



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP

WWW.CIKD.CA

journal homepage: <https://www.ijol.cikd.ca>



Aligning Modern Career Expectations with Workplace Outcomes: Insights from the Kaleidoscope Career Model

Uygar Öztürk^{1*}, Aydan Yavuz Öztürk², Menekşe Yarız³

¹Ahlat Vocational School, Department of Finance-Banking and Insurance, Bitlis Eren University, Türkiye

^{2,3}Independent Researcher

Keywords:

Kaleidoscope career model,
Motivation, Performance, Work
psychology, Career development

Received

02 July 2025

Received in revised form

29 July 2025

Accepted

03 August 2025

*Correspondence:

uozturk@beu.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

The Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM) offers a flexible, individual-centered approach that reflects modern career expectations. The model is based on three core parameters: authenticity, balance, and challenge. In today's labor market, employee productivity is primarily evaluated through motivation and performance, significantly influencing organizational outcomes. This study examines the effects of KCM parameters on employee motivation and performance within the context of modern career perspectives. It specifically explores the relationship between individual career outcomes and organizational results. The research was conducted with a sample of 386 healthcare professionals working in the eastern provinces of Türkiye. Data were collected through validated KCM, motivation, and performance scales and analyzed using correlation and multiple regression techniques. The findings reveal that the "challenge" dimension has the most potent positive effect on all aspects of motivation and employee performance. The results indicate that career models prioritizing individual values can generate meaningful organizational outcomes, offering strategic insights for human resource practices.

©CIKD Publishing

Modern times are characterized by a rapid cycle of transformation, in which innovations immediately permeate daily life and are just as swiftly replaced by new ones. This dynamic process directly influences individuals' personal preferences; what is desirable today may quickly lose relevance in the face of new priorities tomorrow. Contemporary society is increasingly shaped by individuals who possess clear goals in every life area and prefer active engagement over passive observation. Among these aspirations, career goals have gained

considerable prominence and are influenced by, as well as exert influence on, various contextual parameters.

A career is a lifelong process encompassing all work-related experiences acquired by an individual (Tüz, 2003). More specifically, it refers to professional development, achievements, and experiences gained throughout one's working life (Taşlıyan et al., 2011). The literature reveals the presence of various career approaches. However, this study focuses on the following models: boundaryless career, protean career, post-corporate career, multidirectional career, customized career, and the Kaleidoscope Career Model (Polat & Özdemir, 2021; Seğer & Çınar, 2011; Sullivan & Arthur, 2006).

One prominent emerging approach in recent years is the Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM), which represents a shift from organization-centered to individual-centered career development based on personal values, preferences, and beliefs. Comprising three core dimensions—authenticity, balance, and challenge—this model plays an active role throughout an individual's life stages (Polat & Özdemir, 2021). Modern career understanding has evolved beyond financial gain and status acquisition, emphasizing opportunities for self-development, continuous transformation, and personal fulfillment. In this regard, the KCM provides a practical framework for supporting individuals in achieving their career goals (Denizli & Dündar, 2023).

The Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM) emphasizes individuals' efforts to shape careers that best fit their personal characteristics and life conditions, including internal and external changes. Every career decision directly affects an individual's life, just as life decisions continuously reshape career paths. Therefore, KCM focuses on the dynamic interaction between personal life and career preferences (Sullivan et al., 2009).

The model is grounded in the idea that individuals make choices and changes to balance their careers and lives. It also considers the sacrifices and preferences individuals—particularly women—make throughout their career journeys. Research shows that women are more likely to sacrifice to maintain career-life balance (Denizli & Dündar, 2023). KCM is structured around three core parameters influencing career choices: authenticity, balance, and challenge. At different life stages, individuals combine these dimensions to form unique career patterns. Much like a kaleidoscope, these patterns shift over time, reflecting the most suitable design for the individual's current life context (Sullivan & Carraher, 2022).

The model has been conceptually defined through these three primary parameters (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2006): 1) Authenticity: The desire to define and express a career path aligned with one's true self (Hall & Chandler, 2005). 2) Balance: The process of managing demands between work and non-work life domains (Sullivan & Baruch, 2009). 3) Challenge: The aspiration to overcome difficulties and achieve success and growth in one's career (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005).

These parameters may vary in importance over time depending on changing priorities. While one may dominate at a given stage, the others recede yet remain relevant to decision-making processes (Sullivan et al., 2009).

Derived from the Latin word *movere*, meaning "to move," motivation is an internal drive that directs individuals toward specific behaviors. It initiates and sustains actions, shaping their continuity or cessation (Neill, 2002). Instinctual factors such as survival, achievement, power, sexuality, and fulfilling needs often drive behavior (Graham & Weiner, 2012). Intrinsic

motivation arises from the inherent interest or curiosity in the task, independent of external rewards. In contrast, extrinsic motivation is driven by external incentives such as promotions, salary increases, or bonuses. However, when these rewards are withdrawn, a decline in performance may occur (Bénabou & Tirole, 2003; Doğan & Aslan, 2018).

Performance is a concept that expresses the outcome of a specific activity in either quantitative or qualitative terms. It reflects the extent to which personal or organizational goals have been achieved and indicates how successfully a task has been completed (Özer, 2009). Meanwhile, the concept of motivation encompasses the reasons behind individual behavior, the factors that trigger such behavior, and the internal or external forces that sustain or terminate it (Graham & Weiner, 2012). Conversely, a career refers to the cumulative efforts exerted by an individual to gain increasing responsibility, prestige, and influence in a professional domain (Aktaş, 2015).

In a broader sense, performance refers to the effectiveness and impact of actions undertaken to achieve a specific goal or ideal (Lebas, 1995). It involves the measurement of success or failure during the process of reaching a defined target (Altun & Memişoğlu, 2008). Originating from the French term performance, the concept encompasses task execution, implementation, and operational processes. Core performance components include goal setting, efficient use of resources, and the outcomes achieved. High performance is crucial for organizational sustainability and revenue growth (Sahin & Kasap, 2021). Furthermore, positive performance is often rewarded through promotions, salary increases, and career opportunities, reinforcing employee motivation (Sonnentag & Frese, 2002).

In the context of modern career understanding, individuals' expectations from work have significantly evolved. The desire to establish a balance between work and personal life, to work in environments aligned with one's values, and to engage in development-oriented, challenging tasks has become increasingly prominent. In this regard, the Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM), with its three core parameters authenticity, balance, and challenge, offers a valuable theoretical framework for understanding the changing career expectations of today's workforce. However, a review of the existing literature reveals a notable gap, particularly in studies examining the relationship between KCM and key determinants of career success such as motivation and performance. This gap highlights a critical need to understand how intrinsic sources of motivation and organizational performance outcomes are shaped through career development processes.

This study aims to provide theoretical and empirical contributions by examining the impact of KCM's three parameters (authenticity, balance, and challenge) on employee motivation and performance orientation. The novelty of this research lies in extending the application of the KCM beyond its traditionally gender-focused scope, utilizing it as a framework to explain employee behavior within organizational settings. Furthermore, by establishing a link between high-performance work systems and the parameters of KCM, the study enables a more holistic approach to understanding the alignment between individual career goals and organizational outcomes. In this way, the research offers a comprehensive insight into how individuals navigate their careers amidst rapidly evolving labor market dynamics and increasing employability pressures. Ultimately, this study delivers original contributions to academic literature and generates practical implications for human resource management practices.

The following research questions guide the study:

RQ 1: Which parameter of the Kaleidoscope Career Model has the most significant impact on employee motivation?

RQ 2: Which parameter of the Kaleidoscope Career Model has the most significant impact on employee performance?

Literature Review

In career literature, human resource practices and motivational factors are considered to play a critical role in understanding employees' work attitudes and performance. Zhang et al. (2014) found that human resource practices that satisfy employees lead to more positive affect and higher performance. Individuals with non-traditional, non-linear career paths tend to be motivated beyond extrinsic rewards, placing greater emphasis on intrinsic rewards, personal growth, and meaningful work (Baruch, 2004).

This trend becomes more apparent in the face of rapid environmental changes, such as increasing globalization, a more diverse workforce, technological advancements, and the growing conceptualization of non-traditional careers (Koekemoer & Crafford, 2019). In this context, the concept of career has also evolved. In contrast, career success was initially assessed through objective indicators (e.g., income level); it has gradually expanded to include subjective evaluations (Jansen et al., 2022). Moreover, career success is influenced by internal dynamics and external circumstances (Akkermans et al., 2020).

Personal motivation positively influences job performance through the employee's interest in and commitment to their work, while organizational incentives such as salary, rewards, and promotions also enhance employee performance. These motivational support organizations are crucial in increasing productivity (Altındağ & Akgün, 2015). An individual's level of professional motivation impacts their job performance and strengthens their sense of organizational commitment. The satisfaction derived from work enhances employee motivation, which in turn contributes to a stronger attachment to the organization (Zeynel & Çarıkçı, 2015).

Both professional and institutional training activities support employee motivation and performance while contributing positively to career development. Investment in training enhances an individual's professional competencies and simultaneously boosts their work motivation (Niati et al., 2021). The availability of career advancement opportunities within the organization increases motivation and job satisfaction. Employees' confidence in their institution's potential for promotion emerges as a key motivational factor. The positive interaction between these two elements directly influences job performance and enhances productivity (Febrianti et al., 2020).

Changes in workplace positions may occur depending on employee performance. The belief that performance is fairly evaluated by the organization positively affects motivation and performance. Conversely, employees who perceive the evaluation process as unfair often experience a decline in performance (Eib et al., 2022). Furthermore, punitive approaches and disciplinary measures are among the factors that negatively impact employee performance. Thus, establishing a fair and transparent performance evaluation system and reinforcing the belief that career progression is based on performance are considered strategic necessities for improving employee motivation and performance (Tunçer, 2013).

Research indicates that emerging career approaches contribute positively to employee performance and offer benefits to organizations. However, these new approaches may also reduce employees' organizational commitment. One of the main reasons for this is the perception that such models lead to a decline in employee rights. This perception undermines organizational loyalty and decreases motivation and performance levels (Nazlı, 2024).

The Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM), developed within this evolving understanding, posits that individuals focus on three core career needs—authenticity, balance, and challenge—throughout their careers, with varying intensities at different life stages (Mainiero & Gibson, 2017). According to the model, individuals adjust the relative importance of these parameters in response to the character and context of their lives (Sullivan et al., 2009). Additionally, it has been suggested that cultural and socioeconomic factors may introduce new parameters or influence the salience of the existing ones (Tarhan, 2019).

Within the Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM) framework, the three fundamental elements—authenticity, balance, and challenge—are considered key determinants in achieving career success. Particularly in the dimension of authenticity, supporting individuals' desire to initiate change in their career paths contributes significantly to professional development. Furthermore, it is increasingly evident that organizations aiming to retain talent in today's workforce must adopt innovative models such as the KCM. This is because the new generation of employees is driven by career advancement, self-fulfillment, meaning-making, and the pursuit of work-life balance. The model's ability to respond to these evolving expectations has positioned it as a prominent concept in the contemporary career literature (Koekemoer & Crafford, 2019).

As a novel career approach, the KCM provides a flexible framework suitable for analyzing diverse career goals in today's labor market. For instance, the degree to which an employee adapts to their job tends to have a positive effect on the balance and challenge components of the model, though, at times, it may suppress the importance of authenticity. The challenge element tends to prevail among individuals with high adaptation capacity, while those with lower adaptation capacity often exhibit a stronger need for authenticity (Öztürk, 2024). In this context, the KCM is defined as a flexible model that can take on different forms depending on individuals' life stages and emotional states (Sullivan & Mainiero, 2008).

The KCM is new and emerging as a prominent career model. One of its most significant advantages lies in its emphasis on balancing work and family life. Therefore, employees increasingly see the model as a viable pathway toward achieving their career goals (Sullivan et al., 2009). Importantly, its application is not limited to the private sector; it has also gained traction in public institutions. Notably, emphasizing the challenge dimension in public-sector contexts has been associated with enhanced institutional development (Mouratidou & Grabarski, 2021).

Women often assume multiple roles throughout their lives, requiring them to make greater sacrifices to remain engaged in professional life. Although the KCM is a relatively recent model, it appears to resonate more strongly with female employees (Denizli & Dündar, 2023). Despite the challenges encountered along their career journeys, women persist in their goals and develop stronger adaptability. At the same time, all three parameters—authenticity, balance, and challenge—impact women's career paths at various stages; authenticity plays a more dominant role. In the later stages of their careers, the balance component becomes more

prominent; however, rather than withdrawing, women tend to desire to remain involved consistently (Elley-Brown et al., 2018).

A wide array of factors influences employee performance. Workplace reward systems positively affect motivation and performance while supporting employees' career goals, contributing to organizational success (Pekdemir et al., 2014). Contrary to the widespread belief that difficult working conditions discourage employees and reduce performance, evidence suggests that supporting career development enhances performance. The increasing preference of employees to seek out organizations that prioritize career growth underlines this trend. In this regard, the KCM facilitates alignment between employee and employer career goals, making organizations that adopt this model more attractive and likely to achieve higher levels of employee performance (Tran Huy & Vu Hoang, 2025).

Regarding the "balance" dimension of the model, several studies have reported gender-based differences. For instance, Dima et al. (2023) found that male leaders tend to rate balance higher than female leaders in the early and mid-career stages. However, there was no significant gender difference in the perceived importance of authenticity across the lifespan. Interestingly, older male leaders placed less emphasis on the challenge parameter in later career stages compared to their female counterparts.

The KCM also serves as a metaphor to explain how women rearrange their career patterns around temporal priorities, often influenced by family roles (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005). Prior studies have highlighted the model's applicability in understanding women's career development. For example, August (2011), in a study involving women in the late stages of their careers, found that all three KCM parameters were relevant, but the importance of authenticity notably increased with age (Knowles & Mainiero, 2021). Shaw and Leberman (2015) elaborated on the meanings of KCM parameters for female CEOs in New Zealand's sports industry. Bishu et al. (2023) demonstrated that the need for balance was consistently important across generations for women leaders in U.S. government positions. Similarly, Cho et al. (2015) showed that the balance parameter was crucial in how South Korean women leaders managed family responsibilities and career aspirations.

These findings suggest that individual preferences, life stages, societal roles, and external environmental factors shape career decisions. The Kaleidoscope Career Model provides a flexible framework that captures this variability in modern career trajectories.

Hypothesis Development

Xiao and Cooke (2022) emphasized that references to human resource management practices are directly related to employee well-being. They highlighted the need for a conscious approach to developing authenticity (Shaw & Leberman, 2015). Employees with an employability orientation are more likely to carefully scan their environment and identify career opportunities both within and outside the organization, as they are open to self-development in order to adapt to changes in their jobs (Nauta et al., 2009). Since employability orientation is positively associated with perceived employability (Ekmekcioglu et al., 2020), individuals with this orientation are more likely to pursue job opportunities that align with their personalities and values. As a result, they can remain true to themselves, leading to the fulfillment of the need for authenticity (Tran Huy & Vu Hoang, 2025).

As Ballout (2008) noted, it is reasonable to examine career success through the lens of the Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM): "Individuals view their career success as a function of their satisfaction with internal standards and their perceived success within the social networks of their relationships with others." In this context, it is asserted that individuals should evaluate themselves and their career success based on their own goals rather than the achievements or expectations of others. Participants defined authenticity as "making a difference" and "working as a means to facilitate a desired lifestyle," and they stated that their work contributed to achieving financially meaningful goals and dreams (Koekemoer & Crafford, 2019). Authenticity is also closely linked to loyalty to oneself (Sullivan & Baruch, 2009). According to Knowles and Mainiero (2021), authenticity entails aligning one's values with the values of the employing organization or work context.

In one study, participants defined success in financial terms, but mostly viewed it as a way to support their lifestyle, hobbies, and related activities (Koekemoer & Crafford, 2019). Uka and Prendi (2021) highlighted the connection between employee motivation and company success, while Eckhaus (2021) underscored the importance of goal-setting for happiness and job satisfaction. Women's statements about their passion for sports offered insight into their perception of authenticity (Shaw & Leberman, 2015). Women often prove to be as strong leaders as men in various applied examples. When re-entering the workforce, they desire authenticity and do not want to be sidelined or judged for their decisions to temporarily exit the labor market (Knowles & Mainiero, 2021). Findings from related studies demonstrate that high-performance work systems enhance both career resources and career development motivation through employability orientation (Tran Huy & Vu Hoang, 2025).

Challenge is defined as the need for stimulating work that involves responsibility and/or autonomy (Dima et al., 2023). Additionally, employability-oriented employees are more likely to be aware of the ever-changing demands of their jobs (Tran Huy & Vu Hoang, 2025). They are also better prepared for change and more capable of confronting its associated challenges (Nauta et al., 2009). Thus, individuals with an employability focus fulfill their need for challenge. Furthermore, employability-oriented employees generally have a positive outlook toward change and are prepared to confront challenges in evolving work environments (Tran Huy & Vu Hoang, 2025). In one qualitative study, the statement "you may lose thirty times, but you will win the thirty-first and thirty-second" illustrated the strong link between motivation and challenge (Koekemoer & Crafford, 2019). Another study showed that critical incidents are motivational and promote proactive behavior (Zhang et al., 2022).

When examining the "balance" parameter, members of Generation Y in the sample expressed various perspectives on how balance contributed to their career success. Some participants emphasized the importance of separating work from private life to achieve a comfortable balance (Koekemoer & Crafford, 2019). Their narratives revealed a growing awareness among sports organizations regarding the need to respect employees' family time (Knowles & Mainiero, 2021). Additionally, employability orientation enhances individuals' skills, expertise, and job opportunities, which in turn may reduce concerns about performance and job security. This allows them to allocate their resources more effectively between work and non-work obligations (Tran Huy & Vu Hoang, 2025). The balancing act mentioned varied among participants and was influenced by the nature and flexibility of their jobs and their unique personal circumstances. Other factors included financial status, spousal and family

support, personal drive and ambition, and individual preferences. Several participants also emphasized the importance of balancing work and private life for physical well-being (Koekemoer & Crafford, 2019). Another study found that specific kaleidoscope career patterns are characterized predominantly by challenge, while authenticity and balance recede into the background (Knowles & Mainiero, 2021).

H1: The parameters of the Kaleidoscope Career Model significantly influence employee motivation.

Previous research has shown that the implementation and adoption of High-Performance Work Systems (HPWS) are positively associated with authenticity in the workplace. For instance, Riaz et al. (2019) argue that HPWS reduces perceptions of inequality, favoritism, and self-serving behavior through performance-based pay, open communication, and decentralization, decreasing organizational politics. Similarly, Heffernan and Dundon (2016) emphasize that HPWS enhances perceptions of organizational justice. Practices such as performance-based rewards establish a transparent link between effort and reward, reinforcing perceptions of distributive justice. Accordingly, it is reasonable to expect that the perception of HPWS contributes to meeting employees' need for authenticity (Tran Huy & Vu Hoang, 2025). HPWS, defined as human resource management practices that enhance organizational members' skills, commitment, and productivity to maximize their contribution to organizational success, is inherently performance-oriented (Datta et al., 2005; Tran Huy & Vu Hoang, 2025). Individuals seek motivating jobs that allow for participation, learning, growth, and career advancement. The "challenge" parameter is defined as the individual's need to discover stimulating work, acquire new skills, develop expertise, maintain motivation, and enhance workplace engagement (Knowles & Mainiero, 2021). The implementation of HPWS communicates the organization's expectation for extra employee effort. To meet these expectations, employees often face increased workloads, tighter deadlines, and more demanding goals (Agarwal, 2022). Additionally, progressive training and flexible job assignments enhance skills and competencies, thereby supporting self-efficacy (Karadas & Karatepe, 2019). Participatory decision-making and open communication improve understanding of organizational challenges and necessary changes, increasing preparedness and the capacity to respond to unexpected situations (Miao et al., 2021). Without a healthy workforce, achieving high performance becomes unlikely (Koekemoer & Crafford, 2019).

Furthermore, HPWS fosters the development of social capital through information exchange and coordination. Their participation- and commitment-oriented nature promotes collaboration and teamwork, encouraging the establishment of strong social ties among individuals and groups (Siddique et al., 2019). The availability of job resources helps employees manage challenging work demands. Therefore, HPWS is expected to create positive challenges that enable employees to meet their need for stimulation and growth (Tran Huy & Vu Hoang, 2025). The third core parameter of the Kaleidoscope Career Model relates to balance, which reflects employees' efforts to manage competing work and non-work demands (Sullivan & Mainiero, 2008). The relationship between HPWS and the balance parameter can be explained through two primary mechanisms (Babic et al., 2019). First, resources gained through HPWS—such as skills, behaviors, and rewards—may help individuals function more effectively within the family domain. Rewards serve as essential resources that support the fulfillment of family

demands. HPWS also enhances psychological resources such as self-esteem and self-efficacy, which can be applied in both work and non-work domains. Moreover, job autonomy and flexibility allow employees to choose alternative paths to achieving goals and to allocate time to family and other non-work activities (Miao et al., 2021). Second, positive moods and emotions generated at work can be transferred to family and non-work settings. Empirical studies have provided evidence supporting the positive effects of HPWS on well-being and work-family enrichment (Babic et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2022).

The need for balance reflects employees' efforts to harmonize demands from both work and personal life. This need is often expressed through the adjustment of working hours to reduce stress associated with family responsibilities, such as caregiving for children, spouses, or elderly dependents (Knowles & Mainiero, 2021).

How employees evaluate career choices and balance the parameters of authenticity, challenge, and balance constitutes a central focus of this study. Based on the reviewed literature and theoretical framework, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H2: The parameters of the Kaleidoscope Career Model significantly influence employee performance.

Method

Participants and Procedure

The sample of this study consists of healthcare professionals working in public hospitals located in the eastern provinces of Türkiye, specifically in Bitlis and Van. The sample selection was based on the assumption that shift-based working systems in the healthcare sector could significantly affect work-life balance. Additionally, due to the inherently demanding and altruistic nature of healthcare professions, it was considered that these employees might be influenced by and contribute to workplace outcomes such as authenticity, motivation, and performance.

A quantitative research design was employed, and data were collected using a survey method. The questionnaires were administered face-to-face. Participants rated the statements on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). A total of 386 valid responses were obtained during the data collection process. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS statistical software. Descriptive statistics, correlation, and multiple regression analyses were conducted to test the research hypotheses.

Instruments

The data collection instruments included demographic variables, the Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale, the Employee Motivation Scale, and the Employee Performance Scale.

Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale. The Kaleidoscope Career Model Scale (KCMS), developed by Sullivan et al. (2009), assessed participants' career-related values within the Kaleidoscope Career Model framework. The scale consists of three dimensions—authenticity, balance, and challenge—each measured by five items. The scale was adapted into Turkish by Polat (2021), and its validity and reliability were confirmed through statistical analyses. In the original study by Sullivan et al. (2009), the internal consistency coefficients for authenticity, balance, and challenge were reported as $\alpha = .76$, $\alpha = .81$, and $\alpha = .84$, respectively. The present

study calculated Cronbach's alpha coefficients as $\alpha = .71$ for authenticity, $\alpha = .69$ for balance, and $\alpha = .73$ for challenge. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to examine the scale's factor structure using the Direct Oblimin rotation method. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was found to be .77, and the significance value was $p = .00$. The total explained variance was 57.14%, indicating an acceptable level of construct validity. These results demonstrate that the Turkish version of the KCMS has sufficient validity and reliability for use in this study.

Employee Motivation Scale. The Employee Motivation Scale developed by Mottaz (1985) was used to measure employees' job motivation levels. This scale includes two subdimensions: intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation refers to the sense of satisfaction and meaning individuals derive from their work, while extrinsic motivation assesses attitudes toward tangible rewards such as financial compensation and status. The scale contains nine items for intrinsic motivation and 15 items for extrinsic motivation. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients were reported as $\alpha = .94$ for the full scale, $\alpha = .86$ for intrinsic motivation, and $\alpha = .92$ for extrinsic motivation. The Turkish version of the scale, adapted by Tanrıverdi et al. (2017), was utilized in this study. Participants rated the items using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) with Direct Oblimin rotation was performed to test the scale's factor structure. The KMO value was .93, indicating a high level of sampling adequacy, and the significance value was $p = .00$, confirming the data's suitability for factor analysis. The total variance explained by the scale was 57.000%.

Employee Performance Scale. A 4-item performance scale was initially employed by Sigler and Pearson (2000) to assess individual job performance. This scale evaluates employees' perceptions of their own job performance. The scale was adapted into Turkish by Çöl (2008), and its validity and reliability were confirmed. Responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). In the current study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated as .87, indicating that the scale is a highly reliable instrument.

Statistical Analysis

The data collected for this study were analyzed using the SPSS statistical software package. Initially, Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationships among variables. This analysis aimed to evaluate the linear relationships between employee motivation (intrinsic and extrinsic), employee performance, and the three dimensions of the Kaleidoscope Career Model: authenticity, balance, and challenge.

To address the primary research objective, multiple regression analysis was performed to determine the predictive effects of employee motivation and performance on the dimensions of the Kaleidoscope Career Model. Specifically, the extent to which intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and performance predicted authenticity, balance, and challenge was examined. This allowed us to identify which independent variables strongly influenced each KCM dimension. A significance level of $p < .05$ was used for all statistical tests.

Results

Relationships Between the Kaleidoscope Career Model, Motivation, and Performance

The relationships between the Kaleidoscope Career Model—including its subdimensions (authenticity, balance, and challenge)—motivation, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and performance are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Correlations Between the Kaleidoscope Career Model and Its Subdimensions with Motivation, Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and Performance (N = 386)

	Kaleidoscope	Authenticity	Balance	Challenge	Motivation	Intrinsic Motivation	Extrinsic Motivation	Performance
Kaleidoscope	1							
Authenticity	.74**	1						
Balance	.79**	.44**	1					
Challenge	.70**	.21**	.37**	1				
Motivation	.24**	-.11*	.15**	.52**	1			
Intrinsic Motivation	.24**	-.04	.10*	.48**	.89**	1		
Extrinsic Motivation	.23**	-.13**	.16**	.50**	.97**	.76**	1	
Performance	.28**	.15**	.09	.37**	.46**	.55**	.39**	1

Note. N = 386. ** $p < .001$; * $p < .005$

According to the correlation analysis, the Kaleidoscope Career Model and its subdimensions are significantly associated with motivation, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and performance. The overall score of the Kaleidoscope Career Model shows a positive and significant correlation with motivation ($r = .24$, $p < .001$), intrinsic motivation ($r = .24$, $p < .001$), extrinsic motivation ($r = .23$, $p < .001$), and performance ($r = .28$, $p < .001$).

When the subdimensions are examined individually:

Authenticity is positively and significantly correlated with performance ($r = .15$, $p < .001$) at a low level. However, it is negatively and significantly correlated with overall motivation ($r = -.11$, $p < .005$) and extrinsic motivation ($r = -.13$, $p < .001$).

The balance dimension is positively and significantly correlated with motivation ($r = .15$, $p < .001$), extrinsic motivation ($r = .16$, $p < .001$), and intrinsic motivation ($r = .10$, $p < .005$), but shows no significant relationship with performance.

The challenge dimension demonstrates moderate, positive, and significant correlations with motivation ($r = .52$, $p < .001$), intrinsic motivation ($r = .48$, $p < .001$), extrinsic motivation ($r = .50$, $p < .001$), and performance ($r = .37$, $p < .001$).

These results indicate that the challenge dimension, in particular, exhibits the strongest associations with both subdimensions of motivation and performance among all components of the Kaleidoscope Career Model.

The Effects of Kaleidoscope Career Model Parameters on Motivation

Table 2 presents the effects of the Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM) parameters authenticity, balance, and challenge on overall motivation and its subdimensions.

Table 2

Multiple Regression Analysis of the Predictive Effects of Kaleidoscope Career Model Dimensions on Motivation, Intrinsic Motivation, and Extrinsic Motivation (n = 386)

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable								
	Motivation			Intrinsic Motivation			Extrinsic Motivation		
	β	<i>t</i>	R^2	β	<i>t</i>	R^2	β	<i>t</i>	R^2
Kaleidoscope									
Authenticity	-.28**	-5.44	.33	-.15**	-2.92	.26	-.36**	-6.17	.31
Balance	.07	1.16		-.04	-.66		.13*	2.01	
Challenge	.64**	12.30		.59**	11.17		.65**	11.48	

Note. $n = 386$. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

According to the multiple regression analysis, the subdimensions of the Kaleidoscope Career Model (authenticity, balance, and challenge) have statistically significant but varying effects on overall motivation, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation.

Among the predictors, challenge was found to have the strongest positive effect on overall motivation ($\beta = .64$, $p < .01$). In contrast, authenticity had a significant negative effect on motivation ($\beta = -.28$, $p < .01$). The balance dimension did not show a statistically significant effect on motivation ($p > .05$). The overall explanatory power of the model was $R^2 = .33$, indicating that 33% of the variance in motivation is explained by the model.

Concerning intrinsic motivation, challenge again emerged as the strongest positive predictor ($\beta = .59$, $p < .01$). Conversely, authenticity had a significant negative effect on intrinsic motivation ($\beta = -.15$, $p < .01$), while balance had no statistically significant effect. The model explained $R^2 = .26$ (26.2%) of the variance in intrinsic motivation.

For extrinsic motivation, challenge was also the most influential positive predictor ($\beta = .65$, $p < .01$). Additionally, balance positively and significantly predicted extrinsic motivation ($\beta = .13$, $p < .05$). In contrast, authenticity had a significant negative impact on extrinsic motivation ($\beta = -.36$, $p < .01$). The model accounted for $R^2 = .31$ (31.9%) of the variance in extrinsic motivation.

These findings suggest that among the KCM dimensions, challenge is the most decisive factor in predicting all levels of employee motivation—overall, intrinsic, and extrinsic. While authenticity tends to have negative effects, the influence of balance is limited and only significant for extrinsic motivation.

The Effects of Kaleidoscope Career Model Parameters on Performance

Table 3 presents the effects of the Kaleidoscope Career Model dimensions—authenticity, balance, and challenge—on employee performance. Table 3 displays the results of the multiple regression analysis assessing the impact of the Kaleidoscope Career Model dimensions on employee performance. The overall model was found to be statistically significant, with an explained variance (R^2) of 15.6%.

According to the analysis, challenge had the strongest and most significant effect on employee performance ($\beta = .41$, $p < .01$). This finding indicates that workplace challenges, opportunities for growth, and environments where employees can demonstrate their abilities contribute positively to performance. Additionally, authenticity also had a significant positive effect on performance ($\beta = .12$, $p < .05$), suggesting that aligning one's career with personal

values supports higher performance levels. On the other hand, the balance dimension did not have a significant effect on employee performance ($\beta = -.11, p > .05$).

Table 3

Multiple Regression Analysis of the Effects of Kaleidoscope Career Model Dimensions on Employee Performance

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable		
	Performance		
	β	<i>t</i>	R^2
Kaleidoscope			
Authenticity	.12*	2.18	.15
Balance	-.11	-1.79	
Challenge	.41**	7.70	

Note. $n = 386$. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the effects of the Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM) parameters on employee motivation and performance within the framework of modern career concepts. Correlation analysis results indicated significant relationships between the overall KCM and its subdimensions with both motivation and performance. Notably, the challenge dimension demonstrated the strongest positive associations with intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and employee performance. These findings suggest that employees' experiences of overcoming challenges, encountering development opportunities, and pushing personal boundaries may significantly enhance their motivation and performance.

On the other hand, the authenticity dimension was found to be negatively associated with motivation—particularly extrinsic motivation. This may indicate that the desire to remain true to personal values and self-identity can sometimes conflict with organizational expectations, thereby diminishing motivation. The positive correlation between the balance dimension and extrinsic motivation suggests that perceptions of work-life balance can strengthen motivation driven by external rewards.

Findings from the multiple regression analysis confirmed that the challenge dimension significantly and strongly predicts employee motivation, both intrinsically and extrinsically. This supports the idea that employees are more highly motivated in environments that provide opportunities for growth, difficult tasks, and the ability to demonstrate their skills—consistent with the findings of Sullivan et al. (2009) and Mainiero and Gibson (2017).

Interestingly, authenticity was found to predict both overall motivation and its subdimensions negatively. This suggests that motivation may decline when individuals' desires to remain aligned with their personal values and express themselves in the workplace conflict with the organizational structure. These results highlight that authenticity does not universally act as a motivational enhancer and underscore the importance of alignment between organizational culture and individual values.

The balance dimension only showed a significant effect on extrinsic motivation. This indicates that positive perceptions of work-life balance enhance motivation driven by status, rewards, and job security. However, its lack of significant influence on intrinsic and overall motivation suggests that it may be less related to internal satisfaction or the pursuit of meaning. Regarding performance, challenge again emerged as the most influential and significant predictor. An increase in the challenge dimension led to a meaningful increase in employee performance. Authenticity also had a positive and significant effect on performance, indicating

that working in alignment with personal values supports higher job performance. Conversely, the balance dimension did not significantly impact performance statistically. These results imply that individual career values and access to development opportunities play an important role in shaping employee performance.

These findings are consistent with similar studies in the literature, which also highlight the importance of the challenge dimension in enhancing performance. Challenge represents an employee's desire to grow, showcase abilities, and overcome obstacles at work. When these needs are met, employee performance improves—particularly in dynamic and demanding work environments.

The positive effect of authenticity on performance suggests that individuals are more motivated and productive when working in environments that align with their values and beliefs. However, the lack of a significant effect of balance on performance indicates that employees may prioritize career advancement and self-actualization opportunities over work-life balance. This finding is especially relevant in high-intensity sectors such as healthcare, where challenge and authenticity appear to be more decisive in shaping career expectations. In light of these results, the study's hypotheses were partially supported.

In modern career expectations, the finding that challenge is the KCM parameter most strongly and consistently associated with motivation and performance is reasonable and consistent with theoretical assumptions. The desire to grow, push boundaries, and achieve success aligns directly with the challenge concept. Thus, this parameter is well aligned with positive workplace outcomes. However, no similar alignment was observed between employees' perceptions of work-life balance and performance outcomes. This suggests that balance-seeking does not always parallel organizational results and that misalignments may arise between individual priorities and institutional demands.

Practical Implications

This study demonstrates that integrating individual career expectations within the framework of the Kaleidoscope Career Model can lead to positive outcomes in employee motivation and performance. Notably, the challenge dimension is a key driver of motivation, highlighting the importance of offering employees flexibility in job design, opportunities for growth, and platforms to display their skills. Furthermore, the positive effect of authenticity on performance indicates that organizations should foster a culture that respects employee values and accommodates diverse preferences.

Theoretical Contributions

This research contributes to the existing literature by empirically validating the Kaleidoscope Career Model in the healthcare sector within the Turkish context. It provides concrete evidence of how the model's authenticity, balance, and challenge subdimensions interact with employee motivation and performance. The study also offers a theoretical foundation for integrating KCM with motivation theories, advancing a more comprehensive understanding of career development in relation to personal values, work-life balance, and the pursuit of growth.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future studies could examine the effects of the Kaleidoscope Career Model across different industries (e.g., private sector, education, technology) and cultural settings through comparative approaches. Longitudinal research designs may be used to explore how the influence of KCM parameters evolves over time and across career stages, shedding light on the model's dynamic nature. Qualitative studies investigating individual perceptions of authenticity, balance, and challenge can also enrich our understanding of how these concepts operate in real-life career development processes.

Conclusion

This study examines the relationship between modern career expectations and workplace outcomes from the Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM) perspective. By focusing on the model's three core parameters, authenticity, balance, and challenge, the research offers a comprehensive understanding of how these career dimensions align with employee motivation and performance orientation. The findings indicate that the parameters of the KCM significantly influence both motivational dynamics and career adaptability, reflecting the evolving expectations of the contemporary workforce.

The study contributes to the existing literature in several significant ways. First, it extends the theoretical application of the Kaleidoscope Career Model beyond traditional gender-based analyses, situating it within broader organizational and motivational contexts. Second, integrating the concept of employee performance with the KCM framework provides a novel perspective on how organizational practices can shape employees' intrinsic motivational resources, such as authenticity and challenge. Third, by emphasizing employee motivation, the study offers a future-oriented perspective on career development that underscores the need for personal alignment and proactive adaptation in a rapidly changing labor market.

Overall, this study not only confirms the relevance of the KCM in today's organizational settings but also highlights the importance of designing human resource strategies that address the holistic career needs of employees.

Declarations

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Ethics Approval

Not applicable.

Funding Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Citation to this article

Öztürk, U., Öztürk, A. Y., & Yarız, M. (2025). Aligning modern career expectations with workplace outcomes: insights from the kaleidoscope career model. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 14(3), 656-674. <https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2025.60526>

Rights and Permissions



© 2025 Canadian Institute for Knowledge Development. All rights reserved.

International Journal of Organizational Leadership is published by the Canadian Institute for Knowledge Development (CIKD). This is an open-access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](#) (CC BY) License, which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

References

- Agarwal, P. (2022). High-performance work systems and burnout: The moderating role of mindset and the need for achievement. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 30(6), 1803–1818. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-03-2021-2688>
- Akkermans, J., Richardson, J., & Kraimer, M. L. (2020). The Covid-19 crisis as a career shock: Implications for careers and vocational behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 119, 103434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103434>
- Aktaş, K. (2015). Genel anlamda kariyer ve kariyer sorunları [General perspective on career and its challenges]. *Sosyal Araştırmalar ve Davranış Bilimleri*, 1(1), 26–36. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/416669>
- Altındağ, E., & Akgün, B. (2015). Örgütlerde ödüllendirmenin işgören motivasyonu ve performansı üzerindeki etkisi [The impact of rewards in organizations on employee motivation and performance]. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12(30), 281–297. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/mkusbed/issue/19576/208774>
- Altun, A. S., & Memişoğlu, P. S. (2008). Performans değerlendirmesine ilişkin öğretmen, yönetici ve müfettiş görüşleri [Teachers', administrators' and inspectors' opinions on performance evaluation]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 5(3), 7–24. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/108293>
- August, R. A. (2011). Women's later life career development: Looking through the lens of the kaleidoscope career model. *Journal of Career Development*, 38(3), 208–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845310362221>
- Babic, A., Stinglhamber, F., & Hansez, I. (2019). High-performance work systems and well-being: Mediating role of work-to-family interface. *Psychologica Belgica*, 59(1), 301–320. <https://doi.org/10.5334/pb.473>
- Ballout, H. I. (2008). Work-family conflict and career success: The effects of domain-specific determinants. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(5), 437–466. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710810871781>
- Baruch, Y. (2004). Transforming careers: from linear to multidirectional career paths: organizational and individual perspectives. *Career Development International*, 9(1), 58–73. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430410518147>
- Bénabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2003). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 70(3), 489–520. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-937X.00253>
- Bishu, S., Sabharwal, M., & Reyes, R. (2023). Careers of women public managers: Career needs of women public managers across generations. *Public Administration Review*, 83(1), 163–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13548>
- Cho, Y., Kim, N., Lee, M., Lim, J., Han, H., & Park, H. (2015). South Korean women leaders' struggles for a work and family balance. *Human Resource Development International*, 18(5), 521–537. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2015.1076562>
- Çöl, G. (2008). Algılanan güçlendirmenin işgören performansı üzerine etkileri [The effects of perceived empowerment on employee performance]. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 9(1), 35–46. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/2151906>
- Datta, D. K., Guthrie, J. P., & Wright, P. M. (2005). Human resource management and labor productivity: Does industry matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(1), 135–145. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2005.15993158>
- Denizli, A. A., & Dündar, G. (2023). Kaleydoskop kariyer modeli: Bir ölçek uyarlama çalışması [Kaleidoscope career model: A scale adaptation study]. *Sosyal Mucit Academic Review*, 4, 46–68. <https://doi.org/10.54733/smar.1350632>

- Dima, A.M., Jansen, A., Biclesanu, I., Mascu, S., & Point, S. (2023). Top leadership's perspective on the kaleidoscope career model, *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 22(3) (60), 21–39 <https://www.transformations.knf.vu.lt/60/gp60.pdf>
- Doğan, S., & Aslan, M. (2018). Psikolojik sermaye, içsel motivasyon ve iş tatmini ilişkisi. [The relationship between psychological capital, intrinsic motivation, and job satisfaction]. *Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(3), 112–125. <https://doi.org/10.25287/ohuibf.423129>
- Eckhaus, E. (2021). The fourth dimension of happiness and work satisfaction. *Management & Marketing*, 16(2), 118–133. <https://doi.org/10.2478/mmcks-2021-0008>
- Eib, C., Falkenberg, H., Hellgren, J., Malmrud, S., & Sverke, M. (2022). What helps managers being fair? Predicting managers' self-reported justice enactment during pay setting using the Ability-Motivation-Opportunity framework. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(10), 2138–2169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1852590>
- Ekmekcioglu, E. B., Erdogan, M. Y., & Sokmen, A. (2020). Career commitment and subjective career success: The moderating role of career-enhancing strategies. *International Journal of Manpower*, 41(8), 1287–1305. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-07-2018-0230>
- Elley-Brown, M. J., Pringle, J. K., & Harris, C. (2018). Women opting in? New perspectives on the kaleidoscope career model. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 27(3), 172–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1038416217705703>
- Febrianti, N. T., & SE, S. (2020). The effect of career development and motivation on employee performance through job satisfaction in PT Jabar Jaya Perkasa. *International Journal of Business and Social Science Research*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.47742/ijbssr.v1n2p3>
- Graham, S., & Weiner, B. (2012). Motivation: Past, present, and future. In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, T. Urdan, C. B. McCormick, G. M. Sinatra, & J. Sweller (Eds.), *APA educational psychology handbook, Vol. 1. Theories, constructs, and critical issues* (pp. 367–397). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/13273-013>
- Hall, D. T., & Chandler, D. E. (2005). Psychological success: When the career is a calling. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 155–176. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.301>
- Heffernan, M., & Dundon, T. (2016). Cross-level effects of high-performance work systems (HPWS) and employee well-being: The mediating effect of organisational justice. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 26(2), 211–231. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12095>
- Jansen, A., Dima, A. M., Biclesanu, I., & Point, S. (2022). Research topics in career success throughout time: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Management & Marketing*, 17(3). <https://doi.org/10.2478/mmcks-2022-0016>
- Karadas, G., & Karatepe, O. M. (2019). Unraveling the black box. *Employee Relations*, 41(1), 67–83. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-04-2017-0084>
- Knowles, J., & Mainiero, L. (2021). Authentic talent development in women leaders who opted out: Discovering authenticity, balance, and challenge through the kaleidoscope career model. *Administrative Sciences*, 11(2), 60. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci11020060>
- Koekemoer, E., & Crafford, A. (2019). Exploring subjective career success using the kaleidoscope career model. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 45(1), 1–11. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC-1720124fc8>
- Lebas, M. J. (1995). Performance measurement and performance management. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 41(1–3), 23–35. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0925-5273\(95\)00081-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0925-5273(95)00081-X)
- Mainiero, L. A., & Gibson, D. E. (2017). The kaleidoscope career model revisited: How midcareer men and women diverge on authenticity, balance, and challenge. *Journal of Career Development*, 45(4), <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845317698223>
- Mainiero, L. A., & Sullivan, S. E. (2005). Kaleidoscope careers: An alternate explanation for the “opt-out” revolution. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 19(1), 106–123. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2005.15841962>
- Mainiero, L. A., & Sullivan, S. E. (2006). *The opt-out revolt: Why people are leaving companies to create kaleidoscope careers*. Mountain View, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.
- Miao, R., Bozionelos, N., Zhou, W., & Newman, A. (2021). High-performance work systems and key employee attitudes: The roles of psychological capital and an interactional justice climate. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(2), 443–477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1710722>
- Mottaz, J. C. (1985). The relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as determinants of work satisfaction. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 26(3), 365–385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1985.tb00233.x>
- Mouratidou, M., & Grabarski, M. K. (2021). Careers in the Greek public sector: Calibrating the kaleidoscope. *Career Development International*, 26(2), 201–216. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-05-2020-0123>
- Nauta, A., van Vianen, A., van der Heijden, B., van Dam, K., & Willemsen, M. (2009). Understanding the factors that promote employability orientation: The impact of employability culture, career satisfaction, and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(2), 233–251. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908x320147>

- Nazlı, E. (2024). The changing structure of careers and new career theories. *Journal of West European Social Sciences*, 1(2), 101–111. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14186745>
- Neill, J. (2002). What is motivation. *Psy101 Lecture Motivation and Emotion* (2015a3). Wikimedia.
- Niati, D. R., Siregar, Z. M. E., & Prayoga, Y. (2021). The effect of training on work performance and career development: The role of motivation as intervening variable. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 2385–2393. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v4i2.1940>
- Özer, M. A. (2009). Performans yönetimi uygulamalarında performansın ölçümü ve değerlendirilmesi [Measurement and evaluation of performance in performance management practices]. *Sayıştay Dergisi*, (73), 3–29. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1713683>
- Öztürk, U. (2024). The effects of work engagement on kaleidoscope career models. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 34(3), 1447–1462. <https://doi.org/10.18069/firatsbed.1448063>
- Pekdemir, İ., Koçoğlu, M., & Gürkan, Ç. G. (2014). Özerklik ve ödüllendirme algılarının çalışan performansı üzerindeki etkisinde çalışanın inovasyona yönelik davranışının aracılık rolüne yönelik bir araştırma [A study on the mediating role of employee innovative behavior in the effect of autonomy and reward perceptions on employee performance]. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 43(2), 332–350. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/66d20483c035e3b76b800e862c007eff/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=1796365>
- Polat, B. F. (2021). Beş faktör kişilik özelliklerinin ve aile destekleyici örgüt algısının kaleydoskop kariyer üzerindeki etkisi [The impact of the Big Five personality traits and family-supportive organizational perceptions on kaleidoscope careers, Unpublished doctoral dissertation Sakarya University].
- Polat, B. F., & Özdemir, Y. (2021). Yeni kariyer yaklaşımlarına güncel bir bakış: Kaleydoskop kariyer modeli [A contemporary view on new career approaches: The kaleidoscope career model]. *İş ve İnsan Dergisi*, 8(1), 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.18394/iid.724197>
- Riaz, A., Batool, S., & Saad, M. S. M. (2019). The missing link between high performance work practices and perceived organizational politics. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 59(2), 82–94. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0034-759020190202>
- Sahin, Y., & Kasap, S. (2021). Kurumsal performans: Ulusal literatür incelemesi [Corporate performance: A review of the national literature]. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(2), 83–93. <https://doi.org/10.53410/koufbd.850901>
- Seçer, B., & Çınar, E. (2011). Bireycilik ve yeni kariyer yönelimleri [Individualism and new career orientations]. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Dergisi*, 18(2), 49–62. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/yonveek/issue/13695/165745>
- Shaw, S., & Leberman, S. (2015). Using the kaleidoscope career model to analyze female CEOs' experiences in sport organizations. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 30(6), 500–515.
- Sigler, T. H., & Pearson, C. M. (2000). Creating an empowering culture: Examining the relationship between organizational culture and perceptions of empowerment. *Journal of Quality Management*, 5, 27–52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1084-8568\(00\)00011-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1084-8568(00)00011-0)
- Siddique, M., Procter, S., & Gittel, J. H. (2019). The role of relational coordination in the relationship between high-performance work systems (HPWS) and organizational performance. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 6(4), 246–266. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-04-2018-0029>
- Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2002). Performance concepts and performance theory. *Psychological Management of Individual Performance*, 23(1), 3–25.
- Sullivan, S. E., & Arthur, M. B. (2006). The evolution of the boundaryless career concept: Examining physical and psychological mobility. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(1), 19–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.001>
- Sullivan, S. E., & Baruch, Y. (2009). Advances in career theory and research: A critical review and agenda for future exploration. *Journal of Management*, 35(6), 1542–1571. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309350082>
- Sullivan, S. E., & Carraher, S. M. (2022). The kaleidoscope career model. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*.
- Sullivan, S. E., Carraher, S. M., Forret, M. L., & Mainiero, L. A. (2009). Using the kaleidoscope career model to examine generational differences in work attitudes. *Career Development International*, 14(3), 284–302. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430910966442>
- Sullivan, S. E., & Mainiero, L. (2008). Using the kaleidoscope career model to understand the changing patterns of women's careers: Designing HRD programs that attract and retain women. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 10(1), 32–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422307310110>
- Tanrıverdi, H., Koçaslan, G., & Perdecı, O. (2017). Örgütsel adalet, örgütsel bağlılık ve motivasyon arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between organizational justice, organizational commitment, and motivation]. *Ulakbilge*, 5(11), 533–555. <https://doi.org/10.7816/ulakbilge-05-11-02>

- Tarhan, E. (2019). Understanding women's career decisions: kaleidoscope career model. *Journal of Management and Labor*, 3(1), 118–132. http://www.yonetimvecalisma.org/download.php?download_file=Makale_2019_3_1_41.pdf
- Taşlıyan, M., Arı, N. Ü., & Duzman, B. (2011). İnsan kaynakları yönetiminde kariyer planlama ve kariyer yönetimi: İİBF öğrencileri üzerinde bir alan araştırması [Career planning and career management in human resource management: A field study on students of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences (FEAS)]. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 231–241. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/150985>
- Tran Huy, P., & Vu Hoang, N. (2025). Career impact of high-performance work system: A kaleidoscope perspective. *Psychological Reports*, 128(2), 1162–1186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941231159607>
- Tunçer, P. (2013). Örgütlerde performans değerlendirme ve motivasyon [Performance evaluation and motivation in organizations]. *Sayıştay Dergisi*, (88), 87–108. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1713835>
- Tüz, V. M. (2003). Kariyer planlamasında yeni yaklaşımlar [New approaches in career planning]. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(4), 169–176. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/sosbilder/issue/23119/246943>
- Uka, A., & Prendi, A. (2021). Motivation as an indicator of performance and productivity from the perspective of employees. *Management & Marketing*, 16(3), 268–285. <https://doi.org/10.2478/mmcks-2021-0016>
- Wang, L., & Chen, Y. (2022). Success or growth? Distinctive roles of extrinsic and intrinsic career goals in high-performance work systems, job crafting, and job performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 135, 103714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2022.103714>
- Xiao, Q., & Cooke, F. L. (2022). The joint impact of HRM attributions and HRM system consistency on employee well-being: a two-wave study. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 44(4), 926–947. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-07-2021-0333>
- Zeynel, E., & Çarıkçı, H. İlker. (2015). Mesleki motivasyonun, iş tatmini ve örgütsel bağlılık üzerine etkisi: Akademisyenler üzerine görgül bir araştırma [The effect of vocational motivation on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: An empirical study on academics]. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(3), 217–248. <https://iibfdergi.sdu.edu.tr/assets/uploads/sites/352/files/yil-2015-cilt-20-sayi-3-yazi-12-11092015.pdf>
- Zhang, M., Di Fan, D., & Zhu, C. J. (2014). High-performance work systems, corporate social performance and employee outcomes: Exploring the missing links. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120(3), 423–435. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1672-8>
- Zhang, Y., Gao, L., & Feng, Y. (2022). How does workplace event criticality spur employees' proactivity? The roles of work engagement and mindfulness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 976213. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.976213>