

**Why do People Network? Professional Networking Motives and their Implications for
Networking Behaviors and Career Success**

Caitlin M. Porter, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Management
Fogelman College of Business and Economics
University of Memphis
Email: caitlin.porter@memphis.edu

Sang Eun Woo, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Psychological Sciences
Purdue University
Email: sewoo@purdue.edu

Nicole Alonso, Ph.D.
Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Psychology Department
University of Houston
Email: nalonso@central.uh.edu

Galen Snyder, Ph.D.
Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Psychology Department
University of Houston
Email: gsnyder@central.uh.edu

Citation:

Porter, C. M., Woo, S. E., Alonso, N. A., & Snyder, G. P. (2023). Why do people network? Professional networking motives and their implications for networking behavior and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*.

Abstract

Professional networking involves a series of goal-directed interpersonal interactions that build and maintain professional relationships and include the exchange of work and career-benefiting resources. Despite the utility of professional networking, many people eschew the activity, which has spurred interest in the question: “why do people network?” Drawing from psychological theories of personality and behavioral prediction, we offer a theoretical basis for Professional Networking Motives (PNMs) that accounts for prior explanations for why people network. We verify and elaborate upon our initial theoretical conceptualization of PNM by drawing from a series of semi-structured interviews of industrial and organizational psychologists based in the United States to identify the domain-specific content of PNM (Study 1). We further posit that “why” people network (i.e., their PNM) has implications for “how” they network (i.e., networking behaviors) and their career success. In Study 2, we develop and validate a measure of PNM based upon occupationally diverse samples based in the United States, and we use a time-separated research design to evaluate whether PNM differentially predict networking behaviors and career success. We illustrate the value of understanding people’s motives for professional networking, as certain PNM are more important than others for promoting different types of networking behaviors and forms of career success. We conclude by discussing the theoretical and practical implications of our study and offer suggestions for future research to deepen the understanding of professional networking and PNM.

Keywords: professional networking, career success, networking behaviors

Why do People Network? Professional Networking Motives and their Implications for Networking Behaviors and Career Success

Professional networking is a series of goal-directed interpersonal interactions with one or more network contacts that build and maintain professional relationships and that comprise the mutually beneficial exchange of resources that are instrumental for work and career success (Gibson et al., 2014; Porter & Woo, 2015; Wolff & Moser, 2009)¹. Increased access to information, advice, influence, and other forms of “social capital” enables people to be more effective in their work roles, leading to better job performance (e.g., Michael & Yukl, 1993; Thompson, 2005) and professional advancement (e.g., Langford, 2000). Furthermore, people who engage in professional networking are often able to capitalize on their increased effectiveness to achieve long-term career success, such as more substantial salary increases, more job offers, and greater career satisfaction (Forret & Dougherty, 2004; Porter et al., 2016; Wolff & Moser, 2009, 2010). Given the merits of professional networking, one would think that it would be a highly regarded career management activity. Yet many people find professional networking to be uncomfortable or inauthentic (Casciaro et al., 2016). These negative sentiments towards such a professionally beneficial activity have spurred interest in why people network.

To date, scholars have taken various approaches to understanding why people network. Seeking to understand how personality influences professional networking from a motivational perspective, Wolff et al. (2018) investigated how McClelland’s (1987) implicit motives (i.e., psychological needs for power, achievement, and affiliation) were associated with networking behaviors. Other scholars have suggested that people’s beliefs or attitudes about the utility (Kuwabara et al., 2018; Porter & Woo, 2015) or morality of professional networking influence

¹ See the following for discussions of how professional networking is distinguished from related constructs, such as mentoring, social networks, and social support: Gibson et al., 2014; Porter et al., 2016; Wolff et al., 2008.

the likelihood of networking behaviors (Casciaro et al., 2014). While each of these explanations provide insights into why people network, no single approach offers an inclusive explanation, suggesting a need to integrate insights from these differing approaches.

To address this need, we propose a taxonomy of professional networking motives (PNMs), which we conceptualize as *explicit* motives, or “reasons people self-attribute for their actions” (Kehr, 2004). Our approach contrasts with and complements prior research adopting McClelland’s taxonomy of *implicit* motives (i.e., Wolff et al., 2018). Implicit motives develop earlier in one’s life and broadly affect characteristic patterns of behavior over time via ‘natural incentives’ (McClelland et al., 1989, p. 697); they are divorced from context and operate beyond conscious awareness to predict a wide range of behaviors. For example, need for achievement refers to a need to achieve in various life domains, not merely through professional networking. In contrast, *explicit* motives develop over the course of one’s life and are activated by external, social factors such as positive and negative life experiences, norms, and societal expectations; they are within actors’ conscious awareness and explain why people engage in specific behaviors, such as professional networking.

Drawing from theories of personality and behavioral prediction (Triandis, 1980), we posit the existence of three explicit motives for professional networking: (1) *affect-affiliation* motives, reflecting an impetus to network because one enjoys developing high-quality professional relationships, which occurs via the exchange of resources; (2) *strategic* motives, reflecting desires to engage in professional networking as a means to acquire certain work and career-benefiting resources; and (3) a *social-normative* motive, reflecting an impetus to engage in professional networking to adhere to reference group norms about whether one should network. Complementing our initial, theory-driven taxonomy with semi-structured interviews of industrial

and organizational (I-O) psychologists working in businesses in the United States, we delineate the full spectrum of explicit motives that are directly tied to professional networking in Study 1.

In Study 2, we develop and validate the professional networking motives inventory using several samples of occupationally diverse workers based within the United States. As part of this validation effort, we situate PNMs within the nomological network of networking behaviors, illustrating that they offer added value in predicting networking behaviors over and above the most commonly investigated antecedents of professional networking—personality traits (Bendella & Wolff, 2020). We not only illustrate that *why* people network (i.e., PNMs) relates to *how* they use professional networking to manage their careers, but we also show that PNMs impact the types of career success people acquire. We examine multiple forms of career success, both commonly accepted objective standards of “success” (e.g., receiving a promotion) and subjective evaluations of progress towards one’s personal career goals. In doing so, we clarify *which* PNMs are influential in promoting distinct aspects of career success, illustrating that PNMs also have downstream implications for personally valued career outcomes.

This paper makes three contributions to research on professional networking and career success. First, we offer a theoretical basis for understanding “why people network”, which accounts for explanations advanced by prior research: The Affective-Affiliation motive accounts for McClelland’s (1987) need for affiliation; the Strategic motive accounts for utility explanations and McClelland’s needs for achievement and power; and the Social-Normative motive accounts for morality explanations, which are rooted in cultural or social norms.

Second, we offer a theoretically grounded and practically useful measure of PNMs. Lacking an integrative theoretical perspective on this issue, prior research has investigated subsets of motives for professional networking (e.g., Kuwabara et al., 2020). Even the broadest

motive taxonomy used in previous networking research (Wolff et al., 2018)—McClelland's (1987) implicit motives—does not assess the full range of motives relevant to professional networking, as it excludes normative concerns. Additionally, as discussed above, implicit motives are divorced from context and thus, offer limited insight into the self-ascribed reasons for professional networking, in particular. Moreover, because implicit motives are beyond conscious awareness, assessment relies upon tools that require specialized training to administer, such as the Thematic Apperception Test (McClelland et al., 1989). To address these limitations, we offer the Professional Networking Motives Inventory, which can be utilized without specialized training to capture the full range of explicit motives for professional networking.

Finally, we advance the literature by illustrating that *why* people network not only impacts *how* they use professional networking to manage their careers, but also *which* aspects of career success they are most likely to acquire. We suggest that PNMs shape decisions to adopt professional networking as a strategy for acquiring valued career outcomes. While such rationales are noted by Wolff et al. (2018), they stop short of examining how motives relate to professional successes. We illustrate that certain networking motives are more consequential for shaping networking behavior and obtaining (certain forms of) career success than others. Understanding the content of PNMs—as well as how these motives relate to personally valued aspects of career success—provides practical insights into how people may invest in networking activities that are personally fulfilling and professionally fruitful.

Theoretical Basis for Professional Networking Motives

As noted above, we conceptualize PNMs as *explicit* motives. Although prior research has investigated explicit motives in various interpersonal domains, there is no single agreed upon framework. Like prior research (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), we draw from Triandis' (1980)

integrative framework for understanding why people act in social situations (often referred to as a theory of interpersonal behavioral prediction) as a basis for delineating explicit motives for professional networking. Triandis argued that behavioral intentions are determined by three individual differences: 1) affect towards the behavior, 2) beliefs about the utility of the behavior, and 3) social factors. People act in social situations because they believe their actions are associated with valued consequences (i.e., utility); when they receive these valued consequences, their beliefs about the behavior leading to the valued consequences are reinforced (termed situation-behavior reinforcement sequences), and they develop (positive) affect toward the behavior. The intention to act is directly influenced by social factors that encourage the person to perform the behavior, such as moral codes and/or social norms. Triandis conceptualizes these three determinants of interpersonal behavior as characteristic adaptations, individual differences that develop over time as a function of culture, personality traits, and prior experiences.

Culture, personality traits, and prior experiences influence what one finds enjoyable, what one values, and the cultural and social norms that one holds as important (Triandis, 1980), which in turn predispose one to select social situations and strive towards goals that are commensurate. When people are successful in professional networking situations, they recognize the value of their actions and their explicit motives for that behavior are reinforced (i.e., situation-behavior reinforcement); whereas when they are unsuccessful, their explicit motives may be weakened. Indeed, professional networking is a long-term career management activity that requires one to invest time and emotional energy in initiating relationships, identifying mutually beneficial exchanges, illustrating one's competence and goodwill, and persisting in the face of rejection (Porter & Woo, 2015). These experiences shape explicit motives for professional networking.

Drawing from Triandis' (1980) framework, we posit three domain-specific PNMs that we term affective-affiliation, strategic, and social normative motives. The affective-affiliation motive captures affect towards the process of building and maintaining high-quality connections via the exchange of resources. When people have positive professional interpersonal interactions, form high-quality professional relationships, and/or become embedded in professional networks, the affective-affiliation motive is likely strengthened. The strategic motive captures beliefs about the strategic value or utility of networking (Kuwabara et al., 2018; Porter & Woo, 2015). This explicit motive is reinforced when people receive work and career-benefiting resources from professional network contacts, which enables one to compete and be successful in professional contexts. The social-normative motive captures a perceived obligation to engage in professional networking to fulfill the expectations of others (e.g., colleagues, professional contacts), which are more likely when one works in organizations and professions that encourage professional networking. This explicit motive is reinforced when one receives feedback about whether professional networking is desirable, whereas this motive is weakened when one's reference groups regard networking as an immoral activity (e.g., Casciaro et al., 2014).

Study 1: Developing a Taxonomy of Professional Networking Motives

The proposed PNMs provide an integrative perspective on explicit motives for professional networking behavior, subsuming prior explanations for why people network. This theoretically derived taxonomy is consistent with explicit motive taxonomies in other interpersonal domains—such as leadership and helping behavior—which tend to consist of three broad factors concerned with affect or affiliation, the strategic value of the behavior, and normative concerns (e.g., Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Rubenstein et al., 2020). Such taxonomies also illustrate that the content of explicit motives is specific to the behavioral domain. Thus, we

delineate the content of PNMs based on semi-structured interviews of I-O psychologists who commonly engage in professional networking. Because we start with an initial theoretical conceptualization, this study has components of theory generation and theory elaboration, following in the tradition of “pattern-matching” qualitative research (Lee et al., 1999).

Method

Participants and Procedures

Professionals in the field of I-O psychology were contacted by the first author via email to participate in a one-on-one semi-structured interview about their professional networking. We approached these professionals because they work in a profession that relies upon professional networking to acquire information and resources that facilitate work and career success. All participants worked in businesses or government agencies, providing the appropriate context for understanding the explicit motives underlying professional networking behavior. We identified interviewees based on their previous participation in a study about their networking behaviors; thus, we were confident that participants engaged in networking. Out of 94 people contacted, 43 agreed to be interviewed. We considered recruiting additional interviewees, but the novelty of the information in the interviews was waning, suggesting that the information collected captured the full range of differing responses. Sample demographic information is reported in Table 1.

We adopted a semi-structured interview to allow interviewees to share any experiences they considered pertinent to their networking behaviors. If the interviewee desired to continue discussing a topic, the interviewer allowed the conversation to progress in that direction. Interviews were conducted over the phone or in-person at an annual conference, depending upon the preference and availability of the interviewee. Interviews lasted between 20 and 45 minutes, depending upon the networking experiences of the interviewee and their willingness to discuss

their experiences with the interviewer. During the interview, the first author asked interviewees to define networking and describe how they network (e.g., “How do you define networking?”, “What do you do when you ‘network’?”). Then, she asked them about their motivations for networking (e.g., “What motivates you to network?”) and how they define an effective networker (e.g., “What makes an effective networker?”). Finally, interviewees addressed any remaining thoughts about their networking behaviors. Detailed notes from the interviews were used as data.

Data Reduction and Analysis

Similar to prior mixed-methods scale development research (Vissa, 2012), we adopted content analysis to evaluate whether the data reflected the proposed networking motives. Content analysis is often used for coding theory-based interviews; conceptual categories are established by theory and the goal of the research is to populate the pre-existing constructs with contextually relevant content (Francis et al., 2010). Thus, this approach was appropriate for our purposes.

We followed the content analysis approach outlined by Weber (1990): First, the first author defined the units of analysis; she reviewed the text from the interviews and identified excerpts associated with professionals networking motives (i.e., data reduction), which yielded 139 statements. Each interviewee produced between one and six statements (Mode = 3). Second, the first author defined the coding categories *a priori* based on the theorizing above (affective-affiliation, strategic, and social-normative). Third, she coded a sample of the 139 statements into these three categories. Upon doing so, she found that finer-grained categories more accurately represented the content of PNMs, necessitating a revision of the coding protocol. She induced six categories: Affiliation, prosocial, status, learning and performance, career management, and social-normative. Prior research is similar in that they identified more fine-grained categories to represent the three broad behavioral motives identified from theory (e.g., Rubenstein et al. 2020).

Fourth, the second author reviewed the categories separately and the first and second author discussed whether the categories were appropriate and the boundaries of the categories. Then, both the first and second author coded all of the statements to ensure that the six categories fully and accurately represented the range of statements. Most statements were associated with the learning and performance motive, and the fewest statements were associated with the status motive. Although some interviewees exhibited one motive exclusively, most exhibited multiple networking motives, suggesting that people hold multiple motives for professional networking.

As a final step, we recruited two doctoral students pursuing degrees in I-O psychology to independently verify that the 139 statements could be reliably placed into the six categories. The first author met with the doctoral students to describe their task and provide definitions of the categories; then, the students independently coded the 139 statements. Most statements could be categorized into one category, whereas some statements were relevant to multiple categories. Thus, coders were allowed to categorize statements into more than one category. All 139 statements were placed into one or more of the six categories. Cohen's Kappa agreement was acceptable for each category (affiliation = .84, prosocial = .77, status = .70, learning and performance = .77, career management = .73, and social-normative = .76). Thus, we have evidence that the categorization was reproducible by independent coders.

Results

Integrating insights from academic research on behavioral motives and real-life experiences of over 40 professionals, we identified six, domain-specific PNMs: Affiliation, prosocial, status, learning and performance, career management, and social-normative. Table 2 reports the definitions and example quotes for each of the six PNMs.

Affiliation

About 13% (n = 19) of statements were categorized into the affiliation motive. Those who mentioned the affiliation motive tended to derive pleasure from building new relationships, knowing many people, and feeling connected to others; they often described networking as “fun” or “enjoyable”. Thus, people network to build and maintain interpersonal relationships with others, which increases feelings of interconnection. This explicit motive is related to the basic human motive of need for affiliation (McClelland, 1987).

Prosocial

About nine percent (n = 12) of interviewees mentioned prosocial reasons for networking, such as mentoring junior colleagues and introducing contacts to one another. They tended to enjoy facilitating others’ career progression via advice giving and/or bridging disconnected people, suggesting that people network because they enjoy helping others.

Status

About four percent (n = 6) of interviewees described using networking to advance their own careers or develop a reputation in their area of expertise. They used professional networking as a means to ascend a formal or informal social hierarchy within an organization, professional organization, occupation, networking group, or community. This networking motive is conceptually linked to the desire for status, or the “respect, admiration, and voluntary deference an individual is afforded by others, based on that individual’s perceived instrumental social value” (p. 575; Anderson, Hildreth, & Howland, 2015).

Learning and Performance

The majority of statements (47%; n = 66) referred to tapping professional networks for learning new skills or best practices that they could adopt in their own job or career. Because many people leverage the knowledge gained from networking for their work performance, we

grouped learning and performance together. We found that people perform networking purely for learning opportunities; similarly, people may perform networking purely for work performance or business development reasons (i.e., referrals). We suspect that the emphasis on learning may be especially relevant to occupations that require advanced education and continual learning.

Career Management

About 16% (n = 23) of interviewees cited networking as a tool for staying abreast of job opportunities and gaining access to alternative job information. Even though all interviewees were employed at the time, they mentioned a desire to maintain contact with their network contacts should their job change, they need a job in the future, or their employer downsize.

Social-Normative

About 11% (n = 15) of statements discussed professional networking as a required part of the work role or as a professional obligation necessary for career success. Indeed, many people noted that the social context encourages or requires them to network, and multiple interviewees noted that they felt an obligation to do so for professional reasons. This motive was consistent with our theoretical conceptualization of a social-normative motive in that it is concerned with adhering to social norms of a relevant social group (e.g., profession, organization).

Discussion

Drawing from a set of semi-structured interviews, we specified the content of PNMs, finding that the tri-partite model we initially proposed is more complex in the professional networking domain. With regard to the affective-affiliation motive, we found that people tend to derive positive feelings from professional networking when they are connecting to or helping others. Thus, we inferred that the affective-affiliation motive is composed of two more specific motives that capture positive affective reactions to connecting with others (affiliation) and

helping others through networking or exchanging resources (prosocial). Similarly, we inferred that the strategic motive encapsulates three “valued consequences” of professional networking: Status, learning and performance, and career management. Thus, people perceive professional networking as an activity that can help them gain status in a group (e.g., organization, profession, community), learn knowledge and skills that give them an edge in their work, and stay abreast of opportunities for advancing their career (including job search). The social-normative motive was consistent with our initial conceptualization in that it reflects concerns with developing and maintaining a positive reputation amongst one’s social group.

We based our initial conceptualization of PNMs in a broad psychological theory of interpersonal behavior, which provides a strong conceptual basis for understanding why people network. However, the six explicit networking motives that emerged from our interviews are based upon a set of professionals that are unique in that they are all highly educated, from a single occupation (i.e., I-O psychology), from a single cultural context (i.e., United States), and are racially homogenous (i.e., white). Thus, our approach leaves open the possibility that the PNMs we identified are specific to (white) knowledge workers within the United States; in other occupational and/or cultural contexts, people may hold different PNMs or interpret PNMs differently. In Study 2, we develop and validate a measure of PNMs using occupationally diverse samples, providing initial evidence that the identified PNMs are relevant to a wider variety of occupational contexts. Because culture may shape PNMs (Triandis, 1980), we rely on samples from the United States for this initial validation effort. In the General Discussion, we elaborate on how culture may shape PNMs and how future research may extend our initial taxonomy to additional cultural contexts.

Study 2: Development and Validation of The Professional Networking Motives Inventory

Having delineated the content of PNMs, we developed a measure of these six motives, which we term the Professional Networking Motives Inventory (PNMI). The first and second author each developed items to represent each of the six networking motives. We reviewed the items to ensure that they represented their intended constructs and classified them into the six PNMs. In total, we generated 50 items, seven to 11 items for each networking motive. Following the guidelines of Hinkin (1998), we empirically refine these the items (Sample 1) and examine the internal factor structure of the PNMI (Sample 2). Finally, we examine the content validity of the PNMI (Sample 3), and investigate how it relates to professional networking antecedents, behaviors, and criteria to provide evidence of construct validity (Sample 4). The demographic information for all samples is reported in Table 1.

Sample 1: Initial Item Reduction

Procedure

We used Qualtrics to administer a cross-sectional survey containing the PNMI and demographic questions to 300 part-time and full-time United States workers who acknowledged that they engage in professional networking. They were compensated \$5 (USD).

Exploratory Factor Analysis

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis to ensure that the data reflected our theoretical conceptualization and to reduce the initial item pool in a logical, data-driven manner. Exploratory factor analysis allows the data speak for itself rather than forcing it to a factor structure, which provides a stronger evidentiary basis for our conclusions. We submitted the 50 items to a principal axis factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation and an oblique, promax rotation. To identify the appropriate number of factors, we examined four-factor ($X^2 = 1203.6$, $df = 272$), five-factor ($X^2 = 842.73$, $df = 248$), and six-factor solutions ($X^2 = 491$, $df =$

225). The six-factor solution fit the data better than the four-factor ($\Delta X^2 = 712.6$, $\Delta df = 47$, $p < .001$) and the five-factor solution ($\Delta X^2 = 360.87$, $\Delta df = 24$, $p < .001$), and it was also more easily interpretable. For the six-factor solution, we examined whether the eigenvalues exceeded one; six factors had eigenvalues over one, a finding which was confirmed by a bend at six factors in the scree plot. Parallel analysis also suggested a six-factor solution. This six-factor solution also explained 69% of the variance in the items.

Next, we examined the pattern matrix to ensure that items loaded on their hypothesized factors and to investigate the presence of cross loadings. We removed seven items exhibiting loadings of greater than .30 on more than one factor and submitted the remaining items to an exploratory factor analysis with the same specifications. A six-factor solution explained about 70% of the variance in the items, and the items loaded on the six factors as hypothesized. We carefully considered the whether the number of items could be reduced to maintain efficiency and minimize response bias from boredom or fatigue (Hinkin, 1998). We identified items that were overlapping in content or that may be considered vague to an audience with heterogeneous backgrounds. Using this strategy, we reduced the scale by 15 items, yielding a final scale consisting of 28 items, with four to five items representing each networking motive. We submitted the final set of items to an exploratory factor analysis; a six-factor solution emerged that explained 74% of the variance in the items. Table 3 reports factor loadings and internal consistency reliability estimates for the final PNMI.

Sample 2: Internal Factor Structure

Procedure

We used Qualtrics to administer a cross-sectional survey of networking motives and demographic questions to 308 part-time and full-time United States workers who acknowledged that they perform some form of professional networking. They were compensated \$5 (USD).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

First, we examined the psychometric properties of the PNMI using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). We evaluated the fit of the CFA model using the chi-square statistic, Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the Standard Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR). CFI and TLI values above .90 indicate acceptable fit, and values of .95 or higher indicate very good fit. RMSEA and SRMR values of .08 or lower indicate acceptable fit, and values of .05 or lower indicate very good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

We ran a CFA in which the networking motives items loaded on their six respective factors (Model 1). We found that this six-factor model fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 756.62$, $df = 335$, CFI = .94, TLI = .93, RMSEA = .06, SRMR = .04). We also investigated two alternative models: Model 2 specified that all items associated with the Affiliation and Prosocial motives loaded on a single factor and that all Status, Career management, and Learning & Performance motive items loaded on a single factor. We found that this three-factor model fit the data worse than the six-factor solution ($\Delta\chi^2 = 930.54$, $\Delta df = 12$, $p < .001$; $\chi^2 = 1687.16$, $df = 347$, CFI = .81, TLI = .79, RMSEA = .11, SRMR = .07). Model 3 specified a three-factor, higher-order model in which the Affiliation and Prosocial factors loaded on a higher-order Affective-Affiliation factor, and the three strategic motives factors loaded on a Strategic factor; social-normative remained a lower-order factor. This higher-order model fit the data well but exhibited poorer fit compared to the six-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 52.41$, $\Delta df = 7$, $p < .001$; $\chi^2 = 809.03$, $df = 342$, CFI = .93, TLI = .93, RMSEA = .07, SRMR = .05).

Sample 3: Content Validity

Procedure

We used a crowdsourcing platform, Prolific, to recruit workers in the United States to participate in a survey in which they rated how well a set of statements matched three concepts in exchange for \$2.60 (USD). When selecting orbiting constructs for each networking motive, we followed the guidelines recommended by Colquitt et al. (2019). To reduce response fatigue, we randomly assigned participants to rate how well one of two sets of items (consisting of 44 or 47 items) matched three different constructs on a 1 (Extremely bad) to 7 (Extremely good) scale; the constructs were counterbalanced within each survey. Participants read instructions and were given an opportunity to practice before conducting the ratings; if they did not complete the practice items correctly, they were asked to revisit their responses. We recruited 140 participants to rate each set of statements; 28 participants failed attention check items—such as “Mark this item Agree”—and were removed, yielding final sample sizes of 127 and 125.

Results

We adopted the Hinkin and Tracey (1999) approach for calculating correspondence and distinctiveness ratings. Table 4 reports the results of this analysis. All six of the PNMs were easily distinguished from orbiting constructs. When going by the strictest standards, the indices suggest that our scales exhibit moderate to very strong correspondence and distinctiveness (see Colquitt et al., 2019). Thus, we have some evidence of content validity.

Sample 4: Construct Validity

As a final step in our scale validation effort, we provide insights into 1) how the most commonly investigated set of professional networking antecedents—personality traits—relate to PNMs (Gibson et al., 2014), 2) whether PNMs predict professional networking behavior after

accounting for personality traits, and 3) how PNMs relate to objective and subjective career success, illustrating that PNMs have implications for the types of success people achieve in their careers. First, we expect personality traits, which refer to dispositional patterns of behavior, to predict PNMs. Personality traits predict professional networking behaviors and whether or not professional networking interactions are successful (Bendella & Wolff, 2020). As we discussed previously, such positive and negative experiences with professional networking shape PNMs. Thus, we expect that personality traits will be associated with PNMs.

Second, we expect that PNMs incrementally predict professional networking behaviors beyond personality traits. Theoretically, both personality traits and explicit motives are distinct components of one's personality system (McAdams & Pals, 2006): Personality traits explain "how" people behave, whereas motives provide insight into "why" people behave in a certain way (Winter et al., 1998). PNMs are further distinguished from personality traits in that PNMs are domain-specific, whereas personality traits explain how people behave across a variety of situations. Because each captures different features of one's personality, we expect that both personality traits and PNMs predict professional networking behaviors. Specifically, we posit that PNMs are differentially associated with how and where one invests one's networking effort; that is, whether one tends to focus on *building* new relationships, *maintaining* existing relationships, or exchanging resources with one's network contacts (i.e., *using*), and whether one focuses such networking efforts *internal* versus *external* to one's employing organization.

Finally, we posit that PNMs are differentially related to forms of career success. Career success refers to positive work and career outcomes from one's work experiences accumulated over the course of one's career (Judge et al., 1995). Given the breadth of this concept, scholars typically distinguish between two categories of career success: Objective and subjective career

success. Objective career success refers to observable career accomplishments and characterize a person's success relative to others according to objective, societally accepted standards of career advancement, such as promotions, raises, and income; whereas subjective career success refers to one's "internal apprehension and evaluation of his or her career, across any dimensions that are important to that individual" (p. 179; Arthur et al., 2005). These differing conceptualizations implicitly recognize that people emphasize different aspects of their career as important. What people value in their careers—and therefore, what aspects of their careers they pursue—is influenced by their personal values (i.e., characteristic adaptations) that they develop through life experiences. We expect that PNMs, as a set of characteristic adaptations, are differentially associated with the types of career success that people pursue and achieve.

Procedure

We used a crowdsourcing platform (i.e., Prolific) to recruit United States-based workers to participate in a time-separated survey. To ensure data quality, we recruited workers who had at least a 90% approval rate for their previous activities, and we excluded participants who failed multiple attention check items—such as “Mark this item Agree”. At Time 1, we recruited 799 workers to participate in a survey assessing networking motives, personality traits, and demographic characteristics; they were compensated \$2.83 (USD). Of those who participated at Time 1, 571 participated (71% response rate) in a second survey three months later that assessed networking motives, networking behaviors, and career success; they were compensated \$2.75 (USD). Of these 571, 46 failed multiple attention check items and were removed, yielding a final sample size of 525 (overall response rate of 66%) for our analyses, which used listwise deletion.²

² To evaluate whether attrition between Time 1 and Time 2 was associated with nonrandom sampling, we conducted a logistic regression where a dichotomous variable representing participation at Time 2 (1 = yes, 0 = no) was the outcome and Time 1 variables were predictors (Goodman & Blum, 1996).

Measures

Tables 5 and 6 report means, standard deviations, zero-order correlations, and Cronbach's alpha reliability estimates of study variables.

Networking Motives. We assessed networking motives using the 28-item Professional Networking Motives Inventory. Participants rated items on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *Strongly disagree*, 5 = *Strongly agree*). We examined the test-retest reliability by estimating the ICC(1) between each networking motive at Time 1 and Time 2. The Affiliation motive ($ICC(1) = .80$) exhibited good reliability, whereas the remaining PNMs exhibited moderate reliability (Koo & Li, 2016): Prosocial ($ICC(1) = .66$), Status ($ICC(1) = .55$), Career Management ($ICC(1) = .60$), Learning and Performance ($ICC(1) = .61$), and Social-Normative ($ICC(1) = .60$).

We also evaluated the internal factor structure of the PNMI using CFA. Model 1 allowed the networking motives items loaded on their six respective factors ($X^2 = 956.83$, $df = 335$, CFI = .95, TLI = .95, RMSEA = .06, SRMR = .04); Model 2 specified a three-factor model where Affiliation and Prosocial motive items loaded on a single factor and all Status, Career Management, and Learning & Performance motive items loaded on a single factor ($X^2 = 4545.82$, $df = 347$, CFI = .69, TLI = .66, RMSEA = .15, SRMR = .12); Model 3 specified a three-factor, higher-order model where the Affiliation and Prosocial factors loaded on a higher-order factor, and the Status, Career Management, and Learning & Performance motive factors loaded on a higher-order factor ($X^2 = 1013.90$, $df = 342$, CFI = .95, TLI = .95, RMSEA = .06, SRMR = .06). Model 1 fit the data better than Model 3 ($\Delta X^2 = 57.07$, $\Delta df = 7$, $p < .01$) and Model 2 ($\Delta X^2 = 3589$, $\Delta df = 12$, $p < .01$).

Participants' standings on the PNMI and demographic characteristics were unrelated to participation at Time 2; but we found that Time 2 respondents were more conscientious ($O.R. = 1.29$, $p = .005$) and less neurotic ($O.R. = .79$, $p = .006$), suggesting that the samples differ somewhat from Time 1 to Time 2.

Personality Traits. We adopted a measure of the Big-5—Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness—because it is a fairly comprehensive and well-established taxonomy of personality traits (John et al., 2008). The Big-5 personality traits were assessed using Donnellan et al.'s (2006) Mini-IPIP scales, which consists of four items representing each personality trait. Participants rated how well each item described them on a 1 (*Very inaccurate*) to 5 (*Very accurate*) scale.

Networking Behaviors. Professional networking behavior may be characterized by its functions—building, maintaining, and using—and foci—whether it takes place with professional contacts internal versus external to one's employing organization (Wolff & Moser, 2009).

Building behaviors refer to taking the initiative to initiate new relationships; *maintaining* behaviors refer to catching up with professional contacts and maintaining a personal relationship; and *using* behaviors refer to exchanging resources with professional contacts, such as news and professional advice. We assessed networking behaviors using the 18-item short-form networking behaviors scale (Wolff & Spurr, 2020), which assesses six networking behaviors with three items each: internal-building, internal-maintaining, internal-using, external-building, external-maintaining, and external-using. Participants indicated the frequency with which they performed networking behaviors on a four-point scale (1 = *Never or Very seldom*, 2 = *Sometimes*, 3 = *Frequently*, and 4 = *Very often or Always*).

Subjective Career success. Recognizing that subjective career success is a multifaceted concept that and has been conceptualized in various ways, Shockley et al. (2015) offered a comprehensive, multidimensional measure of subjective career success that captures eight aspects of one's career: Recognition, Quality Work, Meaningful Work, Influence, Authenticity,

Personal Life, Growth and Development, and Satisfaction. Participants rated three items for each aspect on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*).

Objective career success. Objective career success was evaluated using measures of receiving a raise, being promoted, and receiving a job offer, all within the past year; responses were coded as yes (= 1) or no (= 0). Participants were also asked to report their salary on the following scale: 1 = <\$10,000, 2 = \$10,000-19,999, 3 = \$20,000-29,999, 4 = \$30,000-39,999, 5 = \$40,000-49,999, 6 = \$50,000-59,999, 7 = \$60,000-69,999, 8 = \$70,000-79,999, 9 = \$80,000-89,999, 10 = \$90,000-99,999, 11 = \$100,000-149,999, 12 = >\$150,000.

Control Variables. When predicting career success outcomes, we controlled for age because one's networking motives and conceptualization of career success may change over the course of one's career. We also controlled for gender because men and women tend to have different degrees of objective career success (Ng et al., 2005). Gender was coded as Men = 1, Women = 0. Finally, we controlled for occupational prestige to account for occupational differences in career success, as some professions are associated with higher salaries or more meaning. Participants indicated which of twenty-three U.S. Census occupation categories best described their current job. Each category has an associated prestige score, on a one-hundred-point scale, assembled by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC, 2010).

Analytic Approach

To account for measurement error and avoid Type I error rates (Westfall & Yarkoni, 2016), we adopted latent variable modeling using the lavaan package in R to examine the associations between personality traits and networking motives and the incremental validity of PNMs in predicting networking behaviors and career success outcomes above and beyond personality traits (Rosseel, 2012). We used maximum likelihood estimation for all latent variable

regressions with continuous outcomes; for dichotomous outcomes (i.e., raise, promotion, job offer), we used Weighted Least Squares Mean and Variance Adjusted estimation, which converts a dichotomous dependent variable to a latent continuous variable.

Results and Discussion

Personality Traits

Table 7 reports the latent variable regressions of personality traits predicting PNMs. We found that personality traits were associated with PNMs in a logical manner. Extraversion was positively associated with all six PNMs; those who are outgoing and gain energy in social situations are more likely to develop a wider range of explicit motives for professional networking. Agreeableness was positively related to the Affective-Affiliation and Prosocial motives; those who have an interest in and care about others are more likely to value networking because it offers opportunities for connection and helping. Conscientiousness was positively related to Status and Career Management motives, suggesting that those who are achievement-oriented are more likely to value professional networking for its career-related benefits. We also found that Openness was positively related to the Strategic motives, with the strongest association with the Learning and Performance motive. This measure of openness captures the intellect aspect of openness (Donnellan et al., 2006), which suggests that those who are higher in intellect are more apt to recognize the instrumental benefits of networking. Finally, Neuroticism was unrelated to the PNMs, perhaps because those who tend to worry or feel nervous are less likely experience positive networking interactions and therefore, to develop PNMs.

Networking Behaviors

Table 8 reports the latent variable regressions of PNMs predicting networking behaviors, after accounting for personality traits. Consistent with expectations, we found that PNMs predict

networking behaviors after accounting for personality traits, providing evidence that PNMs effectively capture features of personality that are distinct from traits. The associations between PNMs and networking behaviors provide insights into how explicit motives shape networking efforts: Those who enjoy networking (Affective-Affiliation) tend to build connections within their employing organizations and maintain connections to those outside of their employing organizations. Those who network to help others (Prosocial) were more likely to engage in networking behaviors centered around maintaining internal connections and exchanging resources with others (Using) both within and outside of their employing organizations.

With regard to the strategic motives, we found that those who network for status emphasize building new relationships (Building) and exchanging resources with others (Using) within and outside of their organizations, consistent with extant research on how people gain status (Anderson & Kilduff, 2009). Those who network to learn new knowledge and skills that they can apply to their work (Learning & Performance) focus their networking efforts on Maintaining and Using connections external to their employing organizations, suggesting that they tend to seek information and resources that they bring back to their employers. Those who network to stay abreast of job opportunities (Career Management) did not regularly perform any of the six networking behaviors, suggesting that this explicit motive is the least influential. Finally, those who network because they feel a social obligation (Social Normative) tended to perform the full range of networking behaviors, suggesting that this motive is the predominant driver of professional networking behaviors.

Career Success

Tables 9 and 10 report the latent variable regressions of PNMs predicting objective and subjective career success after accounting for personality traits, respectively. With regard to

objective career success, we found that the Prosocial motive was associated with an increased likelihood of receiving a raise. These findings suggest that those who network because they enjoy helping others are likely to see their efforts returned in the form of a raise. We also found that those who network because they feel an obligation to do so (Social Normative) were more likely to receive a job offer within the past year and tended to have the highest salaries. These findings suggest that those who network because they feel that they ought to tend to acquire more objective career success. Interestingly, Learning and Performance motive was *negatively* related to salary. It may be the case that those who seek to learn through their networks are currently at an earlier stage in their careers (and therefore have a lower salary), or that they are more interested in the intrinsic aspects of their work as opposed to the economic benefits.

With regard to subjective career success, we found that PNMs were conceptually aligned with the aspects of careers people pursued and achieved. For instance, those who network because they genuinely enjoy building connections with others (Affiliation) tended to have authentic (Authenticity) and satisfying (Satisfaction) careers that allow for a satisfying Personal Life. Those who network because it offers opportunities to help others (Prosocial) tend to experience higher Quality Work and more Meaningful Work.

Turning to the strategic motives, we found that those who network to gain status were more likely to receive Recognition and have Influence over important decisions; Status was also associated with Quality work, Authenticity, Growth and Development, and Satisfaction, illustrating that the Status motive also has implications for additional aspects of career success. Interestingly, we found that those who network to stay abreast of career opportunities (Career Management) tended to have lower career success across nearly all career aspects. Perhaps those who hold this motive are motivated to network to improve their current circumstances;

alternatively, these findings highlight that highly strategic networking motives may in fact undermine the benefits that can flow from professional networking. Learning and Performance was associated with Growth and Development, as one would expect, as well as Quality and Meaningful work, Influence, Authenticity, and Satisfaction. Finally, Social Normative was unrelated to all aspects of subjective career success with the exception of Satisfaction, suggesting that networking to adhere to professional norms is less likely to be associated with personally valued aspects of career success (even though it is associated with objective career success).

General Discussion

We offer an integrative theoretical framework of explicit motives for professional networking that encompasses the multiple explanations for (not) networking that have been advanced in the literature up to this point. Moreover, we delineate explicit PNMs using a sample of United States-based I-O psychologists; and we develop and validate a practically useful measure of these professional networking motives—the PNMI. In doing so, we provide theoretical insights into where PNMs are situated in the nomological network of networking behaviors and how PNMs relate to the types of career success people acquire.

Theoretical Implications

Complementing Triandis' (1980) theory of behavioral prediction with semi-structured interviews of professional I-O psychologists, we delineated six explicit motives underlying professional networking. Our approach differs from prior research examining *implicit* motives: Whereas implicit motives operate beyond conscious awareness to motivate a wide range of behaviors intended to fulfill basic needs, explicit motives reflect the conscious reasons for performing specific behaviors (McClelland et al., 1989). Both implicit motives and explicit motives are features of personality—representing basic psychological needs and characteristic

adaptations, respectively (McAdams & Pals, 2006). As such, they offer complementary, distinct explanations for “why” people network. Moreover, our work extends prior research that has investigated the associations between implicit motives and professional networking behaviors in two significant ways. First, our approach captures a wider range of explicit motives for professional networking that encompass the variety of reasons that extend beyond the three implicit motives investigated by Wolff et al. (2018). Second, our work complements that of Wolff et al. (2018) by providing insights into the specific “valued consequences” that people recognize and pursue through professional networking, which are reflected in strategic PNMs.

Moreover, in validating the PNMI, we clarified where PNMs are situated alongside personality traits, which are the most widely investigated antecedent of professional networking. Personality traits and PNMs capture distinct features of personality (McAdams & Pals, 2006): Personality traits describe dispositional patterns of behavior (“how” people act) and therefore, reflect the tendency to perform a wide range of behaviors. In contrast, PNMs capture “why” people engage in professional networking, specifically. As such, personality traits influence whether people participate in professional networking and their success during networking interactions as well as a wide variety of other behaviors; these (un)successful networking experiences shape people’s PNMs. We offer empirical evidence that personality traits relate to PNMs in a theoretically consistent manner. In addition, we illustrate that PNMs predict networking behaviors beyond personality traits, providing evidence that PNMs capture unique features of personality that are relevant to understanding why people network even after accounting for “how” they typically behave (i.e., personality traits). Moreover, we illustrate that PNMs influence how people network, as they differentially relate to both networking functions and foci.

Finally, we also provide evidence that people's explicit motives for networking have implications for the types of career success they are tend to achieve. We focus on a two key take-aways. First, it is logical to presume that the strategic motives would be more strongly associated with objective career success, but our pattern of findings suggests that people are most likely to be successful by objective standards when they engage in networking because they like helping others (Prosocial) and when they feel an obligation to network (Social Normative). While some have suggested that there is a tradeoff between "getting along" and "getting ahead" (Hogan et al., 1985), our findings are consistent with the notion that seeking to build genuine connections with and assisting others is more likely to pay dividends than being overly strategic (Grant, 2008; Flynn, 2003). This conclusion is further underscored by the findings that the career management motive was negatively related to many aspects of subjective career success. It may be the case that those who are motivated to network to manage their careers occupy dissatisfying jobs, which spurs their desires to find alternative employment. Alternatively, a heightened focus on career management may undermine the extent to which one develops genuine professional connections, which limits the degree to which one acquires personally valued career outcomes.

That being said, we also found that some strategic motives—Status and Learning and Performance—were positively associated with a variety of subjective career success outcomes, suggesting that these PNMs motivate networking efforts in such a way as to assist in acquiring personally valued career outcomes. Thus, our findings suggest that networking for the social (i.e., status) and professional development (i.e., Learning & Performance) benefits is effective for promoting the desired subjective career success. Finally, the social-normative motive was positively associated with salary and career satisfaction. Thus, merely participating in

professional networking, even as a social obligation, is an effective strategy for promoting objective career success, but does little to contribute to personally valued career outcomes.

Practical Implications

This research offers practical implications for individual career management. First, we provide a measure that captures the full range of explicit motives for professional networking and requires no specialized training (unlike measures of implicit motives). A key caveat is that this measure focuses on the explicit motives *for* professional networking; thus, we do not capture reasons for *not* networking. Nevertheless, we expect that this measure could be adopted by career counselors or career-minded professionals for gaining insight into motives for networking. A key point to note is that the PNMI was developed based on information from knowledge workers within the United States; thus, career counselors should carefully consider whether these PNMs are applicable for workers across occupations and/or cultural contexts.

Second, our findings imply that people may be more effective at professional networking if they choose to focus on the potential benefits associated with professional networking, as opposed to its potential drawbacks. By viewing professional networking as an opportunity to pursue personally valued career outcomes, people may approach the activity with more optimism and enthusiasm. As such, people may reflect on their goals or desires for their career, and based on this information, clarify how their professional goals may be fulfilled through professional networking activities. Related to this, career-minded people may remind themselves that the relationship building aspect of professional networking can be an enjoyable activity, and that they should try to have fun when they meet and learn about new people. Indeed, professional networking is one means of developing a cadre of colleagues who can offer support as well as a different perspective on professional issues. Rather than focusing on the potential, mutually

beneficial outcomes associated with professional networking (e.g., career success), one may focus on the relationship building aspect in and of itself, which may incidentally lead to access to network contacts that are more willing to assist in times of need.

Third, apart from leveraging people's natural inclinations, people may endeavor to shape their own professional networking motives to encourage professional networking. Prior to networking events, people may put themselves in the proper mindset by highlighting that professional networking activities offer opportunities to build and maintain relationships (affiliation motive) or to help others achieve their career goals (prosocial motive). By emphasizing that networking activities may be rewarding in and of themselves, people may be more encouraged to engage in professional networking in ways that are more likely to lead to career success. On the flipside, people may discount or de-emphasize the career management aspect of networking, as those who emphasize such benefits are less likely to acquire them.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

A few limitations should be noted when interpreting study results. First, we delineated the content of PNMs using a sample of highly educated participants from a single profession. Indeed, the Study 1 exercise may have influenced the specific content of what networking consequences people value, as networking may offer alternative utility for different types of occupations. For example, for most interviewees in Study 1, there was an implicit connection between learning and performance in their work roles, which is why we proposed the learning and performance motive. For instance, one participant noted that they network to learn "*best practices...with the responsibilities I have, I have no time to do research. And it helps to be able to reach out to someone, learn how to do it, what they did wrong, and the most important thing to do.*" However, some interviewees mentioned networking specifically for business

development purposes (i.e., performance). In retrospect, we see that such performance-related outcomes may be a singular motive driving networking for some professionals, especially those at higher levels of an organization, in professional services roles (e.g., consultants, lawyers), or entrepreneurs. That is, there are some organizations and/or occupations that may emphasize networking for increasing one's work-related effectiveness (or business development), *without* learning new knowledge, skills, or practices. Future research may tailor this measure to certain occupational contexts by distinguishing between learning and performance.

Second, our measure was developed and validated based on participants that were predominantly (~80% or more) White and residing within the United States. Not only is this sample is WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic; Henrich et al., 2010), but it is also primarily White. Heinrich and colleagues have provided evidence that such samples are not representative of human psychology. Thus, there is certainly a need to investigate this concept further in more racially, culturally, and nationally diverse samples. Indeed, given that culture shapes attitudes toward interpersonal behavior (Triandis, 1980) and the professional networking strategies that people adopt (Hwang et al., 2004), it is quite plausible that culture shapes PNMs in various ways. To elaborate on this notion, we provide examples based on the well-established individualism-collectivism cultural syndrome (Triandis, 1989). On the one hand, individualists tend to define themselves independent of groups, prioritize personal goals and task accomplishment, and adhere to their personal attitudes and beliefs. On the other hand, collectivists tend to define themselves as members of a group, prioritize collective goals and harmonious relationships, and adhere to social norms (Triandis, 1995). These differing tendencies may influence how PNMs manifest. For instance, perhaps the Strategic motives we identified—which focus on task accomplishment—are shaped by the individualistic culture

within the United States; due to those within collectivistic cultures emphasizing relationships over task accomplishment, there may be fewer or different Strategic PNMs. This example is just one way in which culture may shape PNMs. In light of these and other possibilities, we hope future research verifies or extends our model of PNMs in other cultural contexts, perhaps via content analysis of interviews (like Study 1). Indeed, it may be the case that the PNMs we identified or the items we developed need to be augmented or altered to better reflect PNMs within certain cultures. If the PNMs we identified in Study 1 are generalizable across cultures, then future research may examine the measurement equivalence of the PNMI across cultures to ensure that people from different cultures interpret the items similarly and to examine whether there are mean differences in PNMs across cultures.

Third, we identified explicit motives *for* professional networking, but our taxonomy does not capture reasons for *not* engaging in professional networking. Scholars studying close relationships have suggested that people hold two sets of social motives—approach and avoidance motives—that operate relatively independent of one another (see Gable & Impett, 2012). Social approach motives are associated with incentives (e.g., hope for affiliation), whereas social avoidance motives are associated with threats (e.g., fear of rejection). Extrapolating these ideas to the context of professional networking, we suggest that PNMs are akin to social approach motives. Yet some people may associate professional networking with social threats, based on prior experiences, and therefore develop explicit motives for *avoiding* professional networking, which we do not capture. We hope future research explores this notion, perhaps by taking a similar approach as we do to identify explicit motives for avoiding professional networking behaviors. Such insights may be useful for helping people identify

perceived social threats and develop methods of overcoming such threat so that they can achieve the personal and professional benefits derived from professional networking.

Fourth, the PNMI may suffer from some degree of social desirability. Because professional networking is regarded as a useful career management tool, people may endorse PNMs more liberally, acknowledging that networking is a “good thing”. Indeed, participants endorsed professional networking motives items at a higher rate across the PNMI ($M = 4.1$ for Social-Normative to $M = 5.6$ for Career Management on a seven-point scale). However, several pieces of evidence suggest that the threat of social desirability is limited. For one, we found that people rate themselves fairly consistently on the PMNI over time (i.e., test-retest reliability), suggesting that the PNMI is assessing a somewhat stable individual difference. Second, PNMs were differentially related to career success outcomes, suggesting that each motive captures a unique construct that has implications for career success. Thus, we have some evidence of construct validity. Third, prominent self-report scales also exhibit higher than average means (such as the Political Skill Inventory; Ferris et al., 2005), but they are considered to be useful tools. Finally, prior research has illustrated that social desirability has a limited influence on the factor structure of self-report individual difference measures, such as personality (e.g., Ellingson et al., 2001). Thus, we have some confidence that the PNMI is a useful tool for assessing PNMs, and that social desirability likely plays a limited role in its utility.

Fifth, even though we adopted a time-separated research design for scale validation, this study cannot provide strong evidence of the causal ordering of study variables. Indeed, given that PNMs are a function of prior experiences, it may be the case that those who have achieved career success—perhaps by means of networking behaviors—have developed an affinity for professional networking. Future research may further verify our research findings by adopting

longitudinal research designs that assess PNMs, professional networking, and career success over time (e.g., Wolff & Moser, 2009). Such research is further complicated by the long-term nature of professional networking. Professional relationships are not developed immediately but are a result of ongoing two-way communication and trust building over time (Porter & Woo, 2015). Likewise, career success is an evaluation of one's entire career.

Nevertheless, we posit that our study offers "proof of concept" for the role of PNMs in influencing how people network and the forms of career success they are likely to achieve. Future research may investigate how PNMs may prompt professional networking behaviors. For example, consistent with person-environment fit perspectives, people may be more likely to enjoy (and benefit from) professional networking events, when those events offer opportunities for them to fulfill their PNMs. For example, a person who has a strong Affiliation motive may prefer networking activities that allow him or her to make new friends, whereas one with a Learning and Performance motive may prefer networking activities where s/he is able to learn something new about their work or profession. That is, when there is match between one's professional networking motives (person) and his or her networking activities (environment), one may be more likely to enjoy those activities and to find them to be fulfilling. If that is the case, then people may be more likely to engage in professional networking activities, helping them overcome negative or ambivalent reactions to professional networking (Kuwabara et al., 2018).

Indeed, professional networking, by its very nature, is about building and maintaining professional relationships over the long term (years) based on a series of intermittent, short-term transactions (Porter & Woo, 2015). Thus, professional networking rarely offers an immediate pay off, which may be one reason many people are not interested in networking; it is an investment of time and effort. When encouraging people to engage in professional networking,

one key consideration may be to set realistic expectations regarding what benefits may be received and when their goals may be fulfilled. To date, we have little information about this stochastic process. Understanding and tracking this process may offer greater insights into how to design interventions to encourage professional networking as well as structure professional networking activities/events so that attendees receive the most benefit from them. One approach is to use a longitudinal measurement burst research design (that integrates Event Sampling Methodology and longitudinal designs; see Sliwinski, 2008) to capture how people conduct professional networking at monthly professional business meetings (e.g., Business Networking groups), and how these professional networking interactions impact their opportunities for business development or work performance over longer periods of time.

Related to this, future research may also investigate why certain PNMs are more effective than others for career success. Study findings revealed that the Prosocial motive was related to objective career success. There are two potential explanations for this: First, it may be that one must develop a high-quality friendships prior to receiving work or career-benefiting resources from professional networking. Because networking is a “long game”, it requires one to (strategically) invest in relationships, building trust over the course of months and years before it “pays off”. Thus, those who are predisposed to continually engage in professional networking may be better off simply because they keep coming back and investing, ultimately leading to more trusting relationships that are motivated to assist in times of need. Second, it may also be the case that people respond more positively to those who are friendly and helpful. Indeed, Casciaro and Lobo (2008) found that people are more attracted to people they like, so much so that ‘liking’ tends to be a prerequisite for approaching colleagues for task-related resources. Building from this idea, it may be that people are also more willing to give to others, when those

others are likeable or perceived as friendly. That is, network contacts may be more willing to give to those with prosocial motives because they present as friendly and likable, smoothing the way for more strategic, task-focused exchanges.

We theorized that PMNs reflect individual differences that manifest over time as a result of natural inclinations and prior experiences (e.g., interpersonal successes and failures). As such, people's networking motives likely change over the course of their careers as a function of their professional experiences, identities, roles, and values. For example, in early career, people may network to gain visibility at one's organization or profession, whereas in late career, people may network to mentor junior colleagues. As such, there is an opportunity to take a life stage approach to understanding people's PNM, which may shed light on how Personality manifests in different networking motives and behaviors over the career. Thus, there are myriad ways in which we could extend PNM research to better understand why and how people engage in professional networking, and how such activity creates opportunities for success.

References

- Anderson, C., Hildreth, J., & Howland, L. (2015). Is the Desire for Status a Fundamental Human Motive? A Review of the Empirical Literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141, 574–601. DOI: 10.1037/a0038781
- Anderson, C., & Kilduff, G. J. (2009). The pursuit of status in social groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 5, 295-298. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01655.x
- Arthur, M. B., Khapova, S. N., & Wilderom, C. P. (2005). Career success in a boundaryless career world. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 177-202. DOI: 10.1002/job.290
- Bendella, H., & Wolff, H.-G. (2020). Who networks? – A meta-analysis of networking and personality. *Career Development International*, 25, 461-479. DOI: 10.1108/CDI-12-2019-0289.
- Casciaro, T., Gino, F., & Kouchaki, M. (2014). The contaminating effects of building instrumental ties: How networking can make us feel dirty. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59, 705-735. DOI: 10.1177/0001839214554990
- Casciaro, T., Gino, F., & Kouchaki, M. (2016). Learn to love networking. *Harvard Business Review Magazine*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2016/05/learn-to-love-networking>
- Casciaro, T., & Lobo, M. S. (2008). When competence is irrelevant: The role of interpersonal affect in task-related ties. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53, 655-684. DOI: 10.2189/asqu.53.4.655
- Chan, K. Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 481-498. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.481
- Colquitt, J. A., Sabey, T. B., Rodell, J. B., & Hill, E. T. (2019). Content Validation Guidelines: Evaluation Criteria for Definitional Correspondence and Definitional Distinctiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104, 1243–1265. DOI: 10.1037/apl0000406

- Djurdjevic, E., Stoverink, A. C., Klotz, A. C., Koopman, J., da Motta Veiga, S. P., Yam, K. C., et al. (2017). Workplace status: The development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*, 1124-1147. DOI: 10.1037/apl00000202
- Donellan, M.B., Oswald, F.L., Baird, B.M., & Lucas, R.E. (2006). The Mini-IPIP Scales: Tiny-Yet-Effective Measures of the Big Five Factors of Personality. *Psychological Assessment, 18*, 192-203. DOI: 10.1037/1040-3590.18.2.192
- Ellingson, J. E., Smith, D. B., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). Investigating the influence of social desirability on personality factor structure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 122-133. DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.1.122
- Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., & Frink, D. D. (2005). Development and validation of the Political Skill Inventory. *Journal of Management, 31*, 126-152. DOI: 10.1177/0149206304271386
- Flynn, F. J. (2003). How much should I give and how often? The effects of generosity and frequency of favor exchange on social status and productivity. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 539-553. DOI: 10.5465/30040648
- Forret, M. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (2004). Networking behaviors and career outcomes: differences for men and women? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*, 419-437. DOI: 10.1002/job.253
- Francis, J. J., Johnston, M., Robertson, C., Glidewell, L., Entwistle, V., Eccles, M. P., et al. (2010). What is an adequate sample size? Operationalising data saturation for theory-based interview studies. *Psychology and Health, 25*, 1229-1245. DOI: 10.1080/08870440903194015
- Gable, S. L., & Impett, E. A. (2012). Approach and avoidance motives and close relationships. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 6*, 95-108. DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.0040.x

- Gibson, C., Hardy III, J. H., & Buckley, M. R. (2014). Understanding the role of networking in organizations. *Career Development International*, 19(2), 146-161.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/CDI-09-2013-0111>
- Goodman, J. S., & Blum, T. C. (1996). Assessing the non-random sampling effects of subject attrition in longitudinal research. *Journal of Management*, 22, 627-652. DOI: 10.1177/014920639602200405
- Grant, A. M. (2013). *Give and Take: Why Helping Others Drives Our Success*. Penguin: New York, NY.
- Grant, A. M., Dutton, J. E., & Russo, B. D. (2008). Giving commitment: Employee support programs and the prosocial sensemaking process. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51, 898-918. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2008.34789652
- Hannnah, S. T., Jennings, P. L., Bluhm, D., Peng, A. C., & Schaubroeck, J. M. (2014). Duty orientation: Theoretical development and preliminary construct testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 123, 220-238. DOI: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.10.007
- Henrich J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 61-83. DOI: 10.1017/S0140525X0999152X.
- Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1, 104-121. DOI: 10.1177/109442819800100106
- Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (1999). An analysis of variance approach to content validation. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2, 175–186. DOI: 10.1177/109442819922004
- Hogan, R., Jones, W. H., & Cheek, J. M. (1985). Socioanalytic theory: An alternative to armadillo psychology. In B. R. Schlenker (Ed.), *The Self and Social Life* (pp. 175-198). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6, 1-55. DOI: 10.1080/10705519909540118
- Hwang, A., Kessler, E. H., & Francesco, A. M. (2004). Student networking behavior, culture, and grade performance: An empirical study and pedagogical recommendations. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3, 139-150. DOI: 10.5465/amle.2004.13500532
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 114–158). The Guilford Press.
- Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D., Jr. (1995). An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 485-519. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01767.x
- Kehr, H. M. (2004). Integrating implicit motives, explicit motives, and perceived abilities: The compensatory model of work motivation and volition. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 479-499. DOI: 10.5465/amr.2004.13670963
- Koo, T. K., & Li, M. Y. (2016). A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 15, 155-163. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012
- Kuwabara, K., Hildebrand, C., & Zou, X. (2018). Lay Theories of Networking: How Laypeople's Beliefs About Networks Affect Their Attitudes Toward and Engagement in Instrumental Networking. *The Academy of Management Review*, 43, 50–64. DOI: 10.5465/amr.2015.0076
- Kuwabara, K., Xou, X., Aven, B., Hildebrand, C., & Iyengar, S. (2020). Lay theories of networking ability: Beliefs that inhibit instrumental networking. *Social Networks*, 62, 1-11. DOI: 10.1016/j.socnet.2020.01.003

- Langford, P.H. (2000). Importance of relationship management for the career success of Australian managers. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 52, 163-168. DOI: 10.1080/00049530008255384
- Lee, T., Mitchell, T., & Sablynski, C. (1999). Qualitative Research in Organizational and Vocational Psychology, 1979–1999. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55, 161–187. DOI: 10.1006/jvbe.1999.1707
- McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2006). A new big five: Fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *American Psychologist*, 61, 204-217. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.61.3.204
- McClelland, D. C. (1987). *Human Motivation*. Cambridge University Press: New York, NY.
- McClelland, D. C., Koestner, R., & Weinberger, J. (1989). How do self-attributed and implicit motives differ? *Psychological Review*, 96, 690-702. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.96.4.690
- Michael, J., & Yukl, G. (1993). Managerial level and subunit function as determinants of networking behavior in organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, 18, 328-351. DOI: 10.1177/1059601193183005
- National Opinion Research Center. (2010). General Social Survey (GSS). Chicago, Ili. Available at: <http://www.norc.org/GSS+Website/About+GSS>
- Ng, T. W. H., Eby, L. T., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 367-408. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00515.x
- Nielsen, I. K., Jex, S. M., & Adams, G. A. (2000). Development and validation of scores on a two-dimensional workplace friendship scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60, 628-643. DOI: 10.1177/00131640021970655
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational

- citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142. DOI: 10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7
- Porter, C. M., & Woo, S. E. (2015). Untangling the networking phenomenon: A dynamic psychological perspective on how and why people network. *Journal of Management*, 41, 1477-1500. DOI: 10.1177/0149206315582247
- Porter, C. M., Woo, S. E., & Campion, M. A. (2016). Internal and external networking differentially predict turnover through job embeddedness and job offers. *Personnel Psychology*, 69, 635-672. DOI: 10.1111/peps.12121
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). "lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling." *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48, 1–36. doi:10.18637/jss.v048.i02
- Rubenstein, A. L., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Thundiyil, T. G. (2020). The comparative effects of supervisor helping motives on newcomer adjustment and socialization outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(12), 1466-1491. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000492>
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 25), pp. 1-65. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., Holtom, B. C., & Pierotti, A. J. (2013). Even the best laid plans sometimes go askew: Career self-management processes, career shocks, and the decision to pursue graduate education. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 169-182. DOI: 10.1037/a0030882
- Shockley, K. M., Ureksoy, H., Rodopman, O. B., Poteat, L. F., & Dullaghan, T. R. (2016). Development of a new scale to measure subjective career success: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, 128-153. DOI: 10.1002/job.2046
- Sliwinski, M. J. (2008). Measurement-burst designs for social health research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 245-261. DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00043.x

- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713. DOI: 10.1007/BF00929796
- Thompson, J. A. (2005). Proactive personality and job performance: a social capital perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1011-1017. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.1011
- Triandis, H. C. (1980). Values, Attitudes, and Interpersonal Behavior. In *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1979: Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values*, (pp. 195-259). University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 506-520. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.96.3.506
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Vandewalle, D. (1997). Development and validation of a work domain goal orientation instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57, 995-1015. DOI: 10.1177/0013164497057006009
- Vissa, B. (2012). Agency in action: entrepreneurs' networking style and initiation of economic exchange. *Organization Science*, 23, 492-510. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.1100.0567
- Weber, R. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (Second edition). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications. DOI: 10.4135/9781412983488
- Westfall, J., & Yarkoni, T. (2016). Statistically controlling for confounding constructs is harder than you think. *PLoS ONE*, 11, e0152719. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0152719
- Winter, D. G., John, O. P., Stewart, A. J., Klohnen, E. C., & Duncan, L. E. (1998). Traits and motives: Toward and integration of two traditions in personality research. *Psychological Review*, 105, 230-250. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.105.2.230

- Wolff, H. G., & Moser, K. (2009). Effects of networking on career success: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 196-206. DOI: 10.1037/a0013350
- Wolff, H. G., & Moser, K. (2010). Do specific types of networking predict specific mobility outcomes? A two-year prospective study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77*, 238-245. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvb.2010.03.001
- Wolff, H.-G., Moser, K., & Grau, A. (2008). Networking: Theoretical foundations and construct validity. In J. Deller (Ed.), *Readings in applied organizational behavior from the Luneburg symposium*. Mering, Germany: Hampp.
- Wolff, H. G., & Spurk, D. (2020). Developing and validating a short networking behavior scale (SNBS) from Wolff and Moser's (2006) measure. *Journal of Career Assessment, 28*, 277-302. DOI: 10.1177/1069072719844924
- Wolff, H. G., Weikamp, J. G., & Batinic, B. (2018). Implicit motives as determinants of networking behaviors. *Frontiers in psychology, 9*, 411-423. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00411

Table 1.

Demographic Information for Study 1 and 2 Samples.

| | Study 1 | Study 2: Development & Validation | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Content Development | Sample 1 Item Reduction | Sample 2 Internal Factor Structure | Sample 3 Content Validity | Sample 4 Construct Validity |
| Gender N (%) | | | | | |
| Male | 20 (47%) | 130 (43%) | 138 (45%) | 108 (42.8%) | 239 (45.5%) |
| Female | 22 (51%) | 170 (57%) | 170 (55%) | 138 (54.8%) | 274 (52.2%) |
| Racio-ethnicity N (%) | | | | | |
| White | 38 (88%) | 245 (81.7%) | 253 (82.1%) | 197 (78.2%) | 435 (84.3%) |
| Black | | 22 (7.3%) | 32 (10.4%) | 14 (5.5%) | 24 (4.7%) |
| Asian | | 23 (7.7%) | 17 (5.5%) | 20 (7.9%) | 27 (5.2%) |
| More than one | | | | 11 (4.4%) | |
| Other or unspecified | 4 (9%) | | | 10 (4.0%) | |
| Age M (SD) | 39.5 (8.7) | 39.8 (12.4) | 39.2 (12.6) | 36.8 (13.0) | 36.5 (9.4) |
| Years of Work | 10.4 (7.5) | 15.7 (11.6) | 14.9 (11.2) | 14.6 (12.0) | 14.5 (9.8) |
| Experience M (SD) | | | | | |
| Occupation N (%) | | | | | |
| Administrative & Office Support | | 23 (7.7%) | 18 (5.8%) | | 32 (6.2%) |
| Business & Finance | | 26 (8.7%) | 25 (8.1%) | | 49 (9.5%) |
| Computer & Tech | | | | 23 (9.1%) | 67 (13%) |
| Education | | 36 (12%) | 26 (8.4%) | 25 (9.9%) | 60 (11.6%) |
| Healthcare | | 35 (11.7%) | 34 (11%) | 17 (6.7%) | |
| Management | | 32 (10.6%) | 50 (16.2%) | | 54 (10.5%) |
| Manufacturing | | | | 11 (4.4%) | |
| Sales | | | 26 (8.4%) | | |

Table 2.
The six professional networking motives, definitions, and example quotes.

| PNM | Definition | Example Quote |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Affiliation | The extent to which one chooses to network because they enjoy connecting with people or groups | <i>"I really like meeting people. I enjoy getting to meet new people and hearing about their jobs and what they're working on. But also being a little more on the outgoing side. I get to meet interesting people doing interesting things. This is a big source of pleasure."</i> |
| Prosocial | The extent to which one chooses to network because they enjoy opportunities to assist others through mentoring, introducing contacts to one another, etc. | <i>"But part of it is helping the people that I know. I've helped people find other jobs – and these are people that I care about and I want to help them. A lot of folks will reach out to let her know that they are looking – I'm not always able to help, but I feel good when I can."</i> |
| Status | The extent to which one chooses to network because it is a means to acquire status or deference within a formal or informal hierarchy, such as an organization or professional group | <i>"I think that I'm trying to be more present and notice people and have them notice me. You become seen as an expert. Maybe that's my ultimate goal – to build up respect in the community so people will seek me out."</i> |
| Learning and Performance | the extent to which one chooses to network because it enables one to more easily acquire knowledge or skills (now or in the future) that facilitate personal or professional growth and/or that result in higher performance (e.g., collaborating with others with different expertise, learning more about best practices, alternative approaches to work) | Quote 1: <i>"Best practices – we all do about the same thing – with the responsibilities I have, I have no time to do research. And it helps to be able to reach out to someone, learn how to do it, what they did wrong, the most important thing to do."</i> Quote 2: <i>"My current motivations are tied to consulting and bringing business into the organization."</i> |
| Career Management | The extent to which one chooses to network because it enables one to maintain employability (e.g., acquiring job offers, promotions) | <i>"Staying connected professionally is a big driver. I have pretty solid position – I don't think it's in any danger of being eliminated. But in the back of my mind, that's always a possibility. So, keeping my network current in case that happens."</i> |
| Social Normative | The extent to which one chooses to network because it fulfills an organizational or occupational obligation, enabling one to adhere to social norm | Quote 1: <i>"It's almost a duty, to add value for the organization. I assume that the better known I am outside of my company, the better I can be for my company."</i> Quote 2: <i>"It's one of the things you've got to do. I don't want to do it, but I've got to."</i> |

Table 3.
Study 2 Factor Loadings for the Exploratory Factor Analysis of the PNMI

| Item Stem: "I engage in professional networking because..." | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
|---|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Affiliation | | | | | | |
| I enjoy making new connections. | .76 | | | | | |
| I like meeting people. | 1.01 | | | | | |
| I enjoy building new relationships. | .91 | | | | | |
| It is fun to socialize. | .86 | | | | | |
| I enjoy connecting with others. | .71 | | | | | |
| Prosocial | | | | | | |
| I enjoy offering professional advice or support. | | .71 | | | | |
| It feels good to help others in professional matters. | | .75 | | | | |
| I like to share information or advice that may be helpful for others in the field. | | .90 | | | | |
| I like helping people with their careers. | | .98 | | | | |
| I enjoy providing resources, such as information or advice, to others who need them. | | .79 | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| It allows me to access professionals at higher levels of the organizational/professional hierarchy. | | | .70 | | | |
| It facilitates my progression up the organizational/professional hierarchy. | | | .81 | | | |
| It builds my reputation as someone "in the know" within my organization or profession. | | | 1.00 | | | |
| It helps me to gain stronger reputation in my organization or field. | | | .85 | | | |
| Learning & Performance | | | | | | |
| It allows me to learn new or different ways of doing my job. | | | | .81 | | |
| It allows me to gain necessary knowledge and skills to be successful in my field. | | | | .81 | | |
| It helps me to advance my knowledge and skills. | | | | .89 | | |
| Connecting with others with expertise helps me to perform my job more effectively. | | | | .78 | | |
| It enables me to gain useful information to accomplish my work goals. | | | | .71 | | |
| Career Management | | | | | | |
| It provides access to network contacts that can help me with my career development. | | | | | .54 | |
| It helps build a network of contacts I could go to if I needed a job. | | | | | .94 | |
| It could possibly lead to a job offer. | | | | | .93 | |
| Connecting with others is a good way to stay aware of potential career opportunities. | | | | | .68 | |
| Social-Normative | | | | | | |
| It is a professional obligation. | | | | | | .76 |
| I am supposed to network. | | | | | | .88 |
| It is part of my job. | | | | | | .91 |
| It is expected of me. | | | | | | .96 |
| I have to network. | | | | | | .89 |
| Internal Consistency Reliability Estimates | .95 | .92 | .93 | .92 | .90 | .95 |

Note. *N* = 300. No other item factor loadings exceeded .20.

Table 4

Content Validity Evidence for the Professional Networking Motives Inventory

| PNM | <i>htc</i> | <i>htd</i> | Orbiting Construct 1 | Orbiting Construct 2 |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Affiliation | .93 | .43 | Workplace Friendship Prevalence (Nielsen et al., 2000) | Coworker Satisfaction (Spector, 1985) |
| Prosocial | .91 | .35 | Prosocial Identity (Grant et al., 2008) | Altruistic Citizenship Behavior (Podsakoff et al., 1990) |
| Status | .90 | .34 | Workplace Status (Djurdjevic et al., 2017) | Values for Power (Shwartz, 1992) |
| Learning & Performance | .89 | .26 | Learning Goal Orientation (Vandewalle, 1997) | Intrinsic Career Goals (Seibert et al., 2013) |
| Career Management | .92 | .39 | Values for Achievement (Schwartz, 1992) | Extrinsic Career Goals (Seibert et al., 2013) |
| Social Normative | .87 | .42 | Duty to Mission (Hannah et al., 2014) | Values for Conformity (Schwartz, 1992) |

Note. PNM refers to Professional Networking Motive; *htc* refers to Hinkin-Tracey correspondence; *htd* refers to Hinkin-Tracey distinctiveness.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, Zero-order correlations, and Reliability Estimates of Personality Traits (Time 1) and PNMI (Time 2)

| | M | S.D. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|----------------------------|-------|------|--------|-------|------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Age | 36.42 | 9.39 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Gender | .47 | .50 | .12** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Occupational Prestige | 50.12 | 8.98 | -.05 | -.11* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Extraversion | 2.80 | 1.09 | .01 | .02 | -.01 | (.87) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Agreeableness | 3.73 | .89 | .13** | .19** | -.02 | .36** | (.83) | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Conscientiousness | 3.73 | .86 | .09 | .02 | -.02 | .04 | .03 | (.77) | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Neuroticism | 2.55 | .92 | -.15** | .13** | -.05 | -.15** | .06 | .31** | (.81) | | | | | | | |
| 8. Openness | 3.97 | .79 | .06 | .00 | -.02 | .27** | .31** | .04 | -.05 | (.75) | | | | | | |
| PNMI (Time 2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Affiliation | 5.01 | 1.45 | .04 | .05 | .00 | .61** | .43** | .04 | -.08* | .21** | (.96) | | | | | |
| 10. Prosocial | 5.48 | 1.10 | .10* | .02 | .06 | .35** | .33** | .08† | -.08† | .22** | .65** | (.94) | | | | |
| 11. Status | 5.19 | 1.11 | -.07† | -.08† | .08† | .27** | .10* | .16** | .12** | .17** | .37** | .42** | (.89) | | | |
| 12. Career Management | 5.58 | 1.04 | -.06 | -.05 | .04 | .23** | .14** | .12** | -.03 | .15** | .32** | .31** | .66** | (.89) | | |
| 13. Learning & Performance | 5.49 | .98 | -.07 | .00 | .03 | .30** | .15** | .12* | -.09* | .24** | .43** | .46** | .59** | .63** | (.94) | |
| 14. Social Normative | 4.23 | 1.55 | -.20** | -.07† | .08† | .15** | .02 | .04 | .03 | -.03 | .08* | .08† | .31** | .15** | .19** | (.94) |

Note. N = 513-525. † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Gender is coded as 1 = man, 0 = woman.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, Zero-order correlations, and Reliability Estimates of PNMI (Time 1), Networking Behaviors, and Career Success (Time 2)

| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|--|----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>PNMI</i> (N = 517) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Affiliation | 5.10 | 1.37 | (.96) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Prosocial | 5.52 | 1.05 | .56 | (.93) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Status | 5.33 | 1.15 | .38 | .36 | (.92) | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Career Management | 5.65 | 1.01 | .22 | .23 | .59 | (.88) | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Learning & Performance | 5.53 | .94 | .37 | .42 | .49 | .62 | (.92) | | | | | | | |
| 6. Social-Normative | 4.10 | 1.55 | .07 | .11 | .26 | .18 | .21 | (.94) | | | | | | |
| <i>Networking Behaviors</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Internal-Building | 2.37 | .70 | .51 | .38 | .37 | .23 | .32 | .22 | (.72) | | | | | |
| 8. Internal-Maintaining | 2.43 | .71 | .33 | .38 | .27 | .18 | .25 | .16 | .63 | (.76) | | | | |
| 9. Internal-Using | 2.54 | .71 | .30 | .35 | .31 | .16 | .24 | .17 | .58 | .75 | (.72) | | | |
| 10. External-Building | 2.09 | .74 | .42 | .35 | .40 | .24 | .34 | .25 | .64 | .44 | .48 | (.80) | | |
| 11. External-Maintaining | 1.86 | .75 | .41 | .28 | .35 | .21 | .29 | .27 | .59 | .45 | .44 | .76 | (.85) | |
| 12. External-Using | 2.04 | .70 | .39 | .34 | .33 | .21 | .33 | .24 | .56 | .49 | .53 | .73 | .75 | (.78) |
| <i>Subjective Career Success</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Recognition | 5.65 | 1.17 | .21 | .21 | .22 | .12 | .17 | .11 | .33 | .25 | .24 | .18 | .14 | .12 |
| 14. Quality Work | 5.80 | 1.01 | .25 | .32 | .21 | .08 | .20 | .00 | .34 | .33 | .30 | .24 | .15 | .15 |
| 15. Meaningful Work | 5.22 | 1.42 | .31 | .34 | .19 | .04 | .28 | .08 | .33 | .28 | .21 | .28 | .23 | .22 |
| 16. Influence | 5.14 | 1.24 | .28 | .28 | .25 | .05 | .20 | .11 | .41 | .37 | .35 | .35 | .32 | .28 |
| 17. Authenticity | 5.16 | 1.32 | .35 | .27 | .24 | .08 | .24 | .11 | .38 | .28 | .20 | .33 | .28 | .24 |
| 18. Personal Life | 5.24 | 1.36 | .16 | .11 | .01 | -.02 | .06 | .06 | .19 | .18 | .10 | .13 | .10 | .08 |
| 19. Growth & Development | 5.67 | .98 | .24 | .26 | .25 | .14 | .32 | .08 | .38 | .28 | .27 | .32 | .23 | .24 |
| 20. Satisfaction | 5.14 | 1.52 | .35 | .30 | .19 | .03 | .25 | .13 | .36 | .25 | .20 | .34 | .26 | .22 |
| <i>Objective Career Success</i> (N = 516) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21. Salary | 6.02 | 2.64 | .06 | .03 | .06 | .03 | -.07 | .08 | .11 | .08 | .11 | .12 | .12 | .11 |
| 22. Raise | .67 | .47 | .08 | .15 | .12 | .09 | .08 | .07 | .15 | .14 | .12 | .06 | .05 | .06 |
| 23. Promotion | .22 | .42 | .10 | .07 | .17 | .14 | .14 | .11 | .14 | .13 | .13 | .07 | .13 | .10 |
| 24. Job Offer | .27 | .45 | .20 | .16 | .18 | .11 | .16 | .12 | .22 | .17 | .14 | .18 | .23 | .15 |

Note. $N = 525$, unless otherwise noted. Cronbach's alpha reliability estimate reported along the diagonal. $|.08| < r < .12|$ is significant at $p < .05$, $|.12| < r < .15|$ is significant at $p < .01$, $r \geq .15|$ is significant at $p < .001$. Raise, Promotion, and Job Offer coded as 1 if received, and 0 if did not receive in the past year. PNMI refers to the Professional Networking Motives Inventory.

Table 6
Continued

| | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|
| PNMI (N = 517) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Affiliation | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Prosocial | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Status | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Career Management | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Learning & Performance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Social-Normative | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Networking Behaviors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Internal-Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Internal-Maintaining | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Internal-Using | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. External-Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. External-Maintaining | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. External-Using | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subjective Career Success | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Recognition | (.89) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Quality Work | .60 | (.89) | | | | | | | | | |
| 15. Meaningful Work | .44 | .52 | (.90) | | | | | | | | |
| 16. Influence | .60 | .58 | .63 | (.86) | | | | | | | |
| 17. Authenticity | .52 | .50 | .65 | .61 | (.87) | | | | | | |
| 18. Personal Life | .37 | .39 | .32 | .33 | .50 | (.88) | | | | | |
| 19. Growth & Development | .54 | .64 | .53 | .54 | .61 | .39 | (.87) | | | | |
| 20. Satisfaction | .45 | .48 | .70 | .57 | .80 | .50 | .62 | (.95) | | | |
| Objective Career Success (N = 516) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21. Salary | .09 | .02 | .07 | .16 | .11 | .06 | .06 | .12 | | | |
| 22. Raise | .23 | .12 | .07 | .09 | .17 | .15 | .14 | .15 | .15 | | |
| 23. Promotion | .17 | .10 | .13 | .13 | .17 | .13 | .18 | .17 | .10 | .33 | |
| 24. Job Offer | .10 | .08 | .09 | .12 | .10 | -.07 | .12 | .10 | .11 | .11 | .10 |

Note. $N = 525$, unless otherwise noted. Cronbach's alpha reliability estimate reported along the diagonal. $|.08| < r < .12|$ is significant at $p < .05$, $|.12| < r < .15|$ is significant at $p < .01$. Raise, Promotion, and Job Offer coded as 1 if received, and 0 if did not receive in the past year. PNMI refers to the Professional Networking Motives Inventory.

Table 7

Latent Variable Regression of Personality Traits (Time 1) predicting Professional Networking Motives (Time 2).

| | Affective-Affiliation | | | | Prosocial | | | | Status | | | | Learning & Performance | | | | Career Management | | | | Social Normative | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------|-------|------------------|----------|-------------|-------|------------------------|----------|-------------|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------|-------|------------------|----------|-------------|-------|
| | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 |
| Age | .01 | .00 | .01 | | .06 | .01 | .01 | | -.10* | -.01 | .01 | | -.09* | -.01 | .01 | | -.07 | -.01 | .00 | | -.19** | -.03 | .01 | |
| Gender | -.01 | -.01 | .10 | | -.03 | -.07 | .10 | | -.06 | -.13 | .10 | | .04 | .09 | .09 | | -.07 | -.11 | .08 | | -.06 | -.17 | .12 | |
| Occupational Prestige | .01 | .00 | .01 | | .07 | .01 | .01 | | .08 [†] | .01 | .01 | | .04 | .01 | .01 | | .04 | .00 | .00 | | .07 | .01 | .01 | |
| Extraversion | .56** | .80 | .07 | | .25** | .32 | .07 | | .25** | .28 | .06 | | .23** | .25 | .06 | | .19** | .17 | .05 | | .20** | .29 | .08 | |
| Agreeableness | .26** | .42 | .08 | | .25** | .36 | .08 | | .02 | .03 | .07 | | .01 | .01 | .07 | | .06 | .07 | .06 | | -.01 | -.01 | .09 | |
| Conscientiousness | -.00 | -.00 | .08 | | .01 | .02 | .09 | | .11* | .16 | .08 | | .08 | .11 | .08 | | .12* | .14 | .07 | | .08 | .14 | .11 | |
| Neuroticism | -.00 | -.00 | .06 | | -.04 | -.05 | .07 | | -.04 | -.04 | .06 | | -.05 | -.05 | .06 | | .07 | .06 | .05 | | .08 | .11 | .08 | |
| Openness | -.04 | -.06 | .07 | | .06 | .09 | .07 | | .10* | .13 | .07 | | .17** | .21 | .06 | | .10 [†] | .10 | .05 | | -.06 | -.10 | .08 | |
| | | | | .48 | | | | .22 | | | | .15 | | | | .14 | | | | .10 | | | | .09 |

Note. $N = 517$. [†] $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Gender is coded as 1 = man, 0 = woman.

Table 8

Latent Variable Regression of Personality Traits and Professional Networking Motives (Time 1) predicting Professional Networking Behaviors (Time 2).

| | Internal Networking Behaviors | | | | | | | | | | | | External Networking Behaviors | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------|------------------|----------|-------------|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------|------------------|----------|-------------|-------|------------------|----------|-------------|-------|
| | Building | | | | Maintaining | | | | Using | | | | Building | | | | Maintaining | | | | Using | | | |
| | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 |
| Step 1 | | | | .47 | | | | .19 | | | | .21 | | | | .29 | | | | .25 | | | | .21 |
| Age | .09* | .01 | .00 | | -.02 | -.00 | .00 | | .08 [†] | .01 | .00 | | .06 | .00 | .00 | | -.03 | -.00 | .00 | | .00 | .00 | .00 | |
| Gender | -.03 | -.03 | .04 | | -.04 | -.06 | .06 | | -.08 [†] | -.11 | .06 | | -.05 | -.06 | .05 | | -.08* | -.11 | .06 | | -.06 | -.08 | .06 | |
| Occupational Prestige | .05 | .00 | .00 | | .05 | .00 | .00 | | .07 | .01 | .00 | | .08 [†] | .01 | .00 | | .10* | .01 | .00 | | .10* | .01 | .00 | |
| Extraversion | .39** | .22 | .04 | | .19* | .14 | .06 | | .26** | .18 | .06 | | .26** | .16 | .05 | | .25** | .19 | .05 | | .19** | .13 | .05 | |
| Agreeableness | .01 | .01 | .03 | | .07 | .05 | .05 | | -.00 | -.00 | .05 | | -.03 | -.02 | .04 | | -.04 | -.03 | .05 | | -.04 | -.03 | .05 | |
| Conscientiousness | .23** | .16 | .04 | | -.01 | -.01 | .05 | | -.00 | -.00 | .05 | | .19** | .15 | .05 | | .07 | .07 | .05 | | .07 | .06 | .05 | |
| Neuroticism | .06 | .03 | .03 | | .02 | .01 | .04 | | .09 | .06 | .04 | | .13* | .08 | .03 | | .16** | .11 | .04 | | .10 [†] | .07 | .04 | |
| Openness | .01 | .01 | .03 | | .08 | .07 | .04 | | .14* | .11 | .04 | | .07 | .05 | .04 | | .03 | .03 | .04 | | .12* | .10 | .04 | |
| Step 2 | | | | .13 | | | | .11 | | | | .14 | | | | .15 | | | | .10 | | | | .14 |
| Affiliation | .15* | .06 | .03 | | .01 | .00 | .04 | | -.06 | -.03 | .04 | | .11 | .05 | .04 | | .19** | .11 | .04 | | .11 | .06 | .04 | |
| Prosocial | .06 | .03 | .03 | | .26** | .16 | .04 | | .24** | .15 | .04 | | .10 [†] | .05 | .03 | | -.01 | -.00 | .04 | | .12* | .08 | .04 | |
| Status | .16* | .08 | .03 | | .11 | .07 | .05 | | .22** | .14 | .05 | | .24** | .14 | .04 | | .13* | .09 | .05 | | .13 [†] | .08 | .04 | |
| Career Management | .04 | .02 | .04 | | .01 | .01 | .06 | | -.09 | -.08 | .06 | | -.02 | -.02 | .05 | | -.00 | -.00 | .05 | | -.02 | -.02 | .05 | |
| Learning & Performance | .08 | .05 | .03 | | .03 | .02 | .05 | | .06 | .04 | .05 | | .08 | .05 | .04 | | .09 [†] | .07 | .04 | | .16** | .12 | .04 | |
| Social-Normative | .16** | .07 | .02 | | .09 [†] | .05 | .03 | | .14** | .07 | .03 | | .16** | .08 | .02 | | .18** | .10 | .03 | | .15** | .08 | .02 | |
| Total R^2 | | | | .60 | | | | .30 | | | | .35 | | | | .44 | | | | .35 | | | | .35 |

Note. $N = 517$. [†] $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Gender is coded as 1 = man, 0 = woman.

Table 9

Latent Variable Regression of Personality Traits and Professional Networking Motives (Time 1) predicting Objective Career Success (Time 2).

| | Raise | | | | Promotion | | | | Job Offer | | | | Salary | | | |
|------------------------|---------|----------|-------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------|-------|
| | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 |
| Step 1 | | | | .05 | | | | .10 | | | | .08 | | | | .17 |
| Age | -.09 | -.01 | .01 | | -.20** | -.02 | .01 | | -.01 | -.00 | .01 | | .08* | .02 | .01 | |
| Gender | -.06 | -.12 | .12 | | -.10 | -.20 | .13 | | .04 | .07 | .12 | | -.23** | -1.19 | .21 | |
| Occupational Prestige | .07 | .01 | .01 | | .05 | .01 | .01 | | .07 | .01 | .01 | | .26** | .08 | .01 | |
| Extraversion | .18† | .18 | .10 | | .03 | .03 | .10 | | .10 | .10 | .10 | | .15* | .42 | .19 | |
| Agreeableness | -.09 | -.13 | .10 | | -.09 | -.12 | .11 | | -.11 | -.14 | .11 | | -.02 | -.06 | .17 | |
| Conscientiousness | .03 | .04 | .09 | | -.12 | -.15 | .09 | | -.00 | -.00 | .08 | | -.02 | -.08 | .19 | |
| Neuroticism | -.04 | -.06 | .10 | | -.12 | -.18 | .11 | | .07 | .10 | .10 | | -.07 | -.18 | .15 | |
| Openness | -.12 | -.17 | .12 | | -.05 | -.07 | .12 | | .11 | .15 | .12 | | -.08 | -.25 | .15 | |
| Step 2 | | | | .05 | | | | .06 | | | | .07 | | | | .02 |
| Affiliation | -.11 | -.09 | .08 | | .05 | .04 | .08 | | .14 | .11 | .08 | | .01 | .02 | .15 | |
| Prosocial | .23** | .21 | .07 | | -.01 | -.01 | .08 | | .05 | .04 | .08 | | .03 | .07 | .14 | |
| Status | .01 | .01 | .09 | | .13 | .13 | .11 | | .14 | .14 | .11 | | .03 | .08 | .17 | |
| Career Management | .06 | .07 | .09 | | .07 | .07 | .11 | | -.03 | -.03 | .11 | | .02 | .06 | .19 | |
| Learning & Performance | .01 | .01 | .08 | | .08 | .09 | .10 | | .06 | .06 | .09 | | -.16** | -.49 | .16 | |
| Social Normative | .02 | .02 | .05 | | .06 | .05 | .05 | | .11† | .08 | .05 | | .09* | .19 | .09 | |
| | | | | .10 | | | | .16 | | | | .15 | | | | .19 |

Note. $N = 516$. † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Gender is coded as 1 = man, 0 = woman. Raise, Promotion, and Job Offer coded as 1 if received, and 0 if did not receive in the past year.

Table 10

Latent Variable Regression of Personality Traits and Professional Networking Motives (Time 1) predicting Subjective Career Success (Time 2).

| | Recognition | | | | Quality work | | | | Meaningful work | | | | Influence | | | |
|------------------------|------------------|----------|-------------|-------|------------------|----------|-------------|-------|------------------|----------|-------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------|-------|
| | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 |
| Step 1 | | | | .11 | | | | .18 | | | | .15 | | | | .14 |
| Age | .07 | .01 | .00 | | .08* | .01 | .00 | | .14** | .02 | .01 | | .15** | .02 | .01 | |
| Gender | .07 [†] | .14 | .08 | | .03 | .06 | .07 | | .08 [†] | .21 | .11 | | -.03 | -.07 | .10 | |
| Occupational Prestige | .03 | .00 | .01 | | -.03 | -.00 | .00 | | .14** | .02 | .01 | | .10* | .01 | .01 | |
| Extraversion | -.01 | -.01 | .07 | | .01 | .00 | .07 | | .02 | .03 | .10 | | .05 | .06 | .09 | |
| Agreeableness | .02 | .02 | .07 | | .07 | .08 | .06 | | .07 | .12 | .09 | | -.01 | -.01 | .08 | |
| Conscientiousness | -.02 | -.02 | .07 | | .17** | .20 | .07 | | .03 | .06 | .10 | | .06 | .10 | .09 | |
| Neuroticism | -.27** | -.26 | .06 | | -.17** | -.15 | .05 | | -.17** | -.23 | .08 | | -.14* | -.16 | .07 | |
| Openness | .03 | .04 | .06 | | .09 [†] | .10 | .05 | | -.06 | -.10 | .08 | | .04 | .05 | .07 | |
| Step 2 | | | | .06 | | | | .08 | | | | .13 | | | | .11 |
| Affiliation | .07 | .06 | .06 | | .00 | .00 | .05 | | .10 | .11 | .08 | | .09 | .09 | .07 | |
| Prosocial | .05 | .05 | .06 | | .19** | .15 | .05 | | .14* | .17 | .07 | | .10 | .10 | .07 | |
| Status | .16* | .15 | .07 | | .19** | .17 | .06 | | .10 | .14 | .09 | | .25** | .29 | .08 | |
| Career Management | -.06 | -.07 | .08 | | -.14* | -.14 | .07 | | -.20** | -.32 | .10 | | -.23** | -.32 | .09 | |
| Learning & Performance | .07 | .08 | .06 | | .09 [†] | .09 | .06 | | .25** | .37 | .08 | | .13* | .17 | .07 | |
| Social Normative | .05 | .04 | .04 | | -.06 | -.04 | .03 | | .04 | .04 | .05 | | .07 | .07 | .04 | |
| | | | | .17 | | | | .26 | | | | .28 | | | | .25 |

Note. $N = 517$. [†] $p < .07$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Gender is coded as 1 = man, 0 = woman.

Table 10

Continued.

| | Authenticity | | | | Personal life | | | | Growth & Development | | | | Satisfaction | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|----------|-------------|-------|--------------------|----------|-------------|-------|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------|--------------------|----------|-------------|-------|
| | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 | β | <i>B</i> | <i>s.e.</i> | R^2 |
| Step 1 | | | | .21 | | | | .17 | | | | .20 | | | | .20 |
| Age | .07 [†] | .01 | .01 | | -.03 | -.01 | .01 | | .02 | .00 | .00 | | .05 | .01 | .01 | |
| Gender | .06 | .13 | .09 | | .04 | .12 | .11 | | .05 | .08 | .08 | | .07 [†] | .19 | .11 | |
| Occupational Prestige | .10 [*] | .01 | .01 | | -.03 | -.01 | .01 | | .05 | .01 | .00 | | .12 ^{**} | .02 | .01 | |
| Extraversion | .01 | .01 | .08 | | -.12 | -.17 | .10 | | .15 [*] | .15 | .07 | | -.04 | -.07 | .10 | |
| Agreeableness | -.02 | -.03 | .07 | | .13 [*] | .20 | .09 | | .08 | .09 | .06 | | .07 | .13 | .09 | |
| Conscientiousness | .03 | .05 | .08 | | .02 | .04 | .10 | | .09 | .11 | .07 | | -.01 | -.01 | .10 | |
| Neuroticism | -.31 ^{**} | -.36 | .07 | | -.38 ^{**} | -.52 | .08 | | -.20 ^{**} | -.20 | .05 | | -.31 ^{**} | -.47 | .08 | |
| Openness | .02 | .02 | .07 | | -.00 | -.01 | .08 | | .07 | .08 | .05 | | .01 | .01 | .08 | |
| Step 2 | | | | .09 | | | | .02 | | | | .11 | | | | .11 |
| Affiliation | .23 ^{**} | .21 | .07 | | .14 [†] | .15 | .08 | | -.11 | -.08 | .06 | | .22 ^{**} | .26 | .08 | |
| Prosocial | -.00 | -.00 | .06 | | .00 | .00 | .08 | | .06 | .05 | .05 | | .03 | .04 | .08 | |
| Status | .14 [*] | .16 | .07 | | -.02 | -.03 | .09 | | .18 ^{**} | .16 | .06 | | .12 [†] | .17 | .09 | |
| Career Management | -.13 [*] | -.18 | .08 | | -.12 [†] | -.19 | .10 | | -.13 [*] | -.14 | .07 | | -.22 ^{**} | -.38 | .11 | |
| Learning & Performance | .14 ^{**} | .18 | .07 | | .06 | .10 | .09 | | .31 ^{**} | .33 | .06 | | .21 ^{**} | .34 | .09 | |
| Social Normative | .06 | .06 | .04 | | .08 [†] | .09 | .05 | | -.01 | -.00 | .03 | | .10 [*] | .12 | .05 | |
| R^2 | | | | .30 | | | | .19 | | | | .31 | | | | .31 |

Note. $N = 517$. [†] $p < .07$, ^{*} $p < .05$, ^{**} $p < .01$. Gender is coded as 1 = man, 0 = woman.