

Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale: Adaptation Study*

¹Esra Töre

²Gölsu Naibođlu

Abstract

This research aims to adapt the Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale (KCMS) developed in the USA by Sullivan, Forret, Carraher, and Mainiero into Turkish. For the research, the opinions of 433 teachers and 93 school managers working in Istanbul in the 2020-2021 academic year were consulted. The findings obtained from the analysis studies showed the reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the scale ranged from .62 to .73. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was determined as .71, and as a result of the factor analysis, the three-factor structure, including the dimensions of "authenticity", "balance" and "challenge" was confirmed. The Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale, which was adapted as a result of the analyzes obtained, was found to be reliable and valid.

Keywords: *Kaleidoscope Career Model, Scale Adaptation, Teacher.*

*This study was presented as an oral presentation at the 12th International Education Management Forum.

¹**First Author**, PhD, Assoc. Prof. Dr., Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Email: esra.tore@izu.edu.tr

²**Second Author**, PhD Student, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Email: gulsuyagcinaiboglu@gmail.com

Recommended Citation: Töre, E., Naibođlu, G. (2023). Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale: Adaptation Study, *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 7(1)

Introduction

Kuzgun (2000) explains the concept of career as "a concept that expresses progress, pauses and tensions in the general pattern and development line, especially in professional roles, which are formed as a result of a lifelong sequence of events, the succession of occupations and other life roles". The concept has also been defined in the literature as "an aspect of life-long events", "roles played throughout life and its whole" (Niles & Bowsbey, 2013 as cited in Naiboğlu, 2020). Individuals who aim to rise in the workplace see career steps in the past (O'Neil, & Jepsen, 2018); nowadays, they are looking for faster transitions in their lives in the name of balance and originality (Kaplan & Gülcan, 2020; O'Neil & Jepsen, 2018). In the 21st century, the concept of career has gone beyond the hierarchical rise within the organization, depending on the individual's success as a result of his work. It has taken a horizontal form rather than a vertical one (O'Neil & Jepsen, 2018).

The effects of technology and globalization that have developed from the past to the present have caused individuals to face a more complex process on their career path (Malone, 2018). In studies conducted within the framework of various disciplines, the ups and downs of the individual's career processes were examined (Ellis et al., 2014). Individuals experience more frequent job or occupation, location, or even country changes (Sullivan & Ariss, 2021). For centuries, "urbanization, industrialization, and globalization" have brought along the difficulties that individuals experience in their family and business lives (Ayoğlu & Baraz, 2020). One of the new career theories, the "Kaleidoscope Career Model" (KCM), Mainiero and Sullivan (2006), and Sullivan et al. (2007), has emerged as a result of research conducted by. The purpose of this model is to explain the decisions individuals make regarding their working lives (Tarhan, 2019; Göktürk, 2019). The model provides a general framework for how individuals face changes in their career journeys, how they maintain balance, and how these changes affect their decisions (Zimmerman & Clark, 2016). At the same time, the model includes various dimensions of "social cognitive career theory", which is one of the most preferred career theories recently (Çark, 2021; Sullivan & Brauch, 2009). According to the model, the career has an active and dynamic structure, which has been likened to a "kaleidoscope offering different visuals in every turn". The three mirrors inside the kaleidoscope represent the three sub-dimensions in the model. These dimensions are "authenticity – balance – challenge". These three dimensions simultaneously affect career decisions and transition throughout life (Sullivan et al., 2009). The aim of this study is to adapt the "Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale" developed in the USA by Sullivan, Forret, Carraher, and Mainiero (2009), which can measure the dynamics by which individuals' career decisions are affected in Turkish. It is aimed to make reliability and validity analyzes of the scale in order to bring the Kaleidoscope Career Model, which offers a different perspective to current career models, to the Turkish national literature.

Career and Career Approaches

Developing and changing living conditions have also changed people's choice between "working for a living" to "working for development". In terms of business life, employers within the organization have focused only on meeting their own demands throughout history; employees, on the other hand, sought stability in the institution they work to meet these demands. A change in

understanding brought about by the changing century has occurred, and it has become imperative to treat employees as "individuals", consider their wishes, and follow and implement the necessary progress (Duarte, 2009; Öztemel, 2020; Tarhan, 2019).

The business world managed by information technology has become a situation where employees cannot see ahead, and the fact that there are risks in every step they will take has created insecurity (Kalleberg, 2009). The individual is left alone with providing and managing his career development, and the responsibility has shifted from the organization to the individual. This change obliges individuals to know themselves and what their age brings. It should also be underlined that the old career approaches are insufficient in the changing century (Pope, 2015; Savickas, 2019). The changes experienced and the difficulties it brings have increased the importance of the choices made by the individual in career decisions and brought along current career approaches.

"Road and journey" and "stair climbing" are the most frequently used metaphors for a career (Inkson, 2004; Baruch, 2006). Sullivan and Baruch (2009) define a career as "an individual's work-related and other-related experiences, both inside and outside organizations, that form a unique motif throughout the individual's life". A career can also be expressed as a living organism showing "change, progress, regression, stagnation" in human life.

In the 20th century, the traditional career approach meant a hierarchy of "stable job, increase in salary, promotion" and represented an agreement with the employer that would secure the future of individuals in the organization by securing themselves (Duarte, 2009). The individual would usually start working in a workplace, wait for a promotion, and then retire depending on his performance and feel safe. From this point of view, it was not customary to change a profession or job (Tarhan, 2019).

On the other hand, modern career approaches argue that individuals aim to rise in the workplace, which they see as a career ladder (O'Neil & Jepsen, 2018). While the traditional approach defines the concept of career as a hierarchical rise within the organization depending on the success of the individual as a result of his work; the modern approach argues that individuals seek faster ways of transition in their lives in the name of balance and originality (Kaplan & Gülcan, 2020; O'Neil & Jepsen, 2018). The effects of technology and globalization that have developed from the past to the present have caused individuals to face a more complex process on their career path (Malone, 2018). Hall (2004), "traditional career versus multifaceted career; defined as a career based on subjective (psychological success) and objective (position, salary) success criteria, shaped around the core values of freedom and growth, under the responsibility of the individual, not the organization. Individuals with protean careers experience more frequent job, occupation, workplace, location, and even country changes (Sullivan & Al Ariss, 2021).

The phenomena of "urbanization, industrialization, and globalization" bring along the difficulties individuals experience in their family and business lives (Ayoğlu & Baraz, 2020). The digitalization brought about by the 4th Industrial Revolution and the change in jobs in the 21st century has affected today's employees (as cited in Öztemel, 2020 from Schwab, 2017). In the business life of the 21st century, "speed, flexibility, project-based and short-term tasks, technological advances" have come to the fore. Individuals' adaptation to changes continues to affect their career paths (Savickas, 2019). Some of the individual factors that follow environmental changes can be given as examples of dual careers, single parenthood, different responsibilities,

differences in family structures, and differences in personal development (Sullivan & Baruch, 2009). The rapid competition brought by the information age and the rapidly increasing selectivity of human capital have made it important to use the employees' talents in the organizations in the most effective way (Sullivan & Mainiero, 2008).

Kaleidoscope Career Model

Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM), interviews applied to more than 3000 people, focus group interviews, and three questionnaires were obtained from a total of five different studies. KCM aims to explain how individuals experience changes in their relationships and roles while making career decisions and progressing on their career paths and the directions of these changes. Individuals evaluate the options available through the kaleidoscope lens to determine the most relevant between their job demands, constraints, and opportunities, as their relationships and personal values and interests. A decision will also affect the result of KCM (Sullivan et al., 2009). The three parameters of KCM (authenticity, balance, and challenge) dynamically affect an individual's career patterns throughout their lifespan. These parameters are effective in different degrees in life, and none disappear completely; their importance and dominance change periodically.

The three parameters of KCM (the metaphor of the three mirrors of the kaleidoscope) add different colors and shapes to the individual's career decisions. The dominance of the parameters that affect the decisions of the individual during a lifetime varies. However, although they never disappear, they feel their presence (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005; Sullivan & Mainiero, 2008; Sullivan et al., 2009).

Authenticity, the first parameter of KCM, defines the individual to behave in accordance with his personality and uniqueness (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Authenticity in KCM means that the values and behaviors of the individual are compatible with the organization in which they belong; be honest/loyal to his values and to himself. It considers it as knowing its strengths and limitations and acting with the best information at that moment (Sullivan & Mainiero, 2006; Dabss, Graham, & Gibson, 2020; Mainiero & Gibson, 2018; Wang, 2020). Balance, which is the second parameter of KCM, is the balance that the individual wants to establish between his/her job and all ties (family, friends, personal wishes...) outside of work; management of all successful business and non-business connections; refers to the intersection of work and life (Sullivan & Mainiero, 2006; Dabss, Graham, & Gibson, 2020; Mainiero & Gibson, 2018; Wang, 2020). Challenge, the last parameter of KCM; personal, skill-based, linear, and side progressions; express the need to participate in studies and develop their skills (Sullivan, & Mainiero, 2006, Dabss, Graham, & Gibson, 2020; Mainiero & Gibson, 2018; Wang, 2020).

The individual will need all three of these parameters throughout his life and exhibit them in different intensities. Three parameters will actively and interactively manifest themselves in the individual's career path. The individual will guide his decisions in line with these parameters in the career steps he will take for the period he is in (Mainiero, 2018):

*If the balance is off, maybe it is time to slow down and find a job elsewhere at a smaller firm.

*If the challenge is missing, it may be time to switch careers.

*If authenticity is required, finding ways to tell the organization the truth can be valuable or develop hobbies or outside interests.

KCM also reveals how women and men think about their careers throughout their lives and reflect on their lives. Mainiero and Sullivan (2006) shared their research on the career journeys of men and women for five years in their book called "The Opt-Out Revolt". According to the research results, women prioritize how others will be affected in their choices and act according to current circumstances; On the other hand, it has been found that men are more flexible by giving priority to their work and family focus in the background. While both men and women have the same life issues, it is seen that their priorities are different. While women are divided into many things, men focus on what needs to be done (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2006).

In the early career stages, women struggle to achieve their goals, and while the dominant "challenge" comes to the fore, "balance and originality" remains in the background. In their mid-career periods, women focus on "balance" and try to balance their families and other responsibilities. "Challenge and originality" requests are in the background. The late-career periods of women are the periods of seeking "authenticity". Although the desire for "balance and challenge" persists, "authenticity" is dominant (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005).

It is seen as a "challenge" predominantly in males in early career periods; focusing on their careers and coping with difficulties are their priorities. The "challenge" parameter involves a long-term process, and men who focus on their careers often avoid other responsibilities. By slowing down from mid-career to late career, they focus more on "authenticity" and begin to question themselves. In late career periods, as retirement approaches, the search for "balance" comes to the fore and they turn to issues related to their other relationships and responsibilities (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2006).

KCM explains how women and men experience changes in their career paths and how they move according to their wants, needs, and desires and their living standards. Three parameters of the model play an active role in each career period and affect career decisions. It is thought that it would be beneficial to adapt the scale of KCM to the Turkish language to bring it into the Turkish national literature and expand the studies to be done in this field. For this purpose, the adaptation study of the scale and its reliability and validity analysis are presented in the next section.

Method

Research Sample

The sample of the study was selected by random sampling method; It consists of 93 school managers and 433 teachers working in the province of Istanbul. 68.6% of the participants were female, 31.4% were male; 38.2% of Generation X (born between 1965-1979) 57.2% of Generation Y (born between 1980-1995); 72.6% undergraduate, 27.4% graduate; 27.9% are school managers and 72.1% are teachers.

Translation Study

The researchers who developed the scale were contacted, and necessary permissions were obtained without making the adaptation study of the scale. In the translation phase of the scale, the five-stage model suggested by Brislin et al. (1973) was used. In the first stage, three linguists and a specialist in the field of guidance and psychological counseling, fluent in English and Turkish, made the scale translation from English. Researchers and field experts evaluated the translation made in the second stage. In the third stage, the scale was translated into English. In the fourth stage, the translation into English was checked and evaluated by experts who were fluent in both

languages. In the last stage, the translation items were examined by two experts, and the Turkish language expert finalized the scale.

Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale

The Kaleidoscope Career Model was designed as a result of various qualitative and quantitative studies (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005; 2006). Based on these studies, Sullivan et al. (2009) developed the "Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale" (KCMS), which includes the sub-dimensions of "authenticity", "balance" and "challenge", in the USA. The scale includes a total of 15 items: 'authenticity' dimension 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; 'balance' dimension 6, 7, 8, 9, 10; The 'challenge' dimension is measured with items 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. The scale was prepared in a 5-point Likert type and definitions between "this does not describe me at all" and "this describes me very well" were used in the original. Coefficient alphas for the authenticity, balance, and challenge scales were 0.76, 0.81, and 0.84 respectively. In this study, it was decided to use the definitions between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree" for evaluation options, considering that they would not distort the statements.

Data Analysis and Process

SPSS and Jamovi programs were used in the analysis of the data obtained in the research. The internal consistency of the scale was found by calculating the Cronbach Alpha coefficient. For the content validity of the scale, the opinions of experts in the field were consulted. Construct validity was determined by exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis.

Findings

Results regarding content validity and reliability for the adaptation study of the Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale are given below. First, exploratory factor analysis of the adapted scale was performed, and then confirmatory factor analysis was performed. The steps of the relevant analyzes are explained below. Afterwards, the reliability calculation was made and the scale was finalized.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

In order to test the suitability of the data obtained in the study for exploratory factor analysis, Bartlett normal distribution analysis was performed ($\chi^2 = 879.55$; df, 105; $p < .001$). As a result of the analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was found to be .75. As a result of the first EFA using the Varimax rotation technique, four factors with eigenvalues greater than one were obtained. However, since the difference between the two factor loads of the 10th item was .10 low, the relevant item was removed from the scale and the analysis was repeated. As a result of the repeated analysis, the factor loads of the 3rd item, 5th item, and 9th item were below .40, so they were removed from the scale, and the analyzes were repeated. As a result of the third analysis, it was seen that the scale items were gathered under three factors in accordance with the original scale. The KMO value of the third analysis was found to be .71 ($\chi^2: 1047$; df, 55; $p < .001$). As a result of EFA, a 3-factor scale consisting of 11 items was obtained. It is seen that the factor loadings of the scale items vary between .44 and .73.

Table 1.
Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale Exploratory Factor Analysis Results

Items	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
I12	.69		
I11	.61		
I13	.60		
I15	.56		
I14	.44		
I6		.68	
I7		.62	
I8		.59	
I1			.73
I2			.59
I4			.50

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

The CFA of the 11-item and 3-factor scale obtained as a result of the EFA was made using the Jamovi program. In factor analysis, the maximum likelihood estimation technique was used. Goodness-of-fit values obtained as a result of CFA are given in Table 2.

Table 2.
Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale CFA Goodness of Fit Values

χ^2	df	X2/df	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA
140	41	3.41	.90	.05	.06

It was seen that the CFA analysis obtained according to the data in Table 2 was within the limits of good agreement (Kline, 2011; Meydan & Şeşen, 2015). As a result of the goodness of fit values obtained, a scale consisting of 3 factors and 11 items was obtained. The factor loadings obtained after performing CFA are given in Table 3.

Table 3.
Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale CFA Factor Loadings

Factor	Indicator	Estimate	SE	p	Stand. Estimate
Factor 1 (Challenge)	I-13	0.64	0.05	.00	0.56
	I-15	0.42	0.04	.00	0.54
	I-12	0.72	0.05	.00	0.71
	I-14	0.48	0.05	.00	0.46
	I-11	0.74	0.05	.00	0.66
Factor 2 (Authenticity)	I-1	0.89	0.07	.00	0.81
	I-2	0.54	0.06	.00	0.50
	I-4	0.60	0.07	.00	0.50
Factor 3 (Balance)	I-6	0.83	0.07	.00	0.65
	I-7	0.66	0.05	.00	0.65
	I-8	0.64	0.05	.00	0.61

As a result of CFA, factor loadings in the challenge sub-dimension were between .42 to .74; .54 to .89 in the authenticity sub-dimension; It was found that it varied between .64 and .83 in the balance sub-dimension. In order to determine the reliability of the adapted Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale, the Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the scale and its sub-dimensions are given in Table 4.

Table 4.
Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale Reliability Coefficient

Scale Name	Cronbach's Alpha
Scale Total	.65
Authenticity Sub-Dimension	.62
Balance Sub-Dimension	.66
Challenge Sub-Dimension	.71

Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations

With the research, Kaleidoscope Career Model was explained, and the scale of the model was adapted to Turkish. As a result of the analyses, it was revealed that the reliability and validity values of the Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale were acceptable.

Before starting the scale adaptation, necessary permissions were obtained from Sullivan (2009), who developed the scale, and the scale was translated into Turkish. The translated scale was applied to 433 teachers and 93 administrators. Explanatory and confirmatory factor analyzes of the scale were performed. Before performing EFA, Barlett normal distribution analysis was performed to determine whether the data were suitable for EFA. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was found to be .75. According to this value obtained, the scale was subjected to EFA. Principal component analysis as a factorization method in order to determine the factor pattern; As a rotation, the "varimax" method, one of the vertical rotation methods, was used. As a result of the EFA, it was seen that the scale items were collected under three factors in accordance with the original scale. The KMO value obtained as a result of EFA was found to be .71 (χ^2 : 1047; df, 55; $p < .001$).

As a result of the CFA for the obtained scale, it was found that there was a significant relationship between the sub-dimensions of the Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale and the relationships between all sub-dimensions. The goodness of fit values obtained as a result of CFA was found to be within the limits of good fit ($\chi^2/df = 3.41$; CFI = .90; SRMR = .05; RMSEA = .06). As a result of these analyzes, the Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale, consisting of 11 items and three factors, was adapted into Turkish. The scale was found to be at an acceptable level.

Since a structure with predetermined dimensions was repeated, items (3rd, 5th, 9th, and 10th) with low factor loads as a result of the analyzes made in the research were excluded from the scale. It is seen that the 3rd and 5th items removed from the scale are within the dimensions of balance and the 9th and 10th items are in the dimensions of authenticity. The fact that these items do not contribute to the authenticity and balance dimensions is a result of cultural differences' influence. It can be said that the elements of authenticity and balance have a more dominant difference between cultures.

Among the career scales adapted to Turkish in the literature, Büyükgoze-Kavas (2012) made the Turkish adaptation of the Career Decision Scale developed by Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico, and Koschier (1976). They found the reliability coefficient for the career indecision sub-scale to be .84. and .77 for the precision subscale. In their study, Akçakanat and Uzunbacak (2019) found the internal consistency reliability coefficient as .80 in the Turkish version of the Career Stability Scale developed by Lounsbury et al. (1999). Özaydın and Siyez (2022), in their research, Tracey et al. (2006) in the Turkish adaptation of the Career Discovery Scale; they obtained model fit by removing a single item, and the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .83. They attributed this item's disrupting the harmony to the culture and education system as the reason why it belongs to another concept. As a result of the analyzes performed in the adaptation study of the Career Paths Scale developed by Sarıoğlu (2018), Smith et al. (2012), the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was found .64 and consistency with the original scale could not be achieved. While the original scale was 38 items, the resulting scale consisted of 4 dimensions and 18 items. In this study, as in the previous studies, some items were discarded, but it was observed that the decreased items were collected in the same sub-dimensions.

Simmons et al. (2022) reached interesting results in their longitudinal research conducted for seven years (2012/2019). In the study, it was found that the authentic sub-dimension significantly affected the communication (networking) that individuals would establish with the local communities to which they belonged. However, the changes in authenticity did not have the same effect. Changes in the balance sub-dimension significantly affect the interaction of the individual with his colleagues, family, and other friends. The challenge sub-dimension was positively related to career success measures (career satisfaction, salary, promotions). Changes in the balance sub-dimension only had a significant increase in the promotion rate; Authenticity, on the other hand, has not been found to have any relationship with career success criteria.

Mouratidou and Grabarski (2021) conducted a qualitative study on the idea that KCM may differ in Greek culture. As a result of the study, they found that the participants were at the middle point in the authenticity dimension, the balance was in a fixed and desired dimension, and the challenge was in the desired but unattainable position. Researchers stated that security and financial stability variables should also be addressed besides these dimensions. As in this research example, it is predicted that different sub-dimensions suitable for Turkish culture may emerge with a more comprehensive study to be carried out in the qualitative dimension.

Wu et al. (2021) revealed that authenticity and self-efficacy, which are the sub-dimensions of KCM, and balance sub-dimension and social support are positively related. Due to the limited number of quantitative studies (Simmons et al., 2022), it is thought that KCMS, which is thought to contribute to the literature by adapting it into Turkish, will contribute to future research that goes beyond the traditional and will focus on the individual career process. The validity and reliability findings obtained in the study related to KCMS are limited within the framework of the participants in this study. It is recommended to supplement with different participants in future research and add qualitative studies to capture different cultural dimensions. It would be beneficial to repeat the scales in different periods and with different samples. Times New Roman 12 pt., single line spacing and justified.

References

- Akçakanat, T. & Uzunbacak, H. H. (2019). Kariyer kararlılığı ölçeği: Türkçeye uyarlama, geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *İktisadi, İdari ve Siyasal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 4(9), 159-170. <https://doi.org/10.25204/iktisad.576572>
- Ayoğlu, H., & Baraz, A. B. (2020). Kadın çalışanların kariyer engelleri: Eskişehir’de bir araştırma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 44, 13-27.
- Baruch, Y. (2006). Career development in organizations and beyond: balancing traditional and contemporary viewpoints. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 125-138.
- Brislin, R. W. LonnerWalter J., & Thorndike Robert M, (1973). *Cross Cultural Research Methods*, New York, John Wiley-SonsPub.
- Büyükköze-Kavas, A. (2012). Kariyer Karar Ölçeği’ nin Türkçe uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 4(38), 159-168.
- Çark, Ö. (2021). Kariyer seçiminde sosyo-bilişsel ve manevi yaklaşımlara bütüncül bakış. *International European Journal of Managerial Research Journal*, 5(1), 158-176.

- Dabbs, S. M., Graham, J. A., & Dixon, M. A. (2020). Extending the Kaleidoscope Model: Understanding career needs of midcareer elite head coaches. *Journal of Sport Management, 34*, 554-567.
- Duarte, M. E. (2009). The psychology of life construction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*, 259-266.
- Ellis, A. M., Bauer, T. N., Mansfield, L. R., Erdogan, B., Truxillo, D. M., & Simon, L. S. (2014). Navigating uncharted waters: Newcomer socialization through the lens of stress theory. *Journal of Management, 41*(1), 203-235.
- Göktürk, S. (2019). *Profesyonel yaşamın orta dönemindeki kadınların kariyer geçişleri: Nitel bir araştırma*. (Master's thesis). Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul.
- Hall, D. T. (2004). The protean career: A quarter-century journey. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 1-13.
<http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/businessreview/2018/08/03/the-changing-dynamic-of-career-development-in-the-age-of-portfolio-careers/>
- Inkson, K. (2004). Images of career: Nine key metaphors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 96-111.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (2009). Precarious work, insecure workers: Employment relations in transition. *American Sociological Review, 74*, 1-22.
- Kaplan, İ., & Gülcan, M. G. (2020). Öğretmen kariyer basamaklarının oluşturulmasına ilişkin görüşlerin incelenmesi: Karma yöntem araştırması. *Gazi Journal of Education Sciences, 6*(3), 380-406.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Mainiero, L. A. (2018). The changing dynamic of career development in the age of portfolio careers. *LSE Business Review*, 1-3.
- Mainiero, L. A., & Gibson, D. E. (2018). The Kaleidoscope Career Model revisited: How midcareer men and women diverge on authenticity, balance, and challenge. *Journal of Career Development, 45*(4), 361-377.
- Mainiero, L. A., & Sullivan, S. E. (2005). Kaleidoscope careers: An alternate explanation for the "opt-out" revolution. *Academy of Management Executive, 19*(1), 106-123.
- Mainiero, L. A., & Sullivan, S. E. (2006). *The opt-out revolt. Why people are leaving companies to create kaleidoscope careers*. California: Davis-Black Publishing.
- Malone, T. W. (2018). How human-computer 'superminds' are redefining the future of work. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 59*(4), 34-41.
- Mouratidou, M., & Grabarski, M. K. (2021). Careers in the Greek public sector: calibrating the kaleidoscope. *Career Development International, 26*(2), 201-216.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-05-2020-0123>
- Naiboğlu, G. (2020). *Kız Anadolu İmam Hatip Liselerindeki öğrencilerin meslek seçimi ve kariyer yönelimleri üzerine bir olgubilim çalışması*. Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- O'Neill, M. S., & Jepsen, D. (2018). Women's desire for the kaleidoscope of authenticity, balance and challenge: A multi-method study of female health workers' careers. *Gender, Work and Organization, 26*(7), 962-982.

- Özaydın, S., & Siyez, D. M. (2022). Kariyer keşfi ölçeği: Türkçeye uyarlama, geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *IBAD Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12, 249-270. <https://doi.org/10.21733/ibad.901688>
- Öztemel, K. (2020). Dördüncü sanayi devriminde çalışmanın anlamı ve kariyer psikolojik danışmanlığı. *Journal of Career Counseling*, 3(2), 1-24.
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Pope, M. (2015). Career intervention: From the industrial to the digital age. In P. J. Hartung, M. L. Savickas, & W. B. Walsh (Eds.), *APA Handbook of career intervention, 1*, 3-19. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Sarioğlu, Z. B. (2018). *Cam tavan sendromu: Ölçek uyarlama çalışması ve demografik değişkenler açısından bir analiz*. (Unpublished Master Thesis). University of Bahçeşehir, İstanbul.
- Savickas, M. L. (2019). *Career counseling (2nd. Ed.)*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Simmons, J., Wolff, H-G., Forret, M. L., & Sullivan, S. E. (2022). A longitudinal investigation of the Kaleidoscope Career Model, networking behaviors, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 138, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2022.103764>
- Sullivan, S. E., & Al Ariss, A. (2021). Making sense of different perspectives on career transitions: A review and agenda for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31, 1-17.
- Sullivan, S. E., & Baruch, Y. (2009). "Advances in career theory and research: A critical review and agenda for future exploration". *Journal of Management*, 36(6), 1542-1571.
- Sullivan, S. E., & Mainiero, L. A. (2007). The changing nature of gender roles, alpha/beta careers and work-life issues: Theory driven implications for human resource management. *Career Development International*, 12(3), 238-263.
- Sullivan, S. E., Forret, M. L., & Carraher, S. M. (2009). Using the Kaleidoscope Career Model to examine generational differences in work attitudes. *Career Development International*, 14(3), 284-302.
- Sullivan, S. E., Forret, M. L., Mainiero, L. A., & Terjesen, S. (2007). "What motivates entrepreneurs? An exploratory study of the lakeidoscope career model and entrepreneurship". *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 12(4), 4-19.
- Tarhan, E. (2019). *Kadın akademisyenlerin sınırsız ve çok yönlü kariyer tutumları: Kişilik ve toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri açısından bir inceleme*. (Doctoral thesis). University of Ankara, Ankara.
- Wang, S. (2020). *Choices or constraints? Applying the Kaleidoscope Career Model to the careers of female doctors in China*. (Doctoral thesis). University of Northumbria, China.
- Wu, C., Zhang, L. Y., Zhang, X. Y., Du, Y. L., He, S. Z., Yu, L. R., Chen, H., Shang, L., & Lang, H. J. (2022). Factors influencing career success of clinical nurses in northwestern China based on Kaleidoscope Career Model: Structural equation model. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 30(2), 428-438. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13499>
- Zimmerman, A., & Clark, M. A. (2016). Opting-out and opting-in: A review and agenda for future research. *Career Development International*, 21(6), 603-633.

ANNEX-1 KALEIDOSCOPE CAREER MODEL SCALE TURKISH VERSION

OTANTIKLİK

1. Yaşamımda, kendime uygun daha büyük bir amaç bulmayı umuyorum.
2. Yaşamımda, daha büyük bir ruhsal gelişime özlem duyuyorum.
3. Eğer şu anda hayalimin peşinden gidebilseydim, giderdim.

DENGE

4. Gerekirse, ailevi sorunları çözebilmek veya endişeleri giderebilmek için işimden vazgeçebilirim.
5. İşimi her zaman ailemin ihtiyaçlarına göre düzenlerim.
6. Aileme vakit ayıramıyorsam, işimin bir anlamı yoktur.

MEYDAN OKUMA

7. Yaptığım her şeyde, sürekli olarak yeni meydan okuyuşlar ararım.
8. Ben aksilikleri üstesinden gelinmesi gereken sorunlar olarak değil, çözüm gerektiren meydan okumalar olarak görürüm.
9. Ek iş sorumlulukları, beni endişelendirmez.
10. Çoğu insan beni hedef odaklı olarak tanırlar.
11. İş zorluklarının üstesinden gelirim ve iş sorunlarımı değişim fırsatlarına dönüştürürüm.

1. Hiç katılmıyorum
2. Çok az katılıyorum
3. Biraz katılıyorum
4. Oldukça katılıyorum
5. Çok fazla katılıyorum

‘Otantiklik’ alt boyutu maddeleri: 1. / 2. / 3.

‘Denge’ alt boyutu maddeleri: 4. / 5. / 6.

‘Meydan okuma’ alt boyutu maddeleri: 7. / 8. / 9. /10. /11.

ANNEX-2

KALEIDOSCOPE CAREER MODEL SCALE ORIGINAL VERSION

AUTHENTICITY

1. I hope to find a greater purpose to my life that suits who I am.
2. I hunger for greater spiritual growth in my life.
3. I have discovered that crises in life offer perspectives in ways that daily living does not.
4. If I could follow my dream right now, I would.
5. I want to have an impact and leave my signature on what I accomplish in life.

BALANCE

6. If necessary, I would give up my work to settle problematic family issues or concerns.
7. I constantly arrange my work around my family needs.
8. My work is meaningless if I cannot take the time to be with my family.
9. Achieving balance work and family is life's holy grail.
10. Nothing matters more to me right now than balancing work with my family responsibilities.

CHALLENGE

11. I continually look for new challenges in everything I do.
12. I view setbacks not as problems to be overcome but as challenges that require solutions.
13. Added work responsibilities don't worry me.
14. Most people would describe me as being very goal-directed.
15. I thrive on work challenges and turn work problems into opportunities for change.