

Development of Career Adapt-Abilities Scale - Employee Selection (CAAS-ES) For Employee Selection Process

Pengembangan Alat Ukur Career Adapt-Abilities Scale - Employee Selection (CAAS-ES) Untuk Proses Seleksi Karyawan

Ilyas Dzaky Almahdy¹

¹Department of Psychology,
Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: ilyas.dzaky31@ui.ac.id

Hanisa Darupa Putri²

²Department of Psychology,
Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: hanisa.darupa@ui.ac.id

Nawang Kusumastuti³

³Department of Psychology,
Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: nawang.kusumastuti@ui.ac.id

Ocky Fajzar Suryani⁴

⁴Department of Psychology,
Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: ocky.fajzar@ui.ac.id

Shah Hussain⁵

⁵Department of Psychology,
Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: shah.hussain@ui.ac.id

Rizka Halida⁶

⁶Department of Psychology,
Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: rizka@ui.ac.id

Correspondence:

Ilyas Dzaky Almahdy
Universitas Indonesia
Email: ilyas.dzaky31@ui.ac.id

Abstract

This study aimed to develop the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale–Employee Selection (CAAS-ES) and examine its psychometric properties among Indonesian job seekers. Career adaptability refers to an individual's ability to cope with career development tasks, work transitions, and changes that affect occupational roles. Assessing career adaptability in employee selection is important for identifying individuals' readiness to navigate uncertainty and meet the demands of dynamic organizational environments. The CAAS-ES was developed based on Savickas' theory of career adaptability and consists of 17 items measuring four dimensions: concern, control, curiosity, and confidence, using a six-point Likert scale. The respondents consisted of 290 job seekers aged 18–64 years. Data were analyzed using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to examine construct validity and Cronbach's alpha to assess reliability. The results indicated that the measurement model demonstrated an adequate fit to the data ($CFI = 0.918$, $TLI = 0.901$, $RMSEA = 0.076$, $SRMR = 0.052$) and excellent reliability ($\alpha = 0.92$). These findings suggest that the CAAS-ES is a valid and reliable instrument for measuring career adaptability among Indonesian job seekers.

Keywords : Career Adaptability, Employee Selection, Job Seeker, Scale Development

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengembangkan Career Adapt-Abilities Scale–Employee Selection (CAAS-ES) serta menguji kualitas psikometriknya pada populasi pencari kerja di Indonesia. Adaptabilitas karier merepresentasikan kemampuan individu dalam menghadapi tugas perkembangan karier, transisi pekerjaan, dan perubahan yang memengaruhi peran kerjanya. Pengukuran adaptabilitas karier dalam proses seleksi karyawan penting dilakukan untuk mengidentifikasi kesiapan individu dalam menghadapi ketidakpastian dan tuntutan organisasi yang dinamis. Alat ukur CAAS-ES dikembangkan berdasarkan teori adaptabilitas karier Savickas dan terdiri atas 17 item yang mengukur empat dimensi, yaitu concern, control, curiosity, dan confidence, menggunakan skala Likert enam poin. Responden penelitian ini terdiri atas 290 pencari kerja berusia 18–64 tahun. Data dianalisis menggunakan Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) untuk menguji validitas konstruk, serta koefisien Cronbach's alpha untuk menguji reliabilitas. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa model pengukuran memiliki tingkat kecocokan yang memadai dengan data ($CFI = 0.918$, $TLI = 0.901$, $RMSEA = 0.076$, $SRMR = 0.052$) serta reliabilitas yang sangat baik ($\alpha = 0.92$). Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa CAAS-ES merupakan instrumen yang valid dan reliabel untuk mengukur adaptabilitas karier pada populasi pencari kerja di Indonesia.

Kata Kunci : Adaptabilitas Karier, Pengembangan Skala, Pencari Kerja, Seleksi Karyawan

Copyright (c) 2026 Ilyas Dzaky Almahdy et al

Received 29/03/2026

Revised 09/06/2026

Accepted 07/07/2026



INTRODUCTION

In the current era of globalization and Industry 4.0, rapid technological advancements, digitalization, and global economic development have significantly transformed the nature of work. Many jobs are becoming increasingly automated, while new roles requiring adaptive skills continue to emerge. In this context, individuals' ability to adapt to career-related changes has become a crucial factor for professional success (Bocciardi et al., 2017). One of the key capabilities that facilitates individuals' adaptation to changes throughout their career journey is career adaptability.

Career adaptability refers to an individual's capacity to respond to changes in the work environment, cope with career-related challenges, and develop new skills to remain relevant in the labour market. Savickas (1997) defined career adaptability as a psychosocial construct that reflects individuals' resources for coping with current vocational tasks and anticipating career-related developments, work transitions, and work-related traumas that may alter their social integration to varying degrees. In the workplace, employees with high career adaptability are better prepared to face uncertainty, manage job transitions, and adjust to organizational demands (Gunkel et al., 2010; Fiori et al., 2015; Al-Jubari et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2021). Furthermore, Rahayu and Hapsari (2025) found that career adaptability is positively associated with workplace happiness. In contrast, individuals with low career adaptability may experience greater difficulty coping with change, which can lead to job instability and lower career satisfaction (Savickas, 2013).

In the context of employee recruitment and selection, organizations today seek not only candidates with strong technical competencies but also individuals who possess high levels of adaptability (Brassey et al., 2024). Organizations require a workforce that is flexible, proactive, and capable of responding to changes in job demands, technological advancements, and increasingly dynamic business environments. The Future of Jobs Report, published by the World Economic Forum (2025), identifies resilience, flexibility and agility, curiosity, and lifelong learning as among the competencies expected to become increasingly important in the future workforce. In this context, career adaptability is closely related to employability, as it enables individuals to maintain the relevance of their competencies in a continuously evolving labour market (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). Therefore, assessing career adaptability may provide valuable information during the selection process by helping organizations identify candidates who are prepared to cope with uncertainty and evolving job demands.

Given the growing importance of adaptability in today's workplace, there is a need for instruments that can accurately assess the career adaptability of job candidates. To date, several instruments have been developed to measure career adaptability, including the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale (CAAS; Savickas & Porfeli, 2012), which has been widely used in cross-cultural research. The CAAS measures four core dimensions of career adaptability: concern, control, curiosity, and confidence. The instrument was later adapted into Indonesian by Sulistiani et al. (2019) as

the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale Indonesian Form (CAAS-Ind), which likewise assesses the same four dimensions of career adaptability.

However, psychometric evaluations of both the CAAS and CAAS-Ind in Indonesia have primarily been conducted within educational settings, with samples largely consisting of high school and university students. Consequently, the available psychometric evidence predominantly reflects career adaptability among individuals who are still in education rather than those who are entering or participating in the labor market. Furthermore, both instruments were developed to assess career adaptability in a general sense and do not specifically consider their application within employee selection contexts.

To address the need for measuring career adaptability among job seekers in Indonesia, Mulyono et al. (2023) developed the Job Seeker Career Adaptability Scale (JS-CAAS), a contextualized version of the CAAS designed specifically for Generation Z job seekers. Although the JS-CAAS demonstrated satisfactory reliability, its development was based on a relatively limited sample of Generation Z job seekers. As a result, further empirical evidence is needed to support its generalizability across broader age groups and more diverse job-seeking populations. In addition, the rapidly evolving nature of the labour market calls for the development of items that more accurately reflect the current experiences of job seekers and the evolving needs of organizations.

Based on the foregoing discussion, there remains a need for an instrument specifically designed to assess career adaptability within the context of employee selection in Indonesia. Unlike the CAAS, CAAS-Ind, and JS-CAAS, the development of the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale–Employee Selection (CAAS-ES) focuses not only on adapting the assessment context but also on creating items that are more relevant to the experiences of individuals entering the workforce. While retaining the four core dimensions of career adaptability proposed by Savickas and Porfeli (2012), the items in the CAAS-ES were developed to capture individuals' readiness to cope with organizational demands, job-related changes, career uncertainty, and the transition into the world of work. Therefore, the novelty of the CAAS-ES lies in three key aspects: its specific focus on employee selection, the development of items that are more contextually relevant to Indonesian job seekers, and its potential use as an assessment tool to support recruitment and selection processes across a broad range of age groups.

The development of the CAAS-ES aims to provide a psychological instrument for assessing individuals' ability to adapt to career-related changes. Through this instrument, organizations may obtain a clearer understanding of job candidates' readiness to cope with dynamic work environments, thereby supporting more informed decisions during recruitment and employee development processes. In addition, the assessment results may help individuals understand their level of preparedness for career-related challenges and provide insights for career development interventions and adaptability training programs.

As part of ongoing advancements in psychometric research, the CAAS-ES is expected to contribute to the field of industrial and organizational psychology, particularly by supporting more effective recruitment practices and enhancing workforce readiness in response to the increasingly dynamic and evolving nature of work.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a quantitative approach using an instrument development design to examine the validity and reliability of the proposed measure. A quantitative approach was selected because the primary objective of the study was to evaluate the psychometric properties of the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale–Employee Selection (CAAS-ES) through statistical analyses of data collected from respondents.

Participants and Sampling Procedure

The target population of this study consisted of job seekers in Indonesia who were within the productive working-age range (18–64 years). A total of 290 respondents who met these criteria participated in the study. This sample size meets commonly recommended requirements for instrument development and factor analysis research, which generally range from 250 to 300 participants (DiStefano et al., 2019; Ludtke et al., 2021; Onde & Alvarado, 2020).

A non-probability sampling approach using convenience sampling was employed. This technique was selected because it enabled the researchers to recruit respondents who were readily accessible and matched the characteristics of the target population (Etikan et al., 2016). Participants were recruited through the online distribution of questionnaires to individuals who were currently seeking employment or interested in participating in employee selection processes. However, convenience sampling may introduce selection bias and limit the representativeness of the sample, as participation depends on individuals' willingness to take part in the study (Bornstein et al., 2013). To reduce this potential bias, respondents were recruited from diverse age groups within the productive workforce and from various educational backgrounds, resulting in a more heterogeneous sample.

Instrument Construction

The Career Adapt-Abilities Scale–Employee Selection (CAAS-ES) was developed based on the career adaptability construct proposed by Savickas (1997). Career adaptability is defined as a psychosocial resource that enables individuals to cope with current and anticipated developmental tasks, career transitions, and work-related challenges that may affect their social integration.

To operationalize this construct, the instrument was developed based on the four core dimensions of career adaptability: concern, control, curiosity, and confidence. These dimensions were further translated into more specific indicators. The concern dimension consisted of four indicators, the control dimension consisted of three indicators, the curiosity dimension consisted of five

indicators, and the confidence dimension consisted of four indicators.

The initial version of the CAAS-ES consisted of 67 items representing the four dimensions. Responses were measured using a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Upon completion of the instrument, five scores were obtained: four dimension scores (concern, control, curiosity, and confidence) and an overall career adaptability score.

Scoring was conducted by summing item responses within each dimension. For negatively-worded items, responses were reverse-scored prior to calculation. Higher scores on a given dimension indicate higher levels of career adaptability within that dimension. The total career adaptability score was calculated by summing the scores across all four dimensions.

Pilot Testing

Prior to pilot testing, the items developed based on Savickas's theory were subjected to a qualitative expert judgment process conducted by lecturers of the Psychological Test Development course at the Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia. This process aimed to evaluate the alignment of each item with the conceptual definitions and indicators of the four dimensions of career adaptability, as well as to ensure that the items adequately represented the intended construct. Feedback obtained from the expert review was used to revise items that were considered unclear, insufficiently representative, or inconsistent with the underlying construct.

Following the expert review process, the revised items underwent a readability assessment. The purpose of this assessment was to determine whether the instrument could be clearly understood by respondents in terms of item wording, instructions, completion time, and other aspects of the questionnaire. The readability assessment was conducted online via Google Forms with 12 participants from diverse backgrounds who met the characteristics of the target population. After completing the questionnaire, participants were interviewed to obtain more detailed feedback regarding the clarity of the instructions, item wording, and their understanding of each item. The feedback obtained was subsequently used to make further revisions before the instrument received final approval from the course lecturers and was administered to the main study sample.

Psychometric Evaluation

The reliability of the CAAS-ES was assessed using the coefficient alpha approach as an indicator of internal consistency reliability. Cronbach's alpha is one of the most widely used methods for evaluating the internal consistency of psychological measures (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2009). Reliability coefficients of .70 or higher are generally considered acceptable (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 2017; Nufus et al., 2026). Reliability analyses were conducted for both the overall scale and each individual dimension because the CAAS-ES is a multidimensional instrument that produces both

dimension-specific scores and a global career adaptability score.

Construct validity was evaluated using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Model fit was assessed using several goodness-of-fit indices, including the chi-square statistic, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). Following the recommendations of Hu and Bentler (1999), RMSEA values of .08 or lower, CFI and TLI values of .90 or higher, and SRMR values of .10 or lower were considered indicative of acceptable model fit.

In addition, item discrimination analyses were conducted to examine the extent to which each item could differentiate between individuals with high and low levels of career adaptability. Item analyses were performed using corrected item-total correlation (CrIT) indices, including corrected item-total correlation for the overall scale (CrITT)

and corrected item-dimension correlation (CrITD) for each dimension. According to Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), items with a corrected item-total correlation of .30 or higher are considered to demonstrate adequate discrimination. Furthermore, the proportion of endorsement (PoE) index was used to examine respondents' tendency to endorse specific items and to identify potential response biases related to social desirability (Millon & Bloom, 2008).

Finally, norms were developed using a within-group norming approach, in which respondents' scores were interpreted relative to the distribution of scores obtained by other individuals who completed the same instrument. Raw scores were transformed into standard scores (SS) to facilitate interpretation. In the present study, scaled scores based on the Wechsler subtest metric ($M = 10$, $SD = 3$) were used to represent the relative position of an individual's score within the normative group.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Data were collected through the online administration of the CAAS-ES to individuals aged between 18 and 64 years. The data collection period lasted 20 days, from May 5 to May 25, 2025. After excluding incomplete responses and cases that did not meet the study criteria, a total of 290 responses were retained for further analysis.

Descriptive analyses indicated that participants ranged in age from 18 to 59 years, with a mean age of 28 years. The majority of participants were female (68.62%). Most participants had previous work experience (85.17%), with the largest proportion reporting more than six years of work experience (28.62%).

Table 1. Reliability Analysis Results for the Initial CAAS-ES Items

Dimension	Item Amount	Cronbach's Alpha
Concern	17	.89
Control	18	.91
Curiosity	16	.90
Confidence	16	.92
Total	67	.97

Initial Reliability Analysis Results

Reliability analysis of the initial 67-item version of the CAAS-ES yielded a very high Cronbach's alpha coefficient ($\alpha = .97$). A Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .70 or higher generally indicates acceptable reliability (Matheson, 2019). However, excessively high alpha values ($\alpha \geq .95$) do not necessarily indicate a good instrument, as they may suggest redundancy among items, meaning that several items assess highly similar aspects of the construct (Hulin et al., 2001).

Initial Item Analysis Results

Based on the item discrimination analysis, all 67 items demonstrated satisfactory discrimination indices. This was indicated by corrected item-total correlation (CrITT) values ranging from .346 to .701 and corrected item-dimension correlation (CrITD) values ranging from .389 to .730. These findings suggest that, overall, the items in the CAAS-ES were

able to adequately differentiate between individuals with high and low levels of career adaptability.

The results of the proportion of endorsement (PoE) analysis showed that all items fell within an acceptable range and were neither excessively low nor excessively high. PoE values ranged from .152 to .652, indicating a balanced distribution of responses across participants. Therefore, the CAAS-ES items were able to capture varying levels of endorsement and adequately represent individual differences in career adaptability.

Initial CFA Validity Results

Construct validity was evaluated using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Following the recommendations of Kline (2005), model fit was assessed using the chi-square statistic, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). These indices are

among the most commonly reported indicators of model fit in CFA. The results of the initial CFA for the CAAS-ES are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. CFA Validity Results for the Initial CAAS-ES Items

Index	Value	Interpretation
χ^2 (df = 2138, $p < .001$)	5495.801	-
Comparative Fit Index (CFI) ≥ 0.90	0.697	Poor Fit
Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) ≥ 0.90	0.687	Poor Fit
Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) ≤ 0.08	0.074	Acceptable Fit
Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) ≤ 0.10	0.067	Excellent Fit

The CFA results were evaluated based on several fit indices, including the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). Following the criteria proposed by Hu and Bentler (1999), CFI and TLI values of .90 or higher indicate acceptable model fit, RMSEA values of .08 or lower indicate acceptable fit, and SRMR values of .10 or lower indicate adequate fit.

As shown in Table 2, the initial CFA results indicated that the CAAS-ES did not demonstrate adequate overall model fit. Specifically, the CFI (.697) and TLI (.687) values were below the recommended threshold of .90, suggesting poor fit. Therefore, further item analysis and model refinement were conducted to improve the psychometric properties of the instrument and achieve a more acceptable factor structure.

Item Selection and CFA Results for the Final CAAS-ES

Following the initial CFA of the 67-item version of the CAAS-ES, the number of items was reduced and a second CFA was conducted. The final version of the CAAS-ES consisted of 17 items selected based on the psychometric performance of each item. Item selection was guided by several criteria, including high corrected item-total correlation (CrITT) and corrected item-dimension correlation (CrITD) values within each indicator, acceptable proportion of endorsement (PoE) values, and factor loadings above .40. These criteria were used to ensure that the selected items demonstrated the strongest psychometric properties among the items representing each indicator. In addition, the final selection process ensured that every indicator of the career adaptability construct remained represented in the instrument. The psychometric characteristics, item blueprint, and CFA results for the selected items are presented in table 3 and 4.

Table 3. Psychometric Properties and Item Blueprint of the Selected CAAS-ES Items

Item	CrITD	CrITT	PoE	Factor Loading	Narration
Concern 1	.504	.523	.445	.552	Saya menyadari bahwa keputusan yang saya ambil saat ini berdampak pada masa depan karier saya.
Concern 7	.505	.677	.252	.700	Saya menyusun rencana perjalanan karier untuk membantu saya mengidentifikasi berbagai kesempatan dan mencoba hal-hal baru.
Concern 11	.512	.613	.300	.626	Saya memahami kriteria yang dibutuhkan untuk menjalankan pekerjaan saya dengan baik.
Concern 14	.635	.693	.352	.721	Saya menyadari tantangan yang muncul saat memulai karier baru.
Control 3	.706	.715	.352	.788	Saya optimis dapat mencapai tujuan karier saya.
Control 5	.605	.664	.279	.724	Saya tidak takut menghadapi tantangan karena saya percaya pada kemampuan saya untuk mencari solusi.
Control 8	.554	.571	.321	.618	Saya merasa nyaman membuat keputusan penting terkait karier saya sendiri.
Control 15	.621	.700	.324	.747	Saya tidak hanya melakukan upaya sesekali, tetapi terus bekerja secara konsisten dalam mencapai tujuan karier yang saya inginkan.
Curiosity 5	.582	.597	.321	.651	Saya secara aktif mencari tahu tentang potensi pengembangan karier saya.

Curiosity 8	.600	.619	.400	.676	Saya mempertimbangkan berbagai opsi sebelum membuat keputusan penting tentang karier saya.
Curiosity 10	.523	.589	.279	.624	Saya mengamati lingkungan sekitar untuk mencari cara alternatif dalam mengerjakan hal-hal yang berkaitan dengan karier saya.
Curiosity 11	.603	.595	.390	.646	Saya berusaha mencari tahu hal-hal yang belum saya ketahui berkaitan dengan karier.
Curiosity 16	.541	.609	.410	.685	Saya mempertimbangkan risiko dan manfaat sebelum mengejar karier baru.
Confidence 3	.635	.579	.293	.709	Saya percaya bahwa saya bisa menyelesaikan pekerjaan dengan cepat.
Confidence 6	.628	.557	.314	.667	Saya percaya dapat dengan cepat memahami instruksi ketika mempelajari suatu hal baru.
Confidence 10	.464	.576	.455	.603	Saya yakin dapat memberikan yang terbaik dalam pekerjaan yang saya lakukan.
Confidence 13	.667	.690	.297	.807	Saya percaya bisa mengelola informasi untuk menyelesaikan pekerjaan yang sulit saya pahami.

Table 4. CFA Validity Results for the Selected CAAS-ES Items

Index	Value	Interpretation
χ^2 (df = 113, p < .001)	299.941	-
Comparative Fit Index (CFI) ≥ 0.90	0.918	Acceptable Fit
Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) ≥ 0.90	0.901	Acceptable Fit
Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) ≤ 0.08	0.076	Acceptable Fit
Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) ≤ 0.10	0.052	Excellent Fit

Based on the results presented in Table 4, the final CAAS-ES model demonstrated an acceptable level of model fit. The CFI and TLI values exceeded the recommended threshold of .90, while the RMSEA and SRMR values met the

recommended fit criteria. These findings indicate that the factor structure of the CAAS-ES is consistent with the theoretical framework of career adaptability and provide support for the construct validity of the instrument.

Table 5. Reliability Analysis Results for the Selected CAAS-ES Items

Dimension	Item Amount	Cronbach's Alpha
Concern	4	.74
Control	4	.80
Curiosity	5	.79
Confidence	4	.78
Total	17	.92

Final Reliability Analysis Results

The reliability analysis of the 17-item final version of the CAAS-ES yielded an overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .92. Although this value was lower than that obtained for the initial 67-item version of the instrument ($\alpha = .97$), the reliability coefficient remained within the excellent range. This finding suggests that the reduction in the number of items did not substantially compromise the internal consistency of the instrument.

Norm Development

According to Shapiro and Wilk, as cited in Creswell (2022), the W statistic in the Shapiro–Wilk test ranges from 0 to 1, with values closer to 1 indicating a more normal distribution. A p-value below .05 suggests that the data significantly deviate from normality. The results of the Shapiro–Wilk test indicated that the data were not normally distributed ($W = .972$, $p < .001$). Therefore, Z-scores were calculated as the basis for norm development. Scaled scores

(SS) were subsequently derived using the Wechsler subtest scaling approach, with a mean of 10 and a standard deviation of 3 ($M = 10$, $SD = 3$). This transformation allows individual scores to be interpreted relative to the distribution of scores within the normative sample.

DISCUSSION

The CAAS-ES was developed to assess career adaptability through a psychometrically sound instrument that demonstrates adequate reliability, validity, item quality, and normative data for the workforce population, which are fundamental characteristics of a well-developed psychological measure (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2009; Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 2017). The instrument development process involved several stages, including qualitative expert judgment, readability testing, validity testing, reliability testing, item analysis, and norm development.

The reliability analysis of the initial 67-item version yielded a very high reliability coefficient ($\alpha = .97$), indicating excellent internal consistency. However, excessively high reliability coefficients may also suggest item redundancy, whereby multiple items repeatedly assess highly similar aspects of the construct (Hulin et al., 2001). Following the item selection process, the final 17-item version maintained a very high level of reliability ($\alpha = .92$). This finding suggests that the reduction in the number of items did not substantially diminish the instrument's ability to consistently measure career adaptability.

The item discrimination analysis indicated that all selected items demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties. Corrected item-total correlation (CrITT) values ranged from .523 to .715, while corrected item-dimension correlation (CrITD) values ranged from .464 to .706. In addition, all items exhibited acceptable proportion of endorsement (PoE) values, indicating that the items generated sufficient variability in respondents' answers (Millon & Bloom, 2008). These findings suggest that the selected items were capable of adequately differentiating individuals with high and low levels of career adaptability (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

The construct validity analysis using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) revealed that the initial 67-item model did not demonstrate adequate model fit. Therefore, an item selection process was conducted using a combination of statistical and theoretical criteria, including CrITT, CrITD, proportion of endorsement (PoE), factor loadings above .40, and representation of each indicator within the career adaptability construct. Based on these criteria, a final set of 17 items representing the four dimensions of career adaptability was retained. The CFA results for the final version demonstrated an acceptable level of model fit, thereby providing support for the construct validity of the CAAS-ES (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005). These findings also supported the four-dimensional structure of career adaptability (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012).

Several recommendations may be considered for future research to further improve the quality of the CAAS-ES. First, future studies should recruit larger and more diverse

samples to enhance the generalizability of the resulting norms across different segments of the Indonesian workforce. Second, this study did not examine criterion validity; therefore, the predictive capability of the CAAS-ES with respect to variables relevant to employee selection has not yet been empirically established (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 2017). Criterion validity was not assessed because this study focused on the initial stage of instrument development, with available resources prioritized toward item development, construct validation, reliability testing, and norm development. Furthermore, assessing criterion validity would require collecting additional data on related constructs, which could increase respondent burden and potentially introduce common method bias due to the use of the same measurement method (Baumgartner & Weijters, 2021). Future research is therefore encouraged to examine the relationships between the CAAS-ES and theoretically relevant variables associated with career adaptability. Such investigations may provide additional validity evidence and further strengthen the practical utility of the CAAS-ES in recruitment and employee selection contexts.

CONCLUSION

This study successfully developed the Career Adapt-Abilities Scale–Employee Selection (CAAS-ES) as an instrument for assessing career adaptability among job seekers. The findings demonstrated that the instrument possesses strong reliability, a factor structure that is consistent with the theoretical framework of career adaptability, and items that effectively differentiate individuals with varying levels of career adaptability. These results provide evidence supporting the validity and reliability of the CAAS-ES as a measure of career adaptability. Therefore, the CAAS-ES may serve as a useful assessment tool for evaluating career adaptability, particularly within employee recruitment and selection contexts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the participants who voluntarily participated in this study. The authors also express their gratitude to the lecturers of the Psychological Test Development course for their valuable feedback during the instrument development process.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

This study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles for research involving human participants. Prior to participation, all respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and the confidentiality of their responses. Informed consent was obtained from all participants before data collection.

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this article.

TRANSPARANCY OF DATA

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

FUNDING

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed to the conception and design of the study. Data collection, data analysis, interpretation of findings, and manuscript preparation were conducted collaboratively by the authors. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Al-Jubari, I., Shamsol Anuar, S. N. B., Ahmad Suhaimi, A. A. B., & Mosbah, A. (2021). The impact of career adaptability and social support on job search self-efficacy: A case study in Malaysia. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(6), 515–524. <https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2021.VOL8.NO6.0515>
- Baumgartner, H., & Weijters, B. (2021). Dealing with common method variance in international marketing research. *Journal of International Marketing*, 29(3), 7–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069031X21995871>
- Boccardi, F., Caputo, A., Fregonese, C., Langher, V., & Sartori, R. (2017). Career adaptability as a strategic competence for career development: An exploratory study of its key predictors. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 41(1), 67–82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-07-2016-0049>
- Bornstein, M. H., Jager, J., & Putnick, D. L. (2013). Sampling in developmental science: Situations, shortcomings, solutions, and standards. *Developmental Review*, 33(4), 357–370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2013.08.003>
- Brassey, J., De Smet, A., Maor, D., & Rabipour, S. (2024). *Developing a resilient, adaptable workforce for an uncertain future*. McKinsey & Company. <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/developing-a-resilient-adaptable-workforce-for-an-uncertain-future>
- Cohen, R., & Swerdlik, M. (2009). *Psychological testing and assessment: An introduction to tests and measurement (7th ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2022). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- DiStefano, C., McDaniel, H. L., Zhang, L., Shi, D., & Jiang, Z. (2019). Fitting large factor analysis models with ordinal data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 79(3), 417–436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164418818242>
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Fiori, M., Bollmann, G., & Rossier, J. (2015). Exploring the path through which career adaptability increases job satisfaction and lowers job stress: The role of affect. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 91, 113–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.08.010>
- Gunkel, M., Schlaegel, C., Langella, I. M., & Peluchette, J. V. (2010). Personality and career decisiveness: An international empirical comparison of business students career planning. *Personnel Review*, 39(4), 503–524. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481011045443>
- Hu, L.-t., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Hulin, C., Netemeyer, R., & Cudeck, R. (2001). Can a reliability coefficient be too high?. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 10(1), 55–58. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP1001&2_05
- Kaplan, R. M., & Saccuzzo, D. P. (2017). *Psychological testing: Principles, applications, and issues (9th ed.)*. Cengage Learning.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (2nd ed.)*. The Guilford Press.
- Lee, P. C., Xu, S., & Yang, W. (2021). Is career adaptability a double-edged sword? The impact of work social support and career adaptability on turnover intentions during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 94, 102875. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2021.102875>
- Lüdtke, O., Ulitzsch, E., & Robitzsch, A. (2021). A comparison of penalized maximum likelihood estimation and Markov chain Monte Carlo techniques for estimating confirmatory factor analysis models with small sample sizes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 615162. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2021.615162/XML/NLM>
- Matheson, G. J. (2019). We need to talk about reliability: Making better use of test-retest studies for study design and interpretation. *PeerJ*, 7, e6918. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.6918>
- Millon, T., & Bloom, C. (Eds.). (2008). *The millon inventories: A practitioner's guide to personalized clinical assessment (2nd ed.)*. The Guilford Press.
- Mulyono, N. K., Sugiarti, R., & Erlangga, E. (2023). Uji validitas job seeker career adaptability scale pada pencari kerja generasi z lulusan perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Fokus Konseling*, 9(2), 78–87. <https://doi.org/10.52657/jfk.v9i2.1945>
- Nufus, A. Z., Purba, D. E., & Subchi, I. (2026). Psychometric properties of the Indonesian version of the challenge-hindrane stressor scale. *Psikostudia*, 15(12), 407–416. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikostudia.v15i1>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory (3rd ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.
- Ondé, D., & Alvarado, J. M. (2020). Reconsidering the conditions for conducting confirmatory factor analysis.

- The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 23, e55. <https://doi.org/10.1017/SJP.2020.56>
- Rahayu, A. P., & Hapsari, M. T. B. (2025). Analysis of career adaptability and happiness at work in fresh graduate employees. *Psikostudia*, 14(1), 129–136. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikostudia.v14i1>
- Savickas, M. L. (1997). Career adaptability: An integrative construct for life-span, life-space theory. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 45(3), 247–259. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.1997.tb00469.x>
- Savickas, M. L., & Porfeli, E. J. (2012). Career adapt-abilities scale: Construction, reliability, and measurement equivalence across 13 countries. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(3), 661-673. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.011>
- Savickas, M. L. (2013). Career construction theory and practice. *Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Sulistiani, W., Retno Suminar, D., & Hendriani, W. (2019). The career adapt-abilities scale-Indonesian form: Psychometric properties and construct validity. *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Education*. <https://doi.org/10.17501/24246700.2018.4201>
- World Economic Forum. (2025). *The future of jobs report 2025*. World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/publications/the-future-of-jobs-report-2025/>