ABSTRACT. Background: Scholars are highlighting the importance of adaptive career behaviors and resources that people could employ in directing their own career development across the lifespan. New constructs emerge with the intention to help the individuals to manage their careers. One of the most promising constructs is career adaptability, which includes such resources as concern, control, curiosity, and confidence. This study attempts to link those resources and study engagement. Engagement has been previously employed as an indicator of occupational well-being of both employees and students. Moreover, study engagement is considered to be adaptation result by some authors. Possibly, study engagement might be one of many positive career-related outcomes linked to career adaptability. Purpose: The purpose of the study is to analyze the links between college students’ career adaptability and study engagement. Method: the sample consisted of 273 college students ($M_{\text{age}} = 20.71$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 2.89$). Career Adapt-Abilities Scale-Short Form (CAAS-SF; Maggiori et al., 2015), the short version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale – student version (UWES-S-9; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006) and a questionnaire for demographic variables were used in the study. Results: Career adaptability resources, namely, concern, control, curiosity, and confidence, were linked to study engagement expressed as vigor, dedication and absorption. Concern and confidence were the only significant predictors of study engagement dimensions. Conclusion: The results support the importance of career adaptability resources for college students’ engagement. Keywords: career adaptability resources, engagement, students.

INTRODUCTION

Due to the rapid changes in the work world, vocational decision-making research and practice have shifted from matching individuals to fitting occupations, to helping individuals adapt to changes (Krieshok, Black, & McKay, 2009). Changes in the environment are inevitable and
being able to encounter those changes is a challenge (Savickas et al., 2009). Naturally, individuals need a set of adaptive career behaviors in directing their own career development throughout the life span (Lent & Brown, 2013). Certain psychological, social and identity resources are necessary when coping with environmental changes and managing life transitions (Hirschi, 2012). Therefore, new constructs emerge. One of those constructs is career adaptability (Savickas, 2011; Savickas et al., 2009). Career adaptability resources, namely, concern, control, curiosity, and confidence, are undoubtedly very important in one’s career and life transitions, as indicated by a number of studies (Guan et al., 2013; Duffy, Douglass, & Autin, 2015; Urbanavičiūtė, Pociūtė, Kairys, & Liniauskaitė, 2016) and, as students are in transition between school and work, the importance of career adaptability resources cannot be overlooked.

In addition, during the last decade, vocational behavior research has been also affected by the growing interest in human flourishing. Recently, with the rise of positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), a new concept of engagement has been offered (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002a). Engagement has been employed as an indicator of well-being of both employees (Perko, Kinnunen, Tolvanen & Feldt, 2016; Hakanen & Schaufeli, 2012; Seppälä et al., 2009) and students (Salanova, Schaufeli, Martínez, & Bresó, 2010). Previous studies have linked engagement to a variety of positive outcomes such as performance (Salanova et al., 2010), achievement (Bigna et al., 2014), and satisfaction with life (Mokgele & Rothmann, 2014). Hence, the awareness of resources that help flourish and stay engaged in one’s studies is crucially important. However, possible facilitators of engagement have been previously explored mostly in organizational research (Akkermans, Brenninkmeijer, Schaufeli, & Blonk, 2015; Bakker & Bal, 2010; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009). Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate if career adaptability might be a resource linked with students’ engagement while they are preparing to leave academic setting and enter the labor market.

BACKGROUND

Career adaptability. The Career construction theory (Savickas, 2005) is one of the recent attempts to explain vocational development in the contemporary work world. According to this theory, individuals need
to develop abilities to anticipate changes in their future and its context, while also finding ways to increase the chances of achieving their expectations (Savickas et al., 2009). Therefore, career adaptability is one of the central aspects of the theory (Savickas, 2005). Career adaptability resources are defined as self-regulatory, psychosocial competencies that condition the adapting strategies and behaviors while achieving adaptation goals (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). The four career adaptability resources include concern (i.e., becoming concerned about the vocational future), control (i.e., taking control of trying to prepare for one’s vocational future), curiosity (i.e., displaying curiosity by exploring possible selves and future scenarios), and confidence (i.e., strengthening the confidence to pursue one’s aspirations) (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012; Savickas, 2005). Theoretically, career adaptability indicates individual’s preparation and resources for coping with current and forthcoming vocational development tasks, occupational transitions and personal traumas (Savickas, 2005). Empirical evidence supports the importance of career adaptability resources: they have been linked to a variety of career-related outcomes, e.g., university graduates’ job-search, self-efficacy and employment status (Guan et al., 2013), undergraduates’ academic satisfaction (Duffy et al., 2015) and career optimism (Tolentino, Garcia, Lu, Restubog, Bordia, & Plewa, 2014). Moreover, career adaptability partially mediates the effects of more context-general, trait-like adaptivity on career-specific behavioral forms of adapting (Hirschi, Herrmann, & Keller, 2015). It is apparent from previous research that the outcomes of career adaptability include a variety of important outcomes. Therefore, it is natural to expect that career adaptability might be a significant career resource for students while they are anticipating transition from school to work. This study focuses on one possible desired outcomes in students’ career path, namely, study engagement.

**Study Engagement.** The concept of study engagement has been derived from the definition and operationalization of work engagement (Schaufeli, Martinez, Pinto, Salanova, & Bakker, 2002b). Analogous to work engagement, study engagement can be defined as a persistent, positive, fulfilling state of mind, characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption in the academic context (Schaufeli et al., 2002b). Vigor refers to high levels of energy and mental while studying, dedication refers
to a sense of inspiration, pride, and challenge, and absorption refers to being fully concentrated in one’s activities (Schaufeli et al., 2002b). The importance of study engagement is supported by a number of studies where it has been linked to a variety of positive outcomes, e.g., satisfaction with life (Mokgele & Rothmann, 2014), academic performance (Salanova et al., 2010), intrinsic motivation (Siu, Bakker, & Jiang, 2014), and achievement (Bigna et al., 2014). In addition, previous studies have employed work engagement as indicators of occupational well-being in both samples of employees (Perko et al., 2016; Hakanen & Schaufeli, 2012; Seppälä et al., 2009) and students (Salanova et al., 2010). Consequently, both practitioners and theoreticians are eager to reveal the possible antecedents of engagement. Various contextual and personal factors have been investigated as facilitators of study engagement, for example, study engagement has been linked to such personal resources as academic self-efficacy, study-related hope and optimism (Ouweneel, Le Blanc, & Schaufeli, 2011); psychological capital (Siu et al., 2014); and fulfillment of such psychological needs as autonomy, competence and relatedness (Sulea, Beek, Sarbescu, Virga, & Schaufeli, 2015). However, there are substantially more studies where the antecedents of work engagement are explored.

Study Engagement and Career Adaptability. As far as career adaptability is concerned, there are some evidence that career adaptability predicts employees’ work engagement: career adaptability partially moderates the relationship between personality and work engagement (Rossier, Zecca, Stauffer, Maggiori, & Dauwalder, 2012). In addition, negative links between career adaptability and burnout, and positive links between adaptability and dimensions of engagement have been established in a sample of Spanish university students (Merino-Tejedor, Hontangas, & Boada-Grau, 2016). Moreover, the aforementioned study used career adaptability as a predictor of study engagement in a more complex model which included career construction behaviors and self-regulation and career adaptability predicted engagement. Furthermore, Merino-Tejedor et al. (2016) suggest that study engagement can be viewed as an adaptation result, whereas career adaptability can be viewed as an adaptability resource for students struggling in the academic setting. Thus, we hypothesize that there will be positive links between college students’ career adaptability and the three dimensions of students’
engagement. In addition, previous studies have shown that career adaptability predicts the expected career-related outcomes despite more stable dispositions, such as personality traits and demographic factors (e.g., Zacher, 2014a). Thus, we propose that career adaptability resources will predict study engagement even when controlling for more stable individual characteristics, namely, demographic factors.

**METHOD**

**Participants**

Participants were students from two colleges in Lithuania. The final sample consisted of 273 students awarding Professional Bachelor’s degree in informational technologies (N = 200; 73.30 percent) and social sciences (N = 73; 26.70 percent). The sample consisted of 69.20 percent male (N = 187) and 30.80 percent female students (N = 86). The age of participants ranged from 18 to 39 (M<sub>age</sub> = 20.71, SD<sub>age</sub> = 2.89). Among the participants, 45.20 percent (N = 126) were in their first study years, 30.80 percent (N = 86) in the second and 24.00 percent (N = 67) in their last year of studies.

**Procedure**

Data collection was conducted from December 2015 to February 2016. All participants were informed that participation was voluntary. The questionnaires were administered by researchers and were completed in lectures during regular lecture hours. Participants were not paid for participation.

**Measures**

The instruments were used with permissions from the authors of the measures. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with the Maximum Likelihood estimation in Mplus 6 (Muthén and Muthén, 1998–2010) was performed in order to check the factor structure of the Lithuanian version of the measures. Model fit was ascertained using various indices: the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) should exceed .90, the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) should be less than .08, and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) should be less than .10 (Hu & Bentler, 1998; Byrne, 2012).
Career adaptability. Career adaptability was measured with the *Career Adapt-Abilities Scale-Short Form* (CAAS-SF) developed by Maggiori, Rossier, and Savickas (2015). The CAAS-SF contains twelve items that yield a total score indicating career adaptability of a participant. The scale consists of four subscales: (a) *concern* (3 items), a sample item is “Thinking about what my future will be like”; (b) *control* (3 items), a sample item is “Taking responsibility for my actions”; (c) *curiosity* (3 items), a sample item is “Investigating options before making a choice”; (d) *confidence* (3 items), sample item is “Taking care to do things well.” All items were scored on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (*not a strength*) to 5 (*greatest strength*). Cronbach’s alphas were .79, .74, .70, and .80 respectively for separate subscales and .89 for total scale. The results of CFA indicate that the four-factor structure provides an adequate fit to the data, $\chi^2 = 116.38$ ($p < .05$), df = 50; CFI = .95, TLI = .94; RMSEA = .070 [.05; .09]; SRMR = .04.

Study engagement. Students’ engagement was measured with the short version of *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale – student version* (UWES-S-9; Schaufeli et al., 2002a; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006) that consists of three subscales: (a) *vigor* (3 items); a sample item is “When I’m doing my work as a student, I feel bursting with energy”; (b) *dedication* (3 items); a sample item is “My studies inspire me”, and (c) *absorption* (3 items); a sample item is “I am immersed in my studies.” All items were scored on a seven-point Likert scale from 0 (*never*) to 6 (*always/every day*). Cronbach’s alphas were .72 for vigor, .86 for dedication and .68 for absorption subscale. The results of CFA indicate that the three-factor structure (with correlation between two items) provided a satisfactory fit to the data, $\chi^2 = 65.17$ ($p < .05$), df = 22; CFI = .97, TLI = .94; RMSEA = .085 [.06; .11]; SRMR = .03.

Demographic variables. Participants reported their age in years; gender (1 = male, and 2 = female); and which year of study they were in (1 = the first year of college, 2 = the second year of college, 3 = the final (third) year of college).
RESULTS

To understand the links between career adaptability and study engagement, correlations between dimensions of aforementioned constructs were computed. Means, standard deviations, and correlations between study variables are reported in Table 1. In addition, correlations between study variables and age were calculated. Age had significant positive correlations with dedication ($r = .21, p < .01$) and absorption ($r = .13, p < .05$). The correlations between age and all other study variables (vigor, concern, control, curiosity, confidence and the total score of career adaptability) were non-significant (ranging from .01 to .11).

Table 1. Summary Data and Intercorrelations Between Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vigor</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dedication</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Absorption</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Concern</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Control</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curiosity</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Confidence</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CAAS–SF</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>43.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CAAS–SF – Career Adapt-Abilities Scale-Short Form (Maggiori et al., 2015).

* $p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

Also, to explore the connection between demographics and study variables, the means of all study variables were compared by gender and study year (Table 2). Female students had significantly higher scores of dedication, absorption, control and confidence; in addition, their total score of career adaptability was also significantly higher than that of male students. There were no significant differences when comparing their scores of vigor, concern, and curiosity.
Table 2. Independent Group T-Test between Study Variables and Student’s Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>t–test</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vigor</td>
<td>M = 2.75, SD = 1.16</td>
<td>M = 2.97, SD = 1.11</td>
<td>t = – 1.48</td>
<td>d = .19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dedication</td>
<td>M = 3.18, SD = 1.19</td>
<td>M = 3.57, SD = 1.42</td>
<td>t = – 2.21*</td>
<td>d = .30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Absorption</td>
<td>M = 2.83, SD = 1.11</td>
<td>M = 3.33, SD = 1.23</td>
<td>t = – 3.34**</td>
<td>d = .43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Concern</td>
<td>M = 9.97, SD = 2.43</td>
<td>M = 10.16, SD = 2.82</td>
<td>t = – .57</td>
<td>d = .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Control</td>
<td>M = 11.17, SD = 2.41</td>
<td>M = 11.78, SD = 2.21</td>
<td>t = – 2.01*</td>
<td>d = .26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curiosity</td>
<td>M = 10.51, SD = 2.34</td>
<td>M = 11.09, SD = 2.46</td>
<td>t = – 1.84</td>
<td>d = .24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Confidence</td>
<td>M = 10.90, SD = 2.51</td>
<td>M = 12.03, SD = 2.54</td>
<td>t = – 3.45**</td>
<td>d = .45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CAAS-SF</td>
<td>M = 42.55, SD = 7.88</td>
<td>M = 45.07, SD = 8.21</td>
<td>t = – 2.42*</td>
<td>d = .31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CAAS-SF – Career Adapt-Abilities Scale-Short Form (Maggiori et al., 2015).
N = 273 (N males = 187; N females = 86).
* p< .05, **p< .01.

When comparing students by their study year, the only significant difference was found in scores of vigor (F (2, 270) = 4.04, p< .05, η²=.03). Post hoc comparisons using Bonferroni test indicated that students in their second study year significantly differed from those in their last study year (M 2nd year students = 3.07, SD 2nd year students = 0.96 and M 3rd year students = 2.54, SD 3rd year students = 1.01; mean difference = .52, p< .05), while the first year students didn’t differ significantly from their older counterparts (M 1st year students = 2.80, SD 1st year students = 1.30).

It was expected that career adaptability would positively predict the components of study engagement (i.e., vigor, dedication, and absorption). Regression analyses were used to test the hypothesis (see Table 3). In the first step, age, gender and study year were included as control variables, similarly to previous studies where those variables were used for controlling effects of career adaptability (Zacher, 2014a). In the second step, the four resources of career adaptability, namely, concern, control, curiosity, and confidence, were added.
Table 3. Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Study Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Vigor</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Absorption</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>(\Delta R^2)</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>(\Delta R^2)</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>(\Delta R^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study year</td>
<td>(-.16^*)</td>
<td>.03^*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-.17^*)</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-.17^*)</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.15^*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15^*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study year</td>
<td>(-.16^*)</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>(-.17^*)</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>(-.18^*)</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14^*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15^*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>.22^*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20^*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Gender: 1 = Male, 2 = Female, Study year: 1 = the first year of college, 2 = the second year of college, 3 = the third year of college. 
\(N = 273\). 
^*p < .05, **p < .01.

The analyses revealed that study year (\(\beta = -.16\)) and age (\(\beta = .15\)) were significant predictors of the vigor. Older students of lower courses reported being more vigorous while studying. The model based on control variables explained vigor at a rate of 3 percent (\(R^2 = .03, 95\% \text{ confidence interval (CI)} [-.01, .06], F(3, 269) = 3.06, p < .05\)). In the second step, only study year (\(\beta = -.16\)) and confidence (\(\beta = .22\)) were significant predictors. The career adaptability resources raised the model's explained variance to 10 percent (\(R^2 = .10, 95\% \text{ CI} [.03, .17], F(7, 265) = 4.32, p < .01\)).

In the first step of analysis, study year (\(\beta = -.17\)) and age (\(\beta = .25\)) were significant predictors of the dedication. Thus, similarly as in the case of vigor, dedication was higher for older students who were studying in lower courses. The model based on control variables explained 7 percent of variance (\(R^2 = .07, 95\% \text{ CI} [.01, .13], F(3, 269) = 6.85, p < .01\)). In the second step, concern (\(\beta = .15\)) and confidence (\(\beta = .34\)) added additional 12 percent of explained variance by raising R square to .19 (\(\text{CI} [.11, .27], F(7, 265) = 8.89, p < .01\)).
Finally, in the first step of analysis, study year ($\beta = -0.17$), age ($\beta = 0.15$) and gender ($\beta = 0.20$) were significant predictors of the absorption. The model based on control variables explained 7 percent of variance ($R^2 = 0.07$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.13], $F(3, 269) = 6.48$, $p < 0.01$). In the second step, adding concern ($\beta = 0.21$) and confidence ($\beta = 0.20$) raised model’s predictive value to 19 percent ($R^2 = 0.19$, CI [0.11, 0.27], $F(7, 265) = 8.88$, $p < 0.01$). Thus, reported dedication and absorption were higher among students with higher concern and confidence.

**DISCUSSION**

The purpose of this study was to analyze the links between college students’ career adaptability and study engagement. According to the Career Construction theory (Savickas, 2005), career adaptability resources are necessary in order for individuals to successfully fit themselves to occupations, work and life situations that suit them. Thus, it is possible that greater levels of career adaptability resources could lead to a better adaptation and well-being in the academic setting. Given that study engagement can be viewed as an adaptation result (Merino-Tejedor et al., 2016) and is considered to be a state that reflects students’ occupational well-being (Salanova et al., 2010), we hypothesized that the dimensions of career adaptability, i.e., concern, control, curiosity, and confidence, would predict the components of study engagement, i.e., vigor, dedication and absorption.

As it was expected, all components of study engagement positively correlated with the general score of career adaptability and the scores of separate components of career adaptabilities, with one exception – vigor did not have significant links with curiosity. Despite this exception, the results support the previous findings in employees (Rossier et al., 2012) and university students’ samples (Merino-Tejedor et al., 2016). In accordance with previous studies (Merino-Tejedor et al., 2016), confidence had the strongest correlations with components of engagement.

The components of career adaptability predicted vigor, dedication, and absorption above control variables further supporting the importance of career adaptability resources in the academic setting. Thus, the results support the hypothesis that career adaptability resources are important predictors of vigor, dedication and absorption. However,
it is important to note that only concern and confidence were significant predictors of engagement dimensions. These results are in line with previous studies where only some dimensions of career adaptability were significant predictors of career-related outcomes (Guan et al., 2013; Duffy et al., 2015; Monteiro & Almeida, 2015).

Concern, which is a resource that helps individuals look ahead and prepare for what might come next (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012), was a predictor of dedication and absorption. According to Savickas (2005), individuals engage in activities and experiences if they believe that their present activities might lead to preferred future. Thus, it is possible that to be dedicated and absorbed in one’s studies, one needs to be concerned about a certain future vision, goal or plan to give more of one’s time to the chosen studies and to see more meaning in the tasks that have to be done to achieve that desired future goals. Moreover, all dimensions of engagement can be predicted by confidence which is necessary for the individuals to achieve their aspirations and is built through various exploration experiences and information-seeking activities (Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). Confidence leads to engaging and mastering vocational development tasks, transitions and personal traumas (Savickas, 2005). The results of the current study suggest that either confidence in one’s abilities might be also a facilitator of study engagement or there are some other underlying factors, such as beliefs or some personality traits, that lead to both greater confidence and study engagement.

In addition, our study further adds to the notion that it is beneficial to investigate the differential effects of different career adaptability dimensions regarding career-related outcomes of interest, as offered by Hirschi et al. (2015). A similar issue should be addressed regarding the multidimensionality of study engagement. Schaufeli et al. (2002a) raise a question whether different engagement dimensions have similar antecedents and consequences. The results of our study support the multidimensionality of study engagement. Vigor, dedication, and absorption had slightly different predictors. This is an important addendum to previous research, especially taken into consideration that the components of engagement are relatively similar, e.g., being fully immersed in one’s activities goes along with high levels of energy and vice versa (Schaufeli et al., 2002a). This means that even though some
studies use engagement as a unidimensional construct (Merino-Tejedor et al., 2016; Sulea et al., 2015; Mokgele & Rothmann, 2014), it is worthwhile considering the differences of the three aspects of engagement.

Implications. Regarding the overall results of our study, there are some practical implications that might be considered. Previous studies have linked career adaptability to various positive outcomes (Guan et al., 2013; Tolentino et al., 2014; Duffy et al., 2015). It is possible that study engagement could also be one of those outcomes. We suggest that adding career adaptability to career counseling might be highly beneficial, and not only in relation to study engagement. Several previous studies have proven the benefits of career construction counseling (Maree, 2015; Cardoso, Silva, Gonçales, & Duarte, 2014) and training devoted to enhancing career adaptability resources (Koen, Klehe, & Van Vianen, 2012). Furthermore, Monteiro and Almeida (2015) suggest that practical experiences and fostering career adaptability during higher education studies are ways of helping graduates to manage the transition to professional contexts. The school-to-work transition is one of the most critical steps in graduates’ careers that can determine vocational outcomes and future career success (Koen et al., 2012). Hence, career counseling or interventions based on Career Construction theory (Savickas, 2005) might be very advantageous.

Limitations and Future Research. Our study has several shortcomings that need to be addressed. First of all, the study has a limitation of employing across-sectional design. A cross-lagged analysis with several measurements over time could allow investigating the causal and reciprocal relationships between study engagement and career adaptability. Similar studies have previously explored the links between job and personal resources and work engagement in samples of employees (Hakanen & Schaufeli, 2012; Simbula, Guglielmi, & Schaufeli, 2011; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009). Also, an experimental or quasi-experimental approach could help reveal how different interventions or counseling strategies affect both career adaptability and study engagement. Some studies have measured the effects of interventions on study engagement (Bresó, Schaufeli, & Salanova, 2011) and work engagement (Ouwe neel, Le Blanc, & Schaufeli, 2013; Akkermans et al., 2015). However, to our knowledge, there are no studies where the effects of Career Construction counseling would be measured in regards to study engagement.
Since study engagement might be considered as adaptation result (Merino-Tejedor et al., 2016), this could be a perspective direction to explore. Furthermore, Career Construction theory (Savickas, 2005) emphasizes the abilities to adapt to changes, transitions, and life tasks. However, it is uncertain if the four career adaptability resources can sufficiently explain successful career behaviors and occupational well-being alone. Obviously, career adaptability is extremely beneficial for individual as indicated by previous research (e.g., Nilforooshan & Salimi, 2016; Brown, Bimrose, Barnes, & Hughes, 2012; Zacher, 2014a). The links between career adaptability and study engagement that have been established in the current study support the importance of career adaptability resources. Still, it is important to understand whether more general resources representing individual’s personal responsibility and flexibility, e.g., general adaptability (Hamtiaux, Houssemand, & Vrignaud, 2013), might play an even more important role when adapting in the academic setting and preparing for a transition to the labor market.

**CONCLUSION**

Psychology is constantly evolving due to the changes in environment and societies. Naturally, new trends and constructs occur. The links between two of those constructs were the focus of the present study. One was career adaptability, which has evolved due to the shifts and changes in vocational psychology, and the other was engagement, which has developed with the growing interest in human strengths and optimal functioning. Both of the constructs are crucially important for students while they are struggling in the academic setting and preparing to transition to the labor market. The findings of the study revealed that career adaptability resources were linked to college students’ engagement, meaning that students with higher levels of concern, control, curiosity and confidence feel more immersed in their studies, more energetic and more dedicated. In addition, concern was a significant predictor of dedication and absorption, while confidence was a significant predictor of all study engagement dimensions above the individual characteristics, such as age, gender and study year. Despite the limitations of the study, the results support the importance of career adaptability resources for college students’ well-being, expressed as high levels of study engagement when preparing to enter the work world.
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