attitude scale, careers are still influenced by traditional constructs as well as contemporary ones.

By overlapping protean and boundaryless categories, Briscoe and Hall (2006) created 16 possible combinations for career orientation. Each combination represented a career profile that was low or high in four areas: values driven and self-directed (relating to protean orientations) and psychological and physical mobility (relating to boundaryless

orientations). They noted that some of these combinations may not be likely to occur in the natural environment, so further analysed the possibilities to determine eight combinations which have a medium or high chance of occurring. The eight types of career profile according to Briscoe and Hall (2006) are presented in Table 1 in a simplified form.

Table 1

Protean and boundaryless combinations: Career profiles

Protean: Self-directed career management	Protean: Values driven	Boundaryless: Psychological mobility	Boundaryless: Physical mobility	Hybrid category/archetypes
Low	Low	Low	Low	“Lost” or “Trapped”
Low	High	Low	Low	“Fortressed”
Low	Low	Low	High	“Wanderer”
Low	High	High	Low	“Idealist”
High	Low	High	Low	“Organization man/woman”
High	High	High	Low	“Solid Citizen”
High	Low	High	High	“Hired gun/hired hand”
High	High	High	High	“Protean career architect”

Briscoe and Hall (2006) created the profiles through a process of determining how readily they could generate real-life examples of career profiles, based on their experience of working with students, clients, acquaintances, and popular culture. This representation allows for a discussion of how the different profiles may be represented by career actors; for example, someone who is low on all four factors is labelled ‘trapped/lost’, because they lack inner values which could direct them and boundaryless attitudes which could help them to explore new options. Seibert, Crant, and Kraimer (1999) suggest that a person with this profile uses more reactive that proactive behaviour, as they are limited by passivity and inability to see possibilities. At the other end of the spectrum is the ‘protean career

architect', who is psychologically and physically boundaryless, using personal values to actively manage their career. Briscoe and Hall (2006) give the example of Mahatma Gandhi as fitting this career profile, whose open-mindedness and self-regulation made him a successful leader. They suggest that protean career architects are rare, indicating that most individuals will fall somewhere between the two extremes.

The present study will also use Briscoe, Hall and Frautschy DeMuth's (2006) approach to measurement of career attitudes. The authors used factor analysis to determine the four different aspects of career attitude targeted by the measure. These were: protean self-concept; protean values-driven attitude; boundaryless mindset; and organisational mobility. The present study will use these factors as the basis for data analysis.

Briscoe et al. (2006) describe the boundaryless and protean career attitudes as independent yet related constructs; boundaryless and protean career attitudes are expected to affect each other to certain degrees in an individual's work experience, however they may affect behaviour in very different ways. In a validity study, Briscoe et al. (2006) found that the measures were connected to existing scales of proactive personality, psychological authenticity, and mastery goal orientation. The study indicated that proactive personality correlates highly with self-directed career management, values-driven attitude, boundaryless mindset, and mobility preference, validating the idea that individuals with boundaryless and protean career attitudes are agentic in their career pursuits. A strong positive relationship was also found between goal orientation mastery, openness to experience, and each of the career attitude measures. Each of the measures was negatively correlated with performance orientation, suggesting that individuals demonstrating

boundaryless and protean career attitudes prefer to define and discover career success on their own terms.

The Measure of Career Adaptability

Models have also been developed through empirical study to measure a person's career adaptability, with the underlying understanding that the construct should be measured as an orientation or stance ranging between two extremes on a continuum (Zhang, 2010). Savickas (1984) developed a method of investigating individuals' degree and rate of career maturity and adaptability and further proposed career concern, career control, career curiosity, and career confidence as developmental lines of career adaptability (Savickas, 2005). Rottinghaus, Day, and Borgen (2005) describe how the unstable nature of today's global economy and technological advances require career actors to hold more coping skills and attitudes than in the past, in order to increase their adjustment to the shifting circumstances influencing work lives. This reality draws attention to the importance of developing contemporary measures of how clients understand themselves, the world of work, and their approaches to career adaption.

In contrast to Zhang's (2010) study which created an adaptability measure using items from several different studies, the present study will measure career adaptability using the items from the Career Futures Inventory-Revised (CFI-R; Rottinghaus, Buelow, Matyja, & Schneider, 2012), which builds on the legacy of research into the construct. The CFI was first developed by Rottinghaus et al. (2005), and measures career adaptability, career optimism, and perceived knowledge of the job market. The CFI incorporates ideas proposed by Savickas' (1997) career adaptability construct and numerous positive psychology concepts, including items related to dispositional optimism (Carver & Sheier,

1981), which measures adults' self-regulation of career-behaviour. Moderate correlations were found between CFI scales and measures of dispositional optimism, problem-solving, and career decision self-efficacy. High CFI scores related to engagement in career exploration activities, higher educational aspirations, and greater comfort with educational and career-related plans. The updated CFI (CFI-R) is comprised of 28 items and five scales, including; Career Agency, Negative Career Outlook, Occupational Awareness, Support, and Work–Life Balance. Rottinghaus et al. (2012) report that in contrast to their intention of establishing numerous dimensions of confidence, control, self-awareness, and optimism, the constructs form a composite career agency dimension. The validation part of their study established internal consistency and initial construct validity of the CFI-R (Rottinghaus et al., 2012).

There will also be four qualitative questions in the survey. One will ask respondents if they hold a two, five, or 10 year plan and what that may involve. Given the accelerated rate of change in the world of work, and the fact that employment contracts are often unstable (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996), the need to reflect upon one's career options is continuous. As explained previously, career planning involves an exploratory attitude and the utilisation of environmental resources and opportunities. Career planning relates to protean and boundaryless ideas by supporting the individual to determine what is important to them. It is also important in times of transition, and together with adaptability, career planning helps individuals to implement their self-concept in response to demands in life and work (Sharf, 2013). A qualitative question will also be inserted after each of the following items: "I enjoy working with people outside of my organization"; "I am responsible for my success or failure in my career"; and "What's most important to me is how I feel about my career success, not how other people feel". If respondents indicate that they

agree or strongly agree with one of the statements, they will be directed to the appropriate follow-up question asking them to explain why they answered that way. If they indicated that they were neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed, they skipped the follow-up question and were directed to the next standard item.

Chapter 4

Methodology

This chapter provides information about the survey respondents, the research method, and the measures used. It also presents the qualitative questions, and explains the ethics and recruitment processes. Lastly, the data analysis methods are outlined.

Participants

The respondents (as shown in Table 2) were approximately one-third students (22 respondents) and two-thirds psychologists (45 respondents). As the literature does not tend to compare the chosen career attitudes in relation to ethnicity or gender, this information was not collected. In cases where a respondent had skipped questions related to a factor, their responses were not analysed for that factor.

Table 2

Student and psychologist numbers

Group	Frequency	Percent
Students	22	33
Psychologists	45	67
Total	67	100

Student participants were enrolled either at University A or University B, in the Master of Educational Psychology programme or the Postgraduate Diploma of Educational Psychology programme (see Table 3). 72.7 per cent were from University A and 27.3 per cent were from University B. The majority of psychologists were employed by the Ministry of Education (72.3 per cent) with 20 per cent selecting ‘other’, referring to non-

governmental organisations (see Table 4). Almost half of the psychologists had been in practice for one to five years (46.7 per cent) (see Table 5).

Table 3

University of attendance for students

Group	Number	Percent
University A	16	73
University B	6	27
Total	22	100

Table 4

Place of employment for psychologists

Workplace	Number	Percent
Ministry of Education	33	73.33
Other	9	20
Private Practice	2	4.44
Prefer not to say	1	2.22
Ministry of Health	0	0
Ministry of Social Development	0	0
Total	45	100

Table 5

Years of employment for psychologists

Years	Number	Per cent
Less than 1 year	9	20
1 – 5 years	21	46.67
5 – 10 years	10	22.22
10 – 15 years	2	4.44
More than 15 years	3	6.67
Total	45	100

Selection of Research Method

This study used an internet-mediated quantitative and qualitative research method. Survey Monkey was used to create a 64-item questionnaire and to generate a web link which directed respondents to the survey. This is an example of 'server-side' research, in which respondents are sent to a website to participate, in contrast to 'client-side' approaches in which a questionnaire is directly emailed to participants (Couper, 2008). It has been suggested that the ease and appeal of well-designed web-based surveys attracts a high response rate, and was necessary in this case to ensure anonymity of respondents. This kind of survey can also be hosted on a dedicated website which provides information about the researcher, the project, and the affiliated institution (Punch, 2014). Using this method also meant that Survey Monkey could manage data entry electronically. The literature review indicated that there are several ways to measure boundaryless and protean values, and a number of ways of measuring adaptability. Therefore, using this approach provided a practical way of gaining an understanding of the selected cohorts' attitudes and values. In addition, using an internet questionnaire allowed for the inclusion of respondents from diverse geographical locations, which was necessary in order to reach students living throughout New Zealand and around the world. The low financial cost of creating the survey using Survey Monkey was also an advantage. An information sheet was distributed with the invitation to participate, introducing the project and explaining protean and boundaryless attitudes and adaptability, participants' rights and consent, and providing contact information for the researcher and supervisors.

Measures

Questionnaire 1: Boundaryless/protean career attitudes.

The survey used Briscoe, Hall and Frautschy DeMuth's (2006) approach to measurement of career attitudes. The survey included questions on several different factors, based on factor analyses done by Briscoe et al. (2006). The factor and dimension labels were not visible to respondents in the present survey (see Table 6). There were 27 items in the boundaryless/protean section as well as two qualitative questions. The quantitative questions included a five-item Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

Factor 1: Boundaryless mindset.

The first section asked questions about preferences relating to boundaryless values (eg. "I enjoy working with people outside my organisation"). A person with a boundaryless career attitude uses different levels of physical and psychological movement to navigate the changing work landscape (Sullivan & Arthur, 2006). It has also been proposed by Briscoe et al. (2006) that individuals will vary in the attitude they hold towards pursuing work-related relationships across organisational boundaries, however this does not necessarily imply physical mobility. Rather, a person with a high boundaryless attitude toward working relationships across boundaries is comfortable about creating and sustaining relationships beyond organisational boundaries.

Factor 2: Mobility preference.

While Briscoe et al. (2006) acknowledge that the boundaryless career attitude is primarily psychological, there is also an emphasis in the literature on careers which span

several employment settings, representing physical employment mobility. Therefore, the inclination for crossing organisational boundaries forms a second boundaryless career attitude, referred to as a preference for mobility. These questions determine how likely an individual is to cross boundaries, for example “In my ideal career, I would work for only one organisation.” An individual who demonstrates an organisational mobility attitude would be comfortable with a career that played out across several organisations.

Factors 3 and 4: Self-directed attitude and values-driven attitude.

The first section of the questionnaire also includes items which represent the protean career attitude, through questions related to self-directed behaviour (eg. “Ultimately, I depend on myself to move my career forward”), and values-driven behaviour (eg. “What’s most important to me I how I feel about my career success, not how other people feel”). Career actors who hold protean career attitudes prefer to use their own values (rather than organisational values, for example) to guide their career, therefore meaning that they are ‘values-driven’ (Briscoe et al., 2006). They are also independent in managing their career, and are therefore ‘self-directed’. Individuals who do not hold protean attitudes would be more likely to use external standards to understand their career moves, rather than internally developed ones, and would be more likely to prefer external direction in career management rather than being proactive and independent. Briscoe et al. (2006) suggest that while protean individuals may exhibit more mobility and a learning orientation, these factors may be correlates of a protean attitude, but not necessarily components of it.

Questionnaire 2: Career adaptability – factors 1 – 5.

In the second section of the questionnaire (see Table 7), items from the Career Futures Inventory-Revised (CFI-R; Rottinghaus et al. 2012) were used to measure career adaptability. The questions assessed aspects including general outcome expectations, positive career planning attitudes, and components of Bandura's personal agency and Parsons' tripartite model. The different sections of the present survey are based on factor analysis by Rottinghaus et al. (2012). The factors were; Career Agency, Negative Career Outlook, Occupational Awareness, Support, and Work-Life Balance. The CFI-R scales are influenced by Savickas' (2005) dimensions of career adaptability, Bandura's (1986) concept of agency, and the basic needs of relatedness, autonomy, and competence described by Deci and Ryan (1985). There were 27 quantitative items and one qualitative question. Quantitative items used the same Likert scale as the first section.

Table 6

Boundaryless and protean career attitude scale items

Factor 1: Boundaryless mindset
1 I enjoy working with people outside of my organization
2 I enjoy jobs that require me to interact with people in many different organizations
3 I enjoy job assignments that require me to work outside of the organization
4 I like tasks at work that require me to work beyond my own department
5 I would enjoy working on projects with people from across many organizations
6 I have sought opportunities in the past that allow me to work outside the organization
7 I am energized in new experiences and situations
8 I seek job assignments that allow me to learn something new
Factor 2: Mobility preference
9 If my organization provided lifetime employment, I would never desire to seek work in other organizations R
10 In my ideal career, I would work for only one organization R
11 I would feel very lost if I couldn't work for my current organization R
12 I like the predictability that comes with working continuously for the same organization R
13 I prefer to stay in a company I am familiar with rather than look for employment elsewhere R
Factor 3: Self-directed attitude

14 I am in charge of my own career
15 Ultimately, I depend upon myself to move my career forward
16 I am responsible for my success or failure in my career
17 Where my career is concerned, I am very much “my own person”
18 Overall, I have a very independent, self-directed career
19 In the past I have relied more upon myself than others to find a new job when necessary
20 Freedom to choose my own career path is one of my most important values
21 When development opportunities have not been offered by my company, I’ve sought them out on my own
Factor 4: Values-driven attitude
22 I’ll follow my own guidance if my company asks me to do something that goes against my values
23 In the past I have sided with my own values when the company has asked me to do something I don’t agree with
24 What I think about what is right in my career is more important to me than what my company thinks
25 It doesn’t matter much to me how other people evaluate the choices I make in my career
26 I navigate my own career, based upon my personal priorities, as opposed to my employer’s priorities
27 What’s most important to me is how I feel about my career success, not how other people feel

R = reverse-scored items

Table 7

Career adaptability scale items

Factor 1: Career Agency (CA): Perceived capacity for self-reflection and forethought to intentionally initiate, control, and manage career transitions
28 I can adapt to change in the world of work
29 I understand my work related interests
30 I am aware of priorities in my life
31 I can establish plans for my future career
32 I am aware of my strengths
33 I am in control of my career
34 I will successfully manage my present career transition process
35 I understand my work-related values
36 I can overcome potential barriers that may exist in my career
Factor 2: Negative Career Outlook (NCO): Negative thoughts about career decisions and belief that one will not achieve favourable career outcomes
37 I doubt my career will turn out well in the future
38 It is unlikely that good things will happen in my career
39 I lack the energy to pursue my career goals
40 Thinking about my career frustrates me

Factor 3: Occupational Awareness (OA): Perceptions of how well an individual understands job market and employment trends
41 I am good at understanding job market trends
42 I keep up with trends in at least one occupation or industry of interest to me
43 I keep current with job market trends
44 I keep current with changes in technology
45 I understand how economic trends affect career opportunities available to me
46 I do not understand job market trends
Factor 4: Support: Perceived emotional and instrumental support from family and friends in pursuing career goals
47 My family is there to help me through career challenges
48 I receive all the encouragement I need from others to meet my career goals
49 Others in my life are very supportive of my career
50 Friends are available to offer support in my career transition
Factor 5: Work-Life Balance (WLB): Ability to understand and manage responsibilities to others across multiple life roles
51 I am good at balancing multiple life roles such as worker, family member, or friend
52 I am very strategic when it comes to balancing my work and personal lives
53 Balancing work and family responsibilities is manageable
54 I can easily manage my needs and those of other important people in my life

Qualitative Questions

The survey also included four qualitative questions:

- Do you have a two, five, and/or 10 year career plan? If so, please provide some indicative commentary about your short (2 year), medium (5 year), or long-term (10 year) career plans.
- You have indicated that you enjoy working with people outside of your organisation. Why is that?
- You have indicated that you are responsible for your success or failure in your career. Why is that?
- You have indicated that what is most important to you is how you feel about your career success, not how other people feel. Why is that?

Ethics Approval, Recruitment, and Informed Consent

The research was granted ethical approval by Massey University Human Ethics Committee, application number 4000015409. Consent procedures were followed whereby respondents were provided with information sheets and made aware of the voluntary nature of the research. Responses were anonymous, as invitations were sent to groups of possible participants who followed a web link to the survey. The questionnaire did not include any questions which could lead to respondents being identified, and Survey Monkey did not collect this information automatically either.

Procedure

A request for participation was sent by e-mail to current University A Masters students and interns, and interns from 2013, 2014, and 2015 by the Master of Educational Psychology course co-ordinator. A request for participation was sent to current University B intern students by the Internship Programme Director. Psychologists were invited to participate through the EdPsych forum, and a request for participation was sent to Ministry of Education psychologists. The invitation emails also included the participant letter which included the key terms, contact details for the researcher and supervisors, and the ethics application number. If respondents chose to participate, they clicked on a web link which took them to the survey. There were 64 items on the survey in total (4 demographic questions, 4 open-ended questions, and 56 items from Briscoe & Hall; 2006 and Rottinghaus et al; 2012), and each item was optional. It took approximately 10 – 15 minutes to complete, depending on how quickly a person responded and how much information they included in their answers to the qualitative questions. Survey Monkey collected the results, which were exported in SPSS format for analysis in that programme.

Data Analysis Method

Responses for the boundaryless, protean and adaptability items were analysed using SPSS and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) procedures. Analysis included comparison of students and psychologists, psychologists from different workplaces, and psychologists with more and less experience. The Negative Outlook items from the adaptability scale were reversed scored, as was done by Rottinghaus et al. (2012). The qualitative questions were coded according to emerging themes in the responses. For example, 10 themes occurred for the question: “You have indicated that what is most important to you is how you feel about your career success, not how other people feel. Why is that?”, which represented the reasons why people care more about their own perceptions of career success. These were: Everyone is different; Knowing myself; People don’t understand my work anyway; My own satisfaction; My own values; My own happiness; My own confidence; I am responsible for myself; Age/experience; and Unsure. Some responses were clearly related to one major theme, for example the response;

> I’m too old to be concerned about what others think of my career success! In my 20s it would have mattered, but in my 40s, I have my own agenda and ideals that are less defined by needing to satisfy or manage the perceptions of others.

which aligns with the theme ‘Age/experience.’ However, other answers involved aspects of two or more themes, such as the response “Other people are not privy to my goals. What I deem as success may not be the same as how another person may see my success”, which relates to the themes ‘Everyone is different’ and ‘My own values’. In these cases, it was determined which theme best represented the statement based on how similar the answer was to other answers from each category.

Summary of Methodology

The majority of participants were psychologists at the Ministry of Education, who had been practicing for less than 10 years. An electronic questionnaire was designed on Survey Monkey, including items from Briscoe et al. (2006) relating to boundaryless and protean attitudes, and items by Rottinghaus et al. (2012) which measure adaptability. Four qualitative questions were also included. The research was granted ethics approval, and participants were recruited through email invitation which included an information letter. SPSS was used to process the quantitative data using MANOVA procedures, and the qualitative answers were grouped according to emerging themes.

Chapter 5

Results

This chapter reports on the findings collected from the survey and is divided into two sections. First the quantitative results will be presented. Then the qualitative results will be presented.

Research Question 1: To What Extent do Postgraduate Educational Psychology Students and Educational Psychology Professionals Hold Boundaryless and/or Protean Career Attitudes?

The quantitative analysis looks at whether there were any differences for different demographic variables. To do this the results for each of the questionnaires were analysed using one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA).

Students and psychologists.

The MANOVA analysis showed no overall effect, $\lambda=.99$, $F(4,50)=.02$, and no effects for individual one-way ANOVAs for each of the four variables. Both students and psychologists agreed with statements associated with boundaryless and protean attitudes (see Table 8). The boundaryless mindset and self-directed attitude factors gained slightly higher mean scores than the mobility preference and values-driven attitude factors (see Table 8). For example, for boundaryless mindset, Question 1, 91.8% per cent of respondents indicated that they enjoyed working with people from outside of their organisation, and for self-directed attitude, Question 15, 96.43% indicated that they depend on themselves to move their career forward. There were no significant differences between the students and psychologists on any of these factors. The lowest score was for self-directed attitude,

Question 24, “What I think about what is right in my career is more important to me than what my company thinks” (endorsed by 56.36% of respondents).

Table 8

Student and psychologist scores for boundaryless and protean attitudes

Factor	Group	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig
Boundaryless mindset	Students	16	4.1094	.60703	.00	.982
	Psychologists	40	4.1219	.51693		
Mobility preference	Students	16	3.6000	.66933	.00	.962
	Psychologists	40	3.5850	.72379		
Self-directed attitude	Students	16	4.0625	.57554	.01	.942
	Psychologists	39	4.0737	.48896		
Values-driven attitude	Students	16	3.7500	.67769	.05	.821
	Psychologists	39	3.7094	.57062		
Across factors score	Students	16	3.9795	.37702	.86	.351
	Psychologists	39	3.8697	.37376		

Ministry psychologists and other psychologists.

The MANOVA showed a significant overall effect, λ=.70, $F(4,34)=3.68$, p=.013. Individual one-way between groups ANOVAs showed a significant difference for the boundaryless factor (see Table 9). The mean score for Ministry psychologists (M=3.98) was significantly less than that for psychologists working outside the Ministry (M=4.48). The partial eta squared (η^2) effect size was .183. Cohen’s (1977) criteria for qualitatively judging this statistic is: .01 = small, .06 = medium, .14 = large. Using these criteria, the effect size was large.

Table 9

Boundaryless & protean scores compared by psychologists working for Min of Ed or Other

Factor	Group	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig
Boundaryless mindset	Ministry	29	3.9784	.48879	8.29	.007
	Other	10	4.4750	.40740		
Mobility preference	Ministry	29	3.7034	.65383	2.86	.099
	Other	10	3.2600	.87965		
Self-directed attitude	Ministry	29	3.9957	.44881	3.03	.090
	Other	10	4.3000	.55340		
Values-driven attitude	Ministry	29	3.6322	.53337	2.13	.153
	Other	10	3.9333	.64406		
Across factors score	Ministry	29	3.8274	.38373	1.46	.235
	Other	10	3.9921	.33065		

Early and late career psychologists.

The analysis showed no overall effect, λ=.82, $F(4,34)=1.82$, and no effects for individual one-way ANOVAs for each of the four variables, except that a significant difference was almost found between early and late-career psychologists on the boundaryless factor (p=.056; see Table 10). The effect size was $\eta^2 = .095$ which was a medium effect. The mean scores for the early career psychologists (M= 3.40) were less than that for the late career psychologists (M=4.33).

Table 10

Boundaryless & protean scores compared by length of time as a psychologist

Factor	Group	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig
Boundaryless mindset	Short	26	3.9952	.52259	3.89	.056
	Long	13	4.3269	.43162		
Mobility preference	Short	26	3.6923	.68406	1.55	.221
	Long	13	3.3846	.81019		
Self-directed attitude	Short	26	3.9808	.45920	2.96	.093

	Long	13	4.2596	.51149		
Values-driven attitude	Short	26	3.6282	.56235	1.60	.213
	Long	13	3.8718	.57395		
Across factors score	Short	26	3.8241	.39697	1.16	.288
	Long	13	3.9607	.31716		

Career profiles.

The results were also analysed in relation to Briscoe and Hall's (2006) career profiles. By overlapping protean and boundaryless categories, Briscoe and Hall (2006) created 16 possible combinations for career orientation. Each combination represented a career profile that was low or high in four areas: being values-driven and self-directed (relating to protean orientations) and psychological and physical mobility (relating to boundaryless orientations). Briscoe and Hall (2006) reduced these 16 profiles to 8 profiles which were most likely to occur in reality. To create these same categories, participant responses were divided into higher or lower on each of the four main items that Briscoe and Hall (2006) used. Participants in the higher group on a particular item were those who agreed or strongly agreed with the item. Those in the lower group were those who either were neutral or disagreed with the item. Participants were then classified according to the eight profiles. For example, someone who was lower for all four items was categorised as 'lost/ trapped'. Someone who was lower on the self-directed, values-driven, and psychological mobility items but was higher on the physical mobility item was in the 'wanderer' category. These results are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Participant results according to the eight career profiles of Briscoe and Hall (2006)

Profile	Whole sample	Psychs.	Students psychs.	Ministry	Non-Ministry psychs.
Lost/Trapped	5	3	2	2	1
Fortressed	0	0	0	0	0
Wanderer	11	7	4	5	2
Idealist	2	1	1	1	0
Organisation Man/Woman	4	3	1	3	0
Solid Citizen	1	0	1	0	0
Hired Gun	3	2	1	2	0
Career Architect	5	3	2	2	1
Total	31	19	12	15	4

The results of the profiling showed that 31 out of 55 (56%) of the total sample could be classified into the eight profiles. In addition, separate analyses of career profiles were carried out for subsamples of the total group of participants: psychologists only, students only, Ministry psychologists, and Non-Ministry psychologists. These breakdowns showed similar patterns of response to those of the total sample.

Research Question 2: To What Extent do Postgraduate Educational Psychology Students and Professionals Endorse Career Adaptability?

Students and psychologists.

Students and psychologists appeared to endorse career adaptability (see Table 12). In particular, respondents tended to agree or highly agree with the items “I can adapt to change in the world of work” (94.34%), “I am aware of priorities in my life” (96.23%) and “I understand my work related values” (98.11). The analysis showed no overall effect, λ=.10,

F(5,47)=1.01, and no effects for individual one-way ANOVAs for each of the five variables except for a significant difference between students and psychologists for the Support factor (*p*=.041), with students (*M*=4.41) indicating higher levels of perceived support than psychologists (4.00).

Table 12

Students and psychologists adaptability scores

Factor	Group	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig
Career agency	Students	14	4.3492	.42669	1.80	.185
	Psychologists	39	4.1567	.47052		
Negative career outlook	Students	14	4.1429	.36314	1.81	.184
	Psychologists	39	3.9423	.51126		
Occupational awareness	Students	14	3.3214	.56411	.15	.700
	Psychologists	39	3.2650	.42872		
Support	Students	14	4.4107	.64007	4.42	.041
	Psychologists	39	4.0000	.62302		
Work-life balance	Students	14	4.1071	.67021	1.03	.316
	Psychologists	39	3.9038	.63509		
Across factors score	Students	14	4.0663	.29994	3.96	.052
	Psychologists	39	3.8536	.35685		

Ministry and other psychologists.

The MANOVA analysis of psychologists from the Ministry of Education and other workplaces showed no overall effect, λ=.24, *F*(5,33)=2.12, *p*=.09, and no effects for individual one-way ANOVAs except for Career Agency where those psychologists who worked outside the Ministry gave responses indicating that they were in stronger control of their career (see Table 13).

Table 13

Adaptability scores for Ministry and other psychologists

Factor	Group	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig
Career agency	Ministry	29	4.0575	.42890	5.64	.023
	Other	10	4.4444	.48855		
Negative career outlook	Ministry	29	3.9224	.52229	.17	.685
	Other	10	4.0000	.50000		
Occupational awareness	Ministry	29	3.2011	.44628	2.61	.115
	Other	10	3.4500	.32442		
Support	Ministry	29	4.0086	.63204	.021	.885
	Other	10	3.9750	.62860		
Work-life balance	Ministry	29	3.9052	.54039	.00	.983
	Other	10	3.9000	.89132		
Across factors score	Ministry	29	3.8190	.33152	1.07	.309
	Other	10	3.9539	.42510		

Early and late career psychologists.

The MANOVA analysis of early and late-career psychologists also showed no overall effect, λ=.10, $F(5,33)=1.86$, p=.13, and no effects for individual one-way ANOVAs for each of the five variables, though Work-Life Balance approached significance (p=.06) indicating that later career psychologists had stronger feelings of work-life balance (see Table 14).

Table 14

Adaptability score for early and late-career psychologists

Factor	Group	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig
Career agency	Early	26	4.0726	.47030	2.59	.116
	Late	13	4.3248	.44087		
Negative career outlook	Early	26	4.0000	.44159	.99	.325

	Late	13	3.8269	.63233		
Occupational awareness	Early	26	3.2308	.41386	.49	.489
	Late	13	3.3333	.46647		
Support	Early	26	3.8846	.63337	2.80	.103
	Late	13	4.2308	.55398		
Work-life balance	Early	26	3.7692	.56091	3.76	.060
	Late	13	4.1731	.70993		
Across factors score	Early	26	3.7915	.33028	2.45	.126
	Late	13	3.9778	.38848		

Qualitative Data

Working with others (boundaryless mindset).

Question 1 in the boundaryless mindset section asked whether the respondent enjoyed working with others outside the organisation. This item was followed by an open-ended question: “You have indicated that you enjoy working with people outside of your organization. Why is that?” Gaining different perspectives and learning from others were popular reasons for respondents endorsing this item. Respondents often detailed the ways they can engage in these learning opportunities, such as acquiring new skills, sharing information, interacting with people from different knowledge bases, networking, and making the most of others’ strengths and expertise (see Table 15). For example; “Different perspectives, different areas of expertise and pathways of support for clients. Also, [I] enjoy the challenge of negotiating, teaching, coaching, learning from a variety of people.” It was also noted that working collaboratively is enjoyable and leads to better outcomes; “It’s interesting to learn about their roles. A large part of my job involves bringing people from

other organisations around a table to support a child/family. I enjoy the strengths they bring."

Table 15

Question 7: Student and psychologist responses

Theme	N	%	Example
Gain different perspectives	15	28.3	"Variety and different exposure and perspectives"
Learn from others	15	28.3	"Having an understanding of what psychs in other organisations are doing is useful for my job"
Diversity makes the job interesting	6	11.3	"It makes the work rich an interesting"
Using multidisciplinary approaches	6	11.3	"Our work is enhanced by multi-disciplinary approaches and understanding alternate points of view"
Enjoy collaborative work	4	7.5	"I have always liked inter-professional collaborative work"
Better outcomes	4	7.5	"They have different skills and experience that can contribute toward improved outcomes for the families we work with"
Diversity of thinking	2	3.8	"Meet a diversity of individuals"
Part of the job	1	1.9	"The work I do involves working with families, schools, and external organisations"
Total	53	100	

Feeling responsible for career success or failure (self-directed attitude).

In the self-directed attitude section, a follow up question was: "You have indicated that you are responsible for success or failure in your career. Why is that?" Having good

skills associated with self-direction was important for almost a third of respondents, and having appropriate knowledge, goals, a willingness to learn, and the ability to work hard were also mentioned as contributing towards feelings of responsibility (see Table 16), for example;

> Because at the end of the day I have responsibility for myself. Changes can happen in an organisation, but I can still choose to either remain or leave if those changes are not suitable to the type of work I want to do.

Some respondents commented that being self-directed and taking responsibility for ones' career contributed toward feelings of career responsibility, showing how the elements of career success interact. Almost half of psychologists (45%) described the different ways they were responsible, such as making the most of opportunities, engaging in professional development, and working hard, for example; "I have a personal responsibility to continually work to upskill myself and take advantage of opportunities." Four respondents commented that although there may be structural barriers to steering ones' career in the direction they desire, essentially it is the person themselves who takes responsibility for their career. Respondents also mentioned the importance of adaptability, with one person commenting;

> I have control and choice in my life even if I need to sometimes be flexible, [and] adapt to change that I don't greatly agree with. No matter what changes occur I can still get considerable job satisfaction from the work I do.

Table 16

Question 23: Student and psychologist responses

Theme	N	%	Example

Responsibility	18	38.3	“Because I am responsible for my own professional development and career path”
Self-direction	14	29.7	“It’s based on the choices and decisions I make”
Ability to work hard	5	10.6	“I will be successful if I work hard, foster positive relationships, continue to upskill”
Having appropriate knowledge	3	6.4	“No one knows me better than I do”
Adaptability	3	6.4	“Need to seize opportunities and plan for future steps”
Having goals	2	4.3	“I have goals and plans to achieve them”
Unsure	2	4.3	“Working for a govt department you are not always necessarily able to achieve the desired outcomes given funding and time restraints that are not conducive to ‘success’”
Total	47	100	

Feelings about career success (values-driven attitude).

In the section on values driven attitude, the follow up question was “You have indicated that what is most important to you is how you feel about your career success, not how others feel. Why is that?” Responses included accepting the fact that everyone measures success differently, being guided by values and self-knowledge, and putting ones’ own happiness, confidence, and satisfaction first (see Table 17). Respondents also mentioned that they felt successful in their work because they are helping others, with one student commenting;

> I have mapped out a life plan. This involves seven very important specific life goals for me. Only one is related to my career which is that I am doing work that challenges me intellectually, am able to be creative, and am able to help others. It is important that I am able to do this in my everyday working life, compared to things others think are important.

Another student highlighted the importance of intrinsic rather than extrinsic measures of success; “I want a career that I enjoy, that challenges me to be a better person and that makes a positive difference in this world. Other people might think money and status are important but these things don't matter to me.” One psychologist highlighted the importance of having their own career under control, saying “We are all expendable and replaceable - I am a work unit to my employer whereas to me, my career is personal, it’s a large part of my life.” Another noted “I try to measure how well I do based on meeting my own goals, whether I did better than last time. Everyone has their own talents and strengths so it would be disheartening to compare myself to others.”

Table 17

Question 35: Student and psychologist responses

Theme	N	%	Example
My own values	10	28.6	“I want a career that I enjoy, that challenges me to be a better person and that makes a positive difference in this world”
Everyone is different	6	17.1	“Because everyone is different, and what others might perceive as not enough of a career success might be just perfect for me”
My own happiness	6	17.1	“My career is an important part of my own happiness. I can’t let

			that depend on what other people feel about it”
My own satisfaction	4	11.4	“Because I primarily value my own judgement, and degree of satisfaction I get from my job”
I am responsible for myself	3	8.6	“I’m responsible for myself, not for the viewpoints others may have”
Knowing myself	2	5.7	“Core competencies show that we must know ourselves”
People don’t understand my work anyway	1	2.9	“Many people do not understand my training so don’t understand my career progression”
My own confidence	1	2.9	“If I am confident about what I am doing and believe in it, then I am happy”
Age/experience	1	2.9	“I’m too old to be concerned about what others think of my career success!”
Unsure	1	2.9	“It’s difficult to answer this question because I’m only just starting out again after re-training as an ed psych after previously being a teacher”
Total	35	100	

Career Plans

This question asked respondents to give information about their two, five, and 10 year career plans. The majority of students were focused on finishing study and gaining registration as a psychologist, then gaining work experience (see Table 18). For example; “Short term (2 yr): Complete study and register to be [an] educational psychologist. Medium (5 yr): Work within the Ministry of Education. Long (10 yr): Be working with something to do with education policies.” Respondents often described staying in their current position as a

short-term plan and then either studying, changing employer, working overseas, moving into private practice, changing to a leadership role or working part time. Many answers included a mixture of all possible combinations, for example;

> Short term – remain in the Ministry of Education behaviour team to develop and solidify how I wish to practice. Medium term – travel to different countries to work as a psychologist and learn about different systems and how practice looks in different contexts. Long term – return to the Ministry of Education, [put] learning into practice, contribute to policy, and complete research while working in the field.

Twenty-five per cent of students and 23 per cent of psychologists commented that they would like to go into private practice at some point in the future, sometimes involving a gradual shift, for example; "I have been in practice 2.5 years and my five year plan is to work partially in private practice and partially as an employee."

Table 18

Respondents' career plans

Theme	N	%
Retire or no plan	15	27.27
Example: *"Five year plan intend on retiring when 60 yrs of age"*		
Finish study>gain registration>work (private practice/employee/policy) or study something else	14	25.45
Example *"I am hoping to complete my degree in Educational Psychology then work as an Educational Psychologist for the Ministry of Education in the short term. I plan to build up my knowledge and experience, and look to do a PhD in the Medium term. In the long term, I aim to work privately, hopefully operating my own consultancy business specialising in gifted and talented children."*		
Continue working>work part time/ different work/study	10	18.18

Example *"Short term – Stay where I am and gain experience. Medium term – pregnancy, maternity leave and finding a job that will allow me to work part time (I would be happy to stay at the Ministry of Education). Long term – Not set, though I don't see myself staying with the Ministry for another 10 years"*		
Continue working>private practice or study	10	18.18
Example *"short: stay with Moe to consolidate learning. 5 yr: be part of a private practice or private sector. 10 yr: own a practice, PhD possibly"*		
Continue working>management or leadership	4	7.27
Example *"…2-5 year career plan is to continue in a management role, but move into more clinical mgmt., eg., managing a team of psychologists"*		
Continue working>go overseas or into private practice	3	5.45
Example *"Short-term plan: to continue in current job, perhaps take on some private work on the side…long-term plan: potentially spend some time practicing overseas, maybe return to NZ to do some private practice…"*		
Total	55	100

Summary of Results

Boundaryless and protean attitudes were endorsed by the respondents, as well as career adaptability. Students and psychologists had similar scores on all measures, except for the Support section of the adaptability measure, which indicated that psychologists feel less perceived support than students. Psychologists working at the Ministry gained a lower mean score for boundaryless attitudes than psychologists working outside the Ministry, as well as a lower score for Career Agency on the adaptability measure. The qualitative data gave an indication of respondents' career plans, the reasons they enjoy working with others, why they feel responsible for their career success, and why they do not focus on how others perceive their career.

Chapter 6

Discussion

This chapter includes a brief summary of the study, summary of the main findings, discussion of the findings, strengths and limitations, and recommendations for future research.

The problem addressed in this study is that we know very little about the ways educational psychologists conceptualise their careers even though contemporary career literature indicates that there has been a shift in the way people are conceptualising their careers, in response to a rapidly changing world affected by globalisation, advanced technology, and volatile worldwide economies. Researchers have identified two kinds of career attitudes; protean and boundaryless. Studies involving students have been undertaken, but there is little research on the career attitudes of those in educational psychology, especially in New Zealand. New thinking about career attitudes may be especially relevant to graduate students as many University-educated workers are said to find themselves part of a high-skill, low-wage labour force. The aim of this study was to investigate whether New Zealand educational psychology students and professionals hold boundaryless and/or protean attitudes about career, and whether they show behaviours associated with adaptability. Quantitative and qualitative questions were used to gain information about respondents' career plans and attitudes. An online survey was used to collect these data. The quantitative responses were analysed using SPSS version 23 and the qualitative responses were coded according to emerging themes.

Research Question 1: To What Extent do Postgraduate Educational Psychology Students and Educational Psychology Professionals hold Boundaryless and/or Protean Career Attitudes?

Boundaryless attitudes.

The results of the survey show that boundaryless attitudes and a preference for mobility were evident among both educational psychology students and educational psychologists. Gaining new perspectives and learning from others were mentioned in almost 60 per cent of open-ended responses for why respondents enjoyed working with people from outside their organisation. A significant difference was found between psychologists from the Ministry of Education and other workplaces, with Ministry of Education psychologists endorsing boundaryless items less strongly. Late-career psychologists appeared to identify slightly more with the boundaryless mindset than early-career psychologists, where the difference was approaching significance.

The results of quantitative and qualitative questions associated with a boundaryless mindset and mobility preference indicate that this group of students and psychologists held boundaryless career attitudes. Arthur and Rousseau (1996) outline six emphases in which the meaning of the boundaryless career lies. A career agent enacting a boundaryless career may:

1) Move across boundaries of different employers
2) Draw marketability and validation from outside the present employer
3) Sustain their career by external networks or information
4) Break organisational career boundaries
5) Reject current work opportunities for personal or family reasons, or

6) Believe they have a boundaryless future despite the existence of structural constraints.

In terms of career plans, respondents appeared to enact many of these aspects of the boundaryless career. They commented about switching to work for different providers of psychological services, intending to work part time in private practice as well as for an organisation, collaborating with colleagues to start new businesses, prioritising part-time work for family reasons, and accepting that there will be structural changes in the services they provide. Change was noted as an important factor in modern careers by the participants in Walton and Mallon's (2004) study; however their responses focussed more on the perceived short-term nature of employment relationships rather than the acceptance of structural changes in stable roles. Respondents in the current study noted that modifications to service delivery will affect career planning, for example the comment;

> I see myself remaining in a front line psychologist role…There is likely to be considerable change in the way we work with the Vulnerable Children's Act and the Special Education update, so I'm waiting to see what may happen before I make any firm plans about where I might like to be in even 2 years.

As discussed by Walton and Mallon (2004), organisations are moving away from using large hierarchies relying on career planning and succession, and attention is shifting to the meanings that individuals find in their career. Interestingly, many of the psychologist respondents in this study are employed by the Ministry of Education, which does have a ladder system in place for career progression; however, these respondents were just as likely as others to mention engaging in future activities which were not associated with their current employer (such as switching to private practice). This may relate to Peiperl and

Baruch's (1997) description of a 'Post-corporate career' in which traditional hierarchies and innovative new ventures combine, resulting in higher levels of career related flexibility and complexity. Attitudes associated with this concept were evident in the responses, in statements about career plans such as;

> Short term plan: to continue in current job, perhaps take on some private work on the side. Medium-term plan: some private practice work, might be part-time with family commitments, otherwise [I] will be looking to move to a different position (likely Ministry of Education or a private provider). Long-term plan: potentially spend some time practising overseas, maybe return to NZ to do some private practice and some part-time employed work.

One aspect that may set this sample group apart from other studies is that secure employment is available to many of them, however they still hold boundaryless attitudes and engage in associated behaviours such as seeking opportunities that allow them to work outside of the organisation. This is consistent with the idea that a boundaryless career may include meaning being gained from outside the employer through external networks or information (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996), and can be seen in several answers where respondents mentioned working for more than one employer at the same time. For example; "I have been in practice for 2.5 years and my five year plan is to work partially in private practice and partially as an employee." This is also consistent with Arthur and Rousseau's (1996) emphasis on careers which unfold beyond a single employment setting.

The observed significant difference in boundaryless mindset between Ministry of Education and other psychologists could relate to how respondents associated the questions with their current employment setting. The items on the boundaryless factor

relate to working with people from outside the organisation, engaging in tasks beyond ones' own department or organisation, how energised one feels about experiencing new situations, and whether they seek job assignments that allow for new learning. None of the participants said they disliked working with people from outside of their organisation, with Ministry of Education psychologists commenting that they enjoy the diversity of perspectives, multidisciplinary approaches, opportunities for learning, and engagement in collaboration that is associated with working with others. The lowest endorsed item on this factor was "I like tasks at work that require me to work beyond my department." Considering that there were no respondents from other government agencies, the Ministry of Education psychologists are placed in a substantially different employment setting to the others (private practice or various NGOs) in terms of organisation size and function of departments. The lower observed score on this factor may be explained by how the Ministry of Education psychologists feel about the nature of government employment rather than engaging in clinical work with colleagues and clients. Support for this theory comes from Jimerson et al.'s (2009) survey of educational psychologists, which indicates that the least preferred work tasks of this group includes administration duties associated with politically driven decision making.

Protean attitude.

The results of the survey showed that there was strong support for protean attitudes toward career. A protean attitude involves driving one's own career, having individually created goals encompassing all areas of life, and being motivated by psychological success rather than external markers of accomplishment. This attitude was evident, and was measured using scales related to self-directed and values-driven attitudes. There were no

significant differences between students and psychologists, psychologists from different workplaces, and early and late-career psychologists. Feelings of self-direction and responsibility were mentioned as reasons why respondents felt responsible for success or failure in their career. Respondents felt that accepting that everyone is different and understanding their own values influences why they are not concerned about how others feel about their career.

An understanding of how the protean career attitude presents itself was explored through quantitative and qualitative questions, with respondents reporting feelings and behaviours associated with self-directed career management. The protean career concept has been described as being driven by the individual rather than the organisation, involving individually created goals which involve ones' whole life, and finding motivation through psychological success rather than external markers of accomplishment (Hall, 1996; Hall & Moss, 1998; & Mirvis & Hall, 1996).

The present results were similar to those reported by Sargent and Domberger (2007), in that respondents felt that their career path was determined by their own actions and that they are responsible for success or failure in their career. Some respondents mentioned self-direction itself, in statements such as; "Self-direction, ultimately I am responsible for my career, decisions to do with where I am working, what I am doing." Others mentioned attitudes or activities related to self-direction, such as "I believe that it is important to be constructive in carving our own career pathways and believe that I have the ability to move forward in any direction I choose". The results were consistent with the explanation of the protean career as a career form in which the individual rather than the organisation takes responsibility for transforming the career path.

The results also showed evidence of values-driven attitudes, consistent with conceptualisations of the protean career. These values appeared to be important for respondents, and as theory suggests, were given more importance than extrinsic factors (Hall, 2004). Similar to Sargent and Domerger's (2007) research, respondents commented that it was important for them to do work that makes a social contribution; however this is not surprising considering that the sample consisted of students and professionals from a helping profession. The significance of personal values which drive the respondents' careers can be seen through statements such as "My values are extremely important to me and so I seek reward from never sacrificing my core values for doing this job rather than moulding myself to the organisation's perception of 'career success'." A combination of boundaryless and protean attitudes was also evident, for example in the response;

> If I feel unhappy based on limitations or policy I feel uncomfortable with in my current workplace then I would rather leave, and seek opportunities that fit with my philosophies (rather than work within constraints that I feel jeopardise what is fair and right).

The respondent alludes to protean attitudes (driving ones' career independently according to personal values), which lead to boundaryless behaviours (moving across organisational boundaries to find a better fit).

Many respondents held protean views about career success, for example;

> Other people are not privy to my goals. What I deem as success may not be the same as how another person may see my success, we each see things from a different perspective based on our values, beliefs and attitudes.

Similar to Walton and Mallon's (2004) study, respondents commented that enjoyment was an integral part of how they view career success. One person commented;

> I want a career that I enjoy, that challenges me to be a better person and that makes a positive difference in this world. Other people might think money and status are important but these things don't matter to me.

Also similar to Walton and Mellon's (2004) research, personal development was described as being important to the respondents in this study. Personal development is central in managing a subjective career, as it relates to how people make meaning of their work. It involves having objectives and plans, but is also associated with the thoughts and feelings respondents hold about their working lives. For example, in response to the question about career plans, one person wrote;

> I have often chosen unusual career pathways which have been strongly questioned such as working in the RTLB service rather than for MoE. I have experienced both success professionally and personally through making this kind of choice.

The interaction of protean and boundaryless attitudes.

The results for protean and boundaryless responses were analysed as to whether participants fitted into Briscoe and Hall's (2006) eight career profiles. Of the participants who could be placed into the eight profiles, 11/35 (35%) fitted the 'wanderer' profile, making it the most common category. This profile represents people who are very boundaryless physically, but not so psychologically, as they are lower on the protean dimensions. Briscoe and Hall (2006) suggest that the 'wanderer' is open to whatever opportunities arise for them, and they do not see geographical or organisational boundaries

as barriers. The limitation for people of this profile is that their psychological appreciation across boundaries is not as sophisticated as their ability to be physically mobile. Because they do not truly use self-direction in their career management, they are controlled by opportunities instead of directing them. Briscoe and Hall (2006) suggest that the challenge for these people is to become attuned to their core values and define priorities more clearly, so that they can make thoughtful boundary-crossing decisions. The high number of respondents fitting into this category may relate to the fact that the sample was made up of students and a high proportion of early-career psychologists. This group may still be exploring their physical boundaries, as they work towards becoming more self-directed.

An equal number of participants fell into the 'lost/trapped' and 'protean career architect' categories, with five people fitting each profile. People who fit the 'lost/trapped' profile were low on all four protean and boundaryless career dimensions. Briscoe and Hall (2006) suggest that people fitting this profile are trapped or lost because they lack emphasis on inner values which could direct their behaviour, and boundaryless perspectives which could uncover new possibilities. People in this situation tend to be reactive instead of proactive, and their success – in terms of survival or better – depends more on luck than anything within their control. They may benefit from basic career development processes such as value clarification and career exploration activities. At the other extreme, the 'protean career architect' is thought to be psychologically and physically boundaryless, actively directing their own career management and being driven by personal values. Briscoe and Hall (2006) suggest that the challenge for someone of this profile is in deciding where to apply their ability so they can have the most impact on the world. However, Briscoe and Hall (2006) propose that in reality, this career perspective does not apply to many people.

Four respondents fit the profile of the ‘organisation man/woman’, which refers to people who are able to successfully take charge of career management, but who are not clear about their own values (Briscoe & Hall, 2006). These people work well across psychological boundaries but are less willing to work across physical boundaries, meaning that they may match their needs to those of the organisation. The ‘organisation man/woman’ may find success in fulfilling the goals of their employer, but never reach greater potential because their own values are less defined. These people may need to be forced out of their comfort zone, in order to engage in reflection and clarify their values.

Three respondents fit the ‘hired-gun/hired-hand’ profile, representing people who may work across physical and psychological boundaries, but are not values-driven. Briscoe and Hall (2006) used this label to describe people who are mobile and adaptive in career management, but not skilled in defining their own values; “Their gun or hand is for hire, but not their heart” (p. 14).

Two respondents fit the ‘idealist’ profile. This label describes people who are psychologically boundaryless and values-driven, but who are not as effective in physical boundary-crossing or career self-management. The challenge for these people is to leave their comfort zone, manage their own career, and immerse themselves in opportunities for physical boundary-crossing.

One person fit the ‘solid citizen’ profile, describing people who are self-directed, values-driven, and psychologically boundaryless, but not physically boundaryless. Briscoe and Hall (2006) suggest that many career actors may find themselves in this situation of being able and willing to embrace more opportunities, but not able to engage in them for any number of reasons.

No respondents in the current study fit with the 'fortressed' profile, which represents people who understand their personal values, but are inflexible in directing their career and unable to recognise opportunities across physical and psychological boundaries.

Research Question 2: To What Extent do Postgraduate Educational Psychology Students and Professionals Endorse Career Adaptability?

Career plans.

The results showed that the majority of students were focused on finishing study and gaining registration as a psychologist, then gaining work experience. Eleven per cent of respondents planned on continuing in their current position in the long term. Thirty-two per cent planned on staying in their current position and then either studying, changing employer, working overseas, moving into private practice, changing to a leadership role or working part time. Twenty-five per cent of students and 23 per cent of psychologists commented that they would like to go into private practice at some point in the future.

Adaptability.

The results showed that all factors associated with adaptability were endorsed (Career Agency, Career Outlook, Occupational Awareness, Support, and Work-Life Balance), with Career Agency gaining the highest mean score. A significant difference was found between students and psychologists on the Support factor of the adaptability scale, with students indicating higher levels of perceived support than psychologists. Both students and psychologists endorsed the Career Awareness items less than the other items.

Adaptability refers to "the quality of being able to change, without great difficulty, to fit new or changed circumstances" (Savickas, 1991, p. 254). Planning and decision making

are thought to be the main elements of career adaptability, which allow individuals to understand the vocational and educational decisions available to them, and use new knowledge and self-efficacy to adapt to change through making choices (Herman, 2001). Planfulness has been a key component of career theory for decades, as it is important for individuals to understand the life roles available in their environments and to prepare for them (Savickas, 1997).

The results showed that the Career Agency factor gained the highest mean scores for students and psychologists on the adaptability section of the current survey. The items focused on being able to adapt; being aware of interests, priorities, values, and strengths; being able to establish and manage plans; and overcoming barriers that may arise. Many respondents commented on the possible future positions they could hold, and the possible paths to get there. For example, one student commented;

> I am hoping to complete my degree in Educational Psychology, and then work as an educational psychologist for the Ministry of Education in the short term. I plan to build up my knowledge and experience, and look to do a PhD in the medium term. In the long term, I aim to work privately, hopefully operating my own consultancy business specialising in gifted and talented children. I would also like to partake in research.

This shows an understanding of possible career trajectories and areas of interest which can guide future decision making.

The results showed strong levels of career decision making in responses that mentioned how possible structural changes could affect professionals' careers. For example, one psychologist said;

> 2 year plan: Will have worked in current MoE Special Ed team for two years. 5 year plan: Hoping to change from school focus work to early intervention work as I enjoy working with young children. However, the Special Education Update may change our work from separate teams to working with children aged 0-21. So I'm uncertain what this will mean for my career goals/practice. 10 Year plan: I would like to become a practice advisor and/OR do my PHD.

Some respondents discussed adaptability directly, accepting that it is a necessary quality in their chosen field;

> I have control and choice in my life even if I need to sometimes be flexible, adapt to change that I don’t greatly agree with. No matter what changes may occur I can still get considerable job satisfaction from the work I do.

As discussed by van Vianen, De Pater, and Preenan (2009) decisions regarding one's career and vocation usually have to be made under conditions of great uncertainty. This is especially true for the Masters students in this sample, as entry to the final year of the Educational Psychology qualification is restricted and highly competitive. Interestingly, in comparing scores across factors (students and psychologists separately), it can be seen that the highest score is for students’ measures of adaptability. This finding is in contrast to research by van Vianen et al. (2009), which suggests that contemporary university graduates do not have the skills or readiness to cope in a changing environment. However, this dissimilarity may be explained by sample differences, as Vianen et al.’s (2009) sample was made up of young adults with little work experience. The students in the current study often have experience in the world of work, as entry to the Masters programme requires an undergraduate degree in Education, Educational Psychology, Psychology, or Teaching.

A significant difference was found between students and psychologists on the Support factor of the adaptability scale, with students indicating higher levels of perceived support than psychologists. Social support involves a person feeling valued, cared for, and esteemed by others in their social network, and may include formal or informal emotional, informational, or instrumental assistance from others to cope with challenges (Rottinghaus, et al., 2012). The observed difference could be related to the age and career stage of respondents, if students were younger than psychologists and still receiving support of different kinds from their families. Research shows that parents and teachers play an important role in shaping tertiary students' positive expectancies about success in their chosen course (Garcia, Restubog, Bordia, Bordia & Roxas, 2015). As they leave the academic environment and receive less input from parents, professionals may feel less support from their social networks as they get older and have families of their own. However, age information was not collected so it is difficult to explain this difference.

Limitations

This study provides useful data about New Zealand educational psychology students' and professionals' attitudes towards career in relation to boundaryless and protean concepts, and adaptability. However, given the lack of previous empirical study on these topics, there are limitations related to the type and size of sample and the design of the study. These limitations will be discussed.

One limitation is sample size. It is difficult to generalise the results to all educational psychology students. Only twenty-two students responded, with the majority attending University A; University B students may have different attitudes which were not represented in this study. Practicing psychologists were invited to participate through the Educational

Psychology Forum, which includes educational psychologists in its membership, through email invitation to graduates from University A, and through two email invitations sent to psychologists in one NZ city. This may have led to a larger number of psychologist respondents from that city, however this is not clear because location information was not collected. Psychologists in different parts of the country may have varying career attitudes depending their particular job situation and location.

There are also limitations related to the design of the study. This study is mainly exploratory. The survey used two previously developed measures, and added qualitative follow-up questions to some items. Validity and reliability of the current survey was not calculated, however the protean and boundaryless items were validated by Briscoe et al. (2006), and the adaptability measure was validated by Rottinghaus et al. (2012).

Another limitation is that only people who agreed with statements were asked to provide follow-up commentary about their response, meaning that it was not clear why some respondents did not agree with some items.

Future research

This study focussed on the career attitudes of psychology students and professionals; it would be interesting to discover whether this group differs from students and professionals from other disciplines and from larger sections of the population. As argued by Pringle and Mallon (2003), much of the empirical research into boundaryless careers has been applied to a limited sample of people from a narrow range of occupations, such as the Silicon valley IT industry (Littleton, Arthur, & Rousseau, 2000) or the biotechnology industry (Gunz, Evans, & Jalland, 2000). However for theory to develop, research must include people who have not been included in traditional career theories, as

boundaryless and protean career concepts will play out differently in non-Western and non-Anglo cultures (Briscoe & Hall, 2006). Future research into the career attitudes of psychology students and professionals specifically should include a large sample of respondents from across New Zealand or from other countries.

Conclusions

This study investigated the boundaryless and protean career perceptions of educational psychology students and professionals. It also investigated their attitudes toward career adaptability.

As discussed by Granrose and Baccili (2006), the psychological contract between employers and employees has changed over time. In the past, employers provided job security in exchange for loyalty. This was the traditional career. In recent times however, a new conception of career has emerged in which the employer provides an opportunity to develop career competencies but the individual does not expect any long-term commitment from the employer in terms of job security. The literature often describes an extreme version of this new landscape, where long-term contracts are rare and career movement is constant, but the results of this study were that many respondents held boundaryless and protean attitudes, even when job security existed. The results of the study indicated that independent career management was important to this sample of students and career psychologists, as they determine what success means to them and how they can achieve it.

The quantitative data indicated that educational psychology students and professionals held boundaryless and protean attitudes. Answers to the qualitative questions expanded on these results, identifying the many ways respondents planned on enacting their boundaryless attitudes. Switching between employers, working in private practice as

well as for an organisation, starting new businesses, prioritising personal lives, and accepting change were mentioned as some of the possible future career paths that respondents may take. These behaviours were influenced by their protean career perceptions, in which respondents prioritised how they feel about their career and experienced feelings of responsibility for career success. Respondents appeared to understand the organisational opportunities available to them, while still navigating their careers independently. This supports Baruch's (2006) suggestion that the protean career represents a contract with oneself, rather than between a person and their employer. The observed results can also be related to Peiperl and Baruch's (1997) 'Post-corporate career' concept, which describes how the general career system has changed to include both traditional hierarchies and innovative new endeavours. Baruch (2006) proposes that as a result of this shift, there is now a higher level of career related complexity and flexibility. To be able to succeed in this environment, adaptability is essential.

Results of the current study indicate that students and professionals agreed with the need for career adaptability, so as to engage in planning and decision making behaviours which allow them to respond to change. Several respondents mentioned specific changes that will affect their careers directly, relating to educational policy updates; others described their goals and the changes that will be necessary to achieve them. As discussed by Zhang (2010), Savickas' (1997) theory of career adaptability co-exists with boundaryless and protean career concepts which consider adaptability as one of the main dimensions in new career attitudes. Hall (2002) defined adaptability as a meta-competency in the protean career construct, supporting Savickas' (1997) definition of adaptability as involving mastery of different roles in developmental tasks. Savickas (1997) suggests that career adaptability emphasises exploration of self and environment, so that a full understanding can be

reached before decisions are made about where one fits best. This relates to the boundaryless career attitude, in which importance is placed on gaining new information and experience in order to realise one's own identity and personal values (Zhang, 2010).

Organisations that employ educational psychology graduates and professionals may need to be aware of the new career concepts they hold, as well as their endorsement of adaptability behaviours. This could mean offering more opportunities for autonomy and career development, in order to retain workers with more boundaryless and protean career attitudes. It may be beneficial for respondents in the current study to enhance their skills relating to Career Awareness, in order to make the most of the opportunities available to them.

In conclusion, the results of this study suggest that this group of educational psychology students and psychologists are oriented toward learning and exploration, while also understanding the importance of being able to adapt to change. While they may eventually find themselves on diverse career paths, holding on to these new career concepts will support them to succeed in the constantly evolving world of work.

References

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

Arthur, M. B., Inkson, K., & Pringle, J. K. (1999). *The new careers: Individual action and economic change*. London, United Kingdom: Sage.

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*(3), 472-491. doi:10.5465/AMR.2000.3363315

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Baruch, Y. (2006). Career development in organisations and beyond: Balancing traditional and contemporary viewpoints. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*,(2) 125 - 138.

Baruch, Y., Bell, M., & Gray, D. (2005). Generalist andspecialist graduate business degrees: Tangible and intangible value. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*(1), 51 - 68.

Baruch, Y, & Quick, J. (2007). Understanding second careers: Lessons from a study of U.S. navy martials. Human Resource Management, 46(4), 471 – 491.

Benes, S. S., & Mazerolle, S. M. (2014). Factors influencing athletic training students' perceptions of the athletic training profession and career choice. *Athletic Training Education Journal, 9*(3), 104 - 112.

Borges, N. J., Savickas, M. L., & Jones, B. J. (2004). Holland's theory applied to medical specialty choice. *Journal of Career Assessment, 12*(2), 188 - 206.

Bourke, R., & Dharan, V. (2015). Assessment practices of educational psychologists in Aotearoa/New Zealand: From diagnostic to dialogic ways of working. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 31*(4), 369-381.

Bradley, H., & Devadason, R. (2008). Fractured transitions: Young adults' pathways into contemporary labour markets. *Sociology 42*(1), 119 – 136.

Bridgstock, R. (2005). Australian artists, starving and well-nourished: What can we learn from the prototypical protean career? *Australian Journal of Career Development, 14(3)*, 40 – 48.

Briscoe, J., Hall, D. T., & Frautschy DeMuth, R. (2006). Protean and boundaryless careers: An empirical exploration. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 69*(1), 30 – 47.

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.

Brown, P., Lauder, H., & Ashton, D. N. (2011). *The global auction: The broken promises of education, jobs and incomes*: New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Buchner, T. (2007). Performance management theory: A look from the performer's perspective with implications for HRD. *Human Resource Development International, 10*(1), 59-73. doi:10.1080/13678860601170294

Busemeyer, M. (2012). On Phillip Brown, Hugh Lauder and David Ashton's the global auction: The broken promises of education, jobs, and incomes. *Socio-Economic Review, 10*(4), 779-793. doi:10.1093/ser/mws005

Cappelli, P. (1999). Career jobs are dead. *California Management Review, 42*(1), 146 - 167.

Cappelli, P. (2001). The national employer survey: Employer data on employment practices. *Industrial Relations, 40*(4), 635.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1981). *Attention and self-regulation: A control-theory approach to human behavior*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Cassin, S. E., Singer, A. R., Dobson, K. S., & Altmaier, E. M. (2007). Professional interests and career aspirations of graduate students in professional psychology: An exploratory survey. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 1*(1), 26-37. doi:10.1037/1931-3918.1.1.26

Coleman, P., & Pine, T. (2010). The professional practice of educational psychology in New Zealand: Participant perspectives. *Psychology Aotearoa 2*(1), 20 – 25.

Cortini, M., Tanucci, G., & Morin, E. (2011). Introduction. In M. Cortini, G. Tanucci, & E. Morin (Eds.), *Boundaryless careers and occupational well-being* (pp. 1 – 7). Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Palgrave MacMillan.

Chiaburu, D., Baker, V., & Pitariu, A. (2006). Beyong being proactive: What (else) matters for career self-management behaviours? *Career Development International, 11*(7), 619 – 632.

Cohen, J. (1977). Eta squared and partial eta squared in fixed factor designs. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 33*, 107 – 112.

Couper, M. (2008). Technology trends in survey data collection. *Social Science Computer Review, 23*(4), 486 - 501.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 19*(2), 109–34. doi: 10.1016/0092-6566(85)90023-6

De Vos, A., & Meganck, A. (2009). What HR managers do versus what employees value: Exploring both parties' views on retention management from a psychological contract perspective. *Personnel Review, 38*(1), 45-60.

De Vos, 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

DeFillippi, R., & Arthur, M. (1994). The boundaryless career: A competency-based perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 15*(4), 307 - 324.

Diemer, M., & Blustein, D. (2007). Vocational hope and vocational identity: Urban adolescents' career development. *Journal of Career Assessment, 15*(1), 98.

DiRenzo, M. S. (2010). *An examination of the roles of protean career orientation and career capital on work and life outcomes.* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA.

Duffy, R. D. (2010). Sense of control and career adaptability among undergraduate students. *Journal of Career Assessment, 18*(4), 420-430.

Dupuis, A., Inkson, K., & McLaren, E. (2005). *Pathways to employment: A study of the employment-related behaviour of young people in New Zealand*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Labour Market Dynamics Research Programme.

Ferreira, A. I., Rodrigues, R. I., & da Costa Ferreira, P. (2016). Career interests of students in psychology specialties degrees: Psychometric evidence and correlations with the RIASEC dimensions. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance, 16*(1), 91-111. doi:10.1007/s10775-015-9289-3

Fitzpatrick, S. J., Monda, S. J., & Wooding, C. B. (2015). Great Expectations: Career planning and training experiences of graduate students in sport and exercise psychology. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 28*(1), 14 - 27. doi:10.1080/10413200.2015.1052891

Friedman, T. L. (2007). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*: New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Garcia, P. R. J. M., Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P., Bordia, S., & Roxas, R. E. O. (2015). Career optimism: The roles of contextual support and career decision-making self-efficacy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 88*, 10-18. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2015.02.004

Granrose, C. S., & Baccili, P. A. (2006). Do psychological contracts include boundaryless or protean careers? *The Career Development International, 11*(2), 163-182. doi:10.1108/13620430610651903

Greenhaus, J. H., Callanan, G. A., & DiRenzo, M. S. (2008). A boundaryless perspective on careers. In L. Cooper & J. Barling (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 277 - 299). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gunz, H., Evans, M., & Jalland, M. (2000). Career boundaries in a 'boundaryless' world. In M. Pieperl, M. Arthur, R. Goffee, & T. Morris (Eds.), *Career frontiers: New conceptions of working lives* (pp. 24 – 54). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Guruz, K. (2008). *Higher education and international student mobility in the global knowledge economy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

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

Hall, D. T. (1976). *Careers in organizations*: Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.

Hall, D. T. (1996). Protean Careers of the 21st Century. *The Academy of Management Executive 10*(4), 8 – 16.

Hall, D. T. (2002). *Careers in and out of organisations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, D. T. (2004). The protean career: A quarter-century journey. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*(1), 1-13. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2003.10.006

Hall, D. T., & Chandler, D. E. (2005). Psychological success: When the career is a calling. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 26*(2), 155-176.

Hall, D. T., & Moss, J. E. (1998). The new protean career contract: Helping organizations and employees adapt. *Organizational Dynamics, 26*(3), 22 - 37.

Herman, R. (2001). Adapting to the adaptables. *Futurist, 35,* 8 - 9.

Hornby, G. (2010). The demise of educational psychology in New Zealand: A personal view. *Psychology Aotearoa 2*(1), 26 – 30.

Horowitz, F. M., Chan Teng, H., & Quazi, H. A. (2003). Finders, keepers? Attracting, motivating and retaining knowledge workers. *Human Resource Management Journal, 13*(4), 23-44.

Inkson, K. (2006). Protean and boundaryless careers as metaphors. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 69*(1), 48 - 63. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.004

Inkson, K., & Baruch, Y. (2008). Organisational careers. In S. Clegg & C. Copper (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organisational behavoiur*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jimerson, S. R., Annan, J., Skokut, M., & Renshaw, T. L. (2009). Educational Psychology in New Zealand: Results of the 2006 International School Psychology Survey. *School Psychology International, 30*(5), 443-455.

Jones, C. (2002). Signaling expertise: How signals shape careers in creative industries. In M. Peiperl, M. Arthur, & N. Anand (Eds.), *Career Creativity: Explorations in the Remaking of Work* (pp. 209 - 228). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

King, Z. (2003). New or traditional careers? A study of UK graduates' preferences. *Human Resource Management Journal, 13*(1), 5 - 26.

Littleton, S., Arthur, M., & Rousseau, D. (2000). The future of boundaryless careers. In A. Collin & R. Young (Eds.), *The future of careers* (pp. 101 – 115). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

London, M. (1993). Relationships between career motivation, empowerment and support for career development. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 66*(1), 55-69.

Mirvis, P., & Hall, D. T. (1994). Psychological success and the boundaryless career. In D. Rousseau & B. Arthur (Eds.), *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organisational era*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mirvis, P., & Hall, D. (1996). Psychological success and the boundaryless career. In M. Arthur & D. Rousseau (Eds.), *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organisational era* (pp. 237 - 255). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Oblinger, D., & Verville, A. (1998). *What business wants from higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students*: San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Peiperl, M., & Baruch, Y. (1997). Back to square zero: The post-corporate career. *Organizational Dynamics, 25*(4), 6-22.

Pringle, J. K., & Mallon, M. (2003). Challenges for the boundaryless career odyssey. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 14*(5), 839-853. doi:10.1080/0958519032000080839

Punch, K. (2014). *Introduction to social research : quantitative & qualitative approaches*: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Richardson, M. (2000). A new perspective for counsellors: From career ideologies to empowerment through work and relationship practices. In A. Collin & R. Young (Eds.), *The future of career* (197 – 212). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rottinghaus, P. J., Buelow, K. L., Matyja, A., & Schneider, M. R. (2012). The career futures inventory-revised: Measuring dimensions of career adaptability. *Journal of Career Assessment, 20*(2), 123-139.

Rottinghaus, P. J., Day, S. X., & Borgen, F. H. (2005). The career futures inventory: A measure of career-related adaptability and optimism. *Journal of Career Assessment, 13*(1), 3-24.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Savickas, M. (1984). Career maturity: The construct and its appraisal. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 32*(4), 222 - 231.

Savickas, M. (1991). Career time perspective. In D. Brown & L. Brooks (Eds.), *Career conselling techniques*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Savickas, M. L. (1997). Career adaptability: An integrative construct for life-span, life-space theory. *Career Development Quarterly, 45*(3), 247-259.

Savickas, M. (2005). The theory and practice of career construction. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent, (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (pp. 149 - 205). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Saxenian, A. (1996). *Regional advantage: Culture and competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*: Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press.

Sharf, R. S. (2013). *Applying career development theory to counseling*: Victoria, Australia: Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning.

Siebert, S., Daudelin, M., & Kraimer, M. (1999). *The role of reflection in managerial learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Quorum.

Skilton, P. F., & Bravo, J. (2008). Do social capital and project type vary across career paths in project-based work?: The case of hollywood personal assistants. *Career Development International, 13*(5), 381-401.

Smith, B., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioural Medicine, 15*(3), 194 – 200.

Stoltz, K. B., Wolff, L. A., Monroe, A. E., Mazahreh, L. G., & Farris, H. R. (2013). Adaptability in the work life task: Lifestyle, stress coping, and protean/boundaryless career attitudes. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 69*(1), 66-83.

Stumpf, S., Colarelli, S., & Hartman, K. (1983). Development of the career exploration survey (CES). *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 22*(2), 191 – 226.

Sturges, J., Guest, D., & Davey, K. (2000). Who's in charge? Graduates' attitudes to and experiences of career management, organisational commitment, and work behaviour. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 26*(7), 821 – 838.

Sturges, J. (2008). All in a day's work? Career self-management and the management of the boundary between work and non-work. *Human Resource Management Journal, 18*(2), 118-134. doi:10.1111/j.1748-8583.2007.00054.x

Sullivan, S. E. (1999). The changing nature of careers: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 25*(3), 457-483.

Sullivan, S. E., & Arthur, M. B. (2006). The evolution of the boundaryless career concept: Examining physical and psychological mobility. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*(1), 19-29.

Tiechler, U. (2007). *Careers of university graduates: Views and experiences in comparative perspectives* [electronic resource]. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

van Vianen, A. E. M., De Pater, I. E., & Preenan, P. T. Y. (2009). Adaptable careers: Maximizing less and exploring more. *Career Development Quarterly, 57*(4), 298-309. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.2009.tb00115.x

Walton, S., & Mallon, M. (2004). Redefining the boundaries? Making sense of career in contemporary New Zealand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 42*(1), 75 – 95.

Zhang, Y. (2010). *Recent tertiary graduates' career attitudes, career adaptability, and career self-management behaviours: Focus on continuity in a fragmented employment context.* (Master’s Thesis). Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10179/2322.

Appendix A

Complete Questionnaire

Welcome to My Survey

Thank you for participating in the survey. Your feedback is important.

* 1. Are you a student or a psychologist?

* 2. If you are a student, which university do you attend?

* 3. If you are a psychologist, where do you work?

* 4. If you are a psychologist, how many years have you been in your current job?

5. Do you have a 2, 5, and/or 10 year career plan? If so, please provide some indicative commentary about your short (2 yr), medium, (5 yr), and long-term (10 yr) career plans:

The following questions ask about your preferences regarding your work context.

Please indicate your answer by choosing from the options.

* 6. I enjoy working with people outside of my organization

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

7. You have indicated that you enjoy working with people outside of your organization. Why is that?

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 11. I would enjoy working on projects with people from across many organizations

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 13. I am energized in new experiences and situations

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 16. In my ideal career, I would work for only one organization

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 20. I am in charge of my own career

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 22. I am responsible for my success or failure in my career

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

23. You have indicated that you are responsible for your success or failure in my career. Why is that?

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 26. In the past I have relied more upon myself than others to find a new job when necessary

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 29. I'll follow my own guidance if my company asks me to do something that goes against my values

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 33. I navigate my own career, based upon my personal priorities, as opposed to my employer's priorities

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

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

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

35. You have indicated that what is most important to you is how you feel about your career success, not how other people feel. Why is that?

The following questions are about how you feel about yourself in the world of work.

Please indicate your answer by choosing from the options.

* 36. I can adapt to change in the world of work

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 37. I understand my work-related interests

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 38. I am aware of priorities in my life

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 39. I can establish a plan for my future career

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 40. I am aware of my strengths

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 41. I am in control of my career

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 42. I will successfully manage my present career transition process

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 43. I understand my work-related values

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 44. I can overcome potential barriers that may exist in my career

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 45. I doubt my career will turn out well in the future

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 46. It is unlikely that good things will happen in my career

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 47. I lack the energy to pursue my career goals

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 48. Thinking about my career frustrates me

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 49. I am good at understanding job market trends

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 50. I keep up with trends in at least one occupation or industry of interest to me

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 51. I keep current with job market trends

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 52. I keep current with changes in technology

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 53. I understand how economic trends affect career opportunities available to me

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 54. I do not understand job market trends

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 55. My family is there to help me through career challenges

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 56. I receive all the encouragement I need from others to meet my career goals

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 57. Others in my life are very supportive of my career

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 58. Friends are available to offer support in my career transition

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 59. I am good at balancing multiple life roles such as worker, family member, or friend

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 60. I am very strategic when it comes to balancing my work and personal lives

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 61. Balancing work and family responsibilities is manageable

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

* 62. I can easily manage my needs and those of other important people in my life

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

Appendix B

Participant information sheet

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
TE KUPENGA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Perceptions of Career – Educational Psychology Students and Professionals

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

Introduction

My name is Jacqueline Seymour and I would like to invite you to take part in this online survey, carried out as part of the requirements for completion of the Master of Educational Psychology within Massey University. The research involves an online survey of postgraduate Educational Psychology students and psychologists in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The purpose of the research is to gain an understanding of the career perceptions held by this group, in relation to new ideas about career.

Project Description and Invitation

You are invited to complete a 62-item survey. The questions relate to Protean and Boundaryless career attitudes and career adaptability. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Protean attitudes involve value-driven and self-directed orientations toward career management. Personal values such as identity and self-awareness are thought to enable individuals to choose careers which reflect their interests, while being self-directed is useful for finding new career opportunities and transferring values into action.

Boundaryless careers involve engaging in job opportunities which go beyond the boundaries of a single employment setting, meaning that individuals with this attitude move between psychological and/or physical boundaries looking for opportunities and jobs with other organisations, in contrast to the traditional idea of a single employer for life.

Adaptability means being able to change fairly easily to fit new or changed circumstances; it involves having the readiness to cope with preparing for and participating in work, as well as the unpredictable adjustments prompted by changes in work and working conditions.

Research in vocational guidance has made important developments regarding students' interests and decisions when choosing a tertiary course, however there is a lack of studies focusing on the career choices made by students already in higher education. There is also limited empirical research investigating career adaptability, particularly in regard to university graduates. Today's educational psychology graduate students are tomorrow's leaders of the field, and they will play a part in defining the future path of practice, research, and education. Several parties will benefit from research into the career attitudes of this group, including employers of educational psychologists, developers of educational psychology courses, and the graduate students themselves.

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
TE KUPENGA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Consent and Participants' Rights

Using the provided electronic link to access the survey is deemed to imply participant consent to participate in the research.

You are under no obligation to complete this survey. If you decide to participate, you have the right to decline to answer any particular question. Upon receipt, data will be stored on a password protected private computer.

Your participation is greatly appreciated.

TO ACCESS THE SURVEY FOLLOW THIS LINK:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/TBJL6J7

Project Contacts

Researcher contact details: Jacqueline Seymour, email
Telephone

Supervisors' contact details: Tom Nicholson, email
Professor, Education, Massey University, Auckland
Massey University Albany Campus
Telephone

Terence Edwards, email
Senior Professional Clinician in Educational Psychology
Massey University Albany Campus
Telephone

Should you have any questions about this research project, please do not hesitate to contact either myself in the first instance, or my supervisors via the contact details above.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee, Application 4000015409. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Andrew Chrystall, Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee, telephone , email .