UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

To employability and beyond

Sustainable careers within contextual boundaries

Pajic, S.

Publication date
2020

Document Version
Other version

License
Other

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Pajic, S. (2020). *To employability and beyond: Sustainable careers within contextual boundaries*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:09 Nov 2026

Chapter 2 Supplementary material

4

Full results of the moderation analysis

Table S.3.1. Methodological moderators of the relationship between Personal Resources with Perceived Employability

Moderator (indented)	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Personal Resources										
Cross-sectional	.35	.02	14.69	<.001	.30	.39	QM(df=1) = 3.90, p=.048	7.57	QE(df=43) = 752.75, p<.001	45
Multiple time points	-.12	.06	-1.98	.048	-.24	-.00				
External	.32	.04	9.30	<.001	.26	.39	QM(df=1) = .07, p=.786	0	QE(df=27) = 333.98, p<.001	29
Internal	.02	.05	.27	.787	-.09	.12				
Psychological Capital										
Cross-sectional	.39	.04	1.50	<.001	.32	.47	QM(df =1)=4.65, p=.031	16.13	QE(df=21) = 49.40, p<.001	23
Multiple time points	-.20	.09	-2.20	.031	-.38	-.02				
External	.35	.13	2.70	.011	.09	.60	QM(df=1) = .01, p=.937	0	QE(df=14) = 432.93, p<.001	23
Internal	-.01	.14	-.08	.94	-.29	.27				
Social capital										
Cross-sectional	.32	.04	7.67	<.001	.23	.40	QM(df=1) = 1.64, p=.200	6.75	QE(df=9) = 86. 00, p<.001	11
Multiple time points	-.12	.09	-1.28	.200	-.31	.06				
External	.30	.02	15.19	<.001	.26	.34	QM(df=1) = .02, p=.902		QE(df=6) = 2.46, p=.873	8
Internal	.00	.03	1.23	.902	-.05	.06				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.2. Methodological moderators of the relationship between Personal Resources with Perceived Employability

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
Personal Resources										
External	17	9611	.36	.04	**.36**	.14	.28	.44	.17	.55
Internal	12	5298	.32	.03	**.32**	.10	.25	.39	.18	.46
Cross-Sectional	38	20430	.37	.03	**.46**	.20	.40	.53	.21	.72
Multipple timepoints	7	3401	.26	.06	**.31**	.17	.14	.47	.06	.56
Social Capital										
External	4	2090	.30	.02	**.39**	.00	.36	.41	.39	.39
Internal	4	2121	.30	.01	**.36**	.00	.30	.41	.36	.36
Cross-Sectional	9	3893	.33	.05	**.43**	.16	.30	.55	.20	.65
Multipple timepoints	2	1010	.21	.05	**.231**	.06	-.42	.89	.06	.40
Psychological Capital										
External	13	6921	.41	.06	**.48**	.24	.34	.63	.16	.81
Internal	3	1769	.31	.05	**.37**	.11	.09	.65	.17	.57
Cross-Sectional	19	11566	.46	.04	**.56**	.20	.46	.66	.29	.83
Multipple timepoints	4	2319	.29	.10	**.33**	.20	.02	.65	.01	.65

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ.

Table S.3.3. Individual vulnerability as moderator of the relationship between Personal Resources and Perceived Employability

Moderator	*B*	SE_B	*Z*	*p*	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	*K*
Personal resources										
Intercept	.34	.03	13.62	<.001	.29	.39	QM(df = 1) = 5.64, p = .017	14.05	QE(df=30) = 516.47, p <.001	21
Average sample age	-.07	.03	-2.38	.017	-.11	-.01				
Intercept	.32	.02	15.08	<.001	.28	.37	QM(df = 1) = 16.92, p<.001	32.74	QE(df =37) = 414.33, p<.001	30
% Men in sample	-.09	.02	-4.11	<.001	-.14	-.05				
Intercept	.28	.03	9.06	<.001	.22	.34	QM(df = 1) = 1.87, p=.172	3.16	QE(df=25) = 643.51, p<.001	27
% University	.04	.03	1.37	.170	-.02	.11				
Unemployed	.40	.04	11.49	<.001	.33	.47	QM(df=2) = 6.71, p=.035	1.95	QE(df=42) = 659.76, p<.001	45
Students	-.14	.08	-1.76	.078	-.29	.02				
Employed	-.11	.05	-2.38	.017	-.20	-.02				
Psychological Capital										
Intercept	.41	.03	12.56	<.001	.35	.47	QM(df=1) = 2.95, p = .086	1.19	QM(df=17) = 287.86, p<.001	19
Average sample age	-.06	.03	-1.72	.086	-.12	.01				
Intercept	.37	.04	1.75	<.001	.31	.44	QM(df=1) = 7.93, p = .004	27.89	QM(df=19) = 348.93, p<.001	21
% Men in sample	-.10	.04	-2.82	.004	-.17	-.03				
Intercept	.34	.06	5.99	<.001	.23	.46	QM(df=1) = .01, p = .920	.00	QE(df=13) = 528.21, p<.001	15
% University	-.01	.06	-.10	.920	-.12	.11				
Unemployed	.46	.06	7.78	<.001	.34	.57	QM(df= 2) = 4.37, p=.112	1.99	QE(df=20) = 409.63, p<.001	22

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Students	-.18	.10	-1.78	.075	-.37	.02				
Employed	-.14	.08	-1.76	.078	-.29	.02				
					Social capital					
Intercept	.29	.05	6.05	<.001	.10	.39	QM(df = 1) = .11, p= .746	0	QE(df = 7) = 94.75, p< .001	9
Age	.02	.05	.32	.746	-.09	.12				
Intercept	.29	.04	7.61	<.001	.28	.37	QM(df = 1) =.70, p= .401	0	QE(df = 9) = 9.35, p< .001	11
% Men in sample	.03	.04	.84	.401	-.05	.11				
Intercept	.30	.05	6.64	<.001	.21	.39	QE(df = 6) = 65.57, p< .001	2.03	QE(df = 6) = 65.57, p< .001	
% University	.08	.05	1.60	.110	-.02	.17				8
Employment status										
Unemployed	.25	.07	3.82	.000	.12	.38	QM(df=2) = .54, p=.765	0	QE(df=8) = 9.16, p<.001	11
Students	.06	.11	.59	.558	-.15	.27				
Employed	.06	.09	.65	.514	-.12	.25				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.4. Individual vulnerability as moderator of the relationship between Personal Resources and Perceived Employability

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
Personal Resources										
Unemployed	7	9013	.44	.03	**.56**	.18	.47	.65	.32	.80
Students	5	878	.25	.03	**.33**	.00	.24	.42	.33	.33
Employed	23	13940	.31	.03	**.37**	.19	.29	.45	.13	.61
Social Capital										
Unemployed	4	2207	.26	.03	**.33**	.04	.23	.43	.27	.40
Students	3	622	.32	.01	**.48**	.00	.40	.56	.48	.48
Employed	4	2074	.35	.11	**.40**	.25	-.01	.81	-.01	.81
Psychological Capital										
Unemployed	8	5445	.53	.05	**.67**	.21	.50	.85	.38	.97
Students	5	672	.26	.03	**.33**	.00	.23	.43	.33	.33
Employed	10	7768	.37	.05	**.44**	.17	.31	.57	.20	.68

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ.

Table S.3.5. Macroeconomic context as moderator of the relationship between Personal Resources and Perceived Employability

Moderator	B	SE_B	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Personal resources									
Intercept	.33	14.54	<.001	.28	.37	QM(df=1) = .84, p=359	0	QE(df=43) = 796.12, p<.001	45
Unemployement	-.02	-.92	.359	-.07	.03				
Intercept	.34	11.96	<.001	.28	.40	QM(df=1) = 1.67, p=.197	1.99	QE(df=38) = 466.3, p<.001	40
EPL	-.06	-1.29	.197	-.15	.03				
Social Capital									
Intercept	.29	7.31	<.001	.21	.37	QM(df=1) = .04, p=.828	0	QE(df=9) = 98.88, p<.001	11
Unemployement	-.01	-.22	.828	-.09	.07				
Intercept	.28	5.95	<.001	.19	.38	QM(df=1) = .03, p=.875	0	QE(df=8) = 1.17, p<.001	10
EPL	.02	.16	.875	-.21	.24				
Psychological capital									
Intercept	.35	1.17	<.001	.28	.41	QM(df=1) = 4.20, p=.040	15.93	QE(df=20) = 331.24, p<.001	22
Unemployement	.07	2.05	.040	.00	.14				
Intercept	.40	7.32	<.001	.29	.51	QM(df=1) = 1.82, p=.177	5.11	QE(df=16) = 345.15, p<.001	18
EPL	-.11	-1.35	.177	-.27	.05				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.6. Individual vulnerability as moderator of the relationship between Personal Resources and Perceived Employability

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\,\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
Personal Resources										
Low EPL	25	13488	.34	.03	**.41**	.15	.35	.48	.21	.61
High EPL	15	6282	.29	.04	**.34**	.17	.25	.44	.12	.57
Social Capital										
Low EPL	8	4281	.30	.05	**.37**	.18	.22	.52	.12	.62
High EPL	2	407	.30	.00	**.46**	.00	.46	.46	.46	.46
Psychological Capital										
Low EPL	10	6360	.42	.05	**.50**	.21	.35	.65	.21	.78
High EPL	8	3464	.33	.05	**.38**	.15	.25	.51	.18	.59

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ.

Table S.3.7. Cultural context as moderator of the relationship between Personal Resources and Perceived Employability

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Personal Resources										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.30	.02	13.95	<.001	.28	.37	QM(df= 1)=.92, p=.338	.20	QE(df=40) = 571.67, p<.001	41
Long Term Orientation	-.02	.02	-.96	.338	-.07	.02				
Intercept	.33	.02	13.86	<.001	.29	.38	QM(df=1) = .32, p=.573	0	QE(df=40) = 719.25, p<.001	41
Power Distance	.01	.02	.56	.573	-.03	.06				
Intercept	.33	.02	13.83	<.001	.29	.38	QM(df=1) = .22, p=.638	0	QE(df=40) = 786.68, p<.001	41
Uncertainty Avoidance	.01	.02	.47	.638	-.04	.06				
Intercept	.33	.02	13.97	<.001	.29	.38	QM(df=1) = .92, p=.339	0	QE(df=40) = 67.96, p<.001	41
Individualism	-.02	.02	-.96	.339	-.07	.02				
Intercept	.33	.02	13.89	<.001	.29	.38	QM(df=1) = .47, p=.494	0	QE(df=40) = 77.67, p<.001	41
Masculinity	.02	.02	.68	.494	-.03	.06				
Intercept	.32	.02	13.34	<.001	.27	.37	QM(df=1) = .09, p=.764	0	QE(df=38) = 572.45, p< .001	41
Indulgance	-.01	.02	-.30	.764	-.06	.04				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	.32	.02	13.77	<.001	.28	.37	QM(df = 1) = .00, p=.986	0	QE(df=40) = 59.47, p<.001	41
Harmony	.00	.02	-.02	.986	-.05	.05				
Intercept	.32	.23	13.77	<.001	.28	.37	QM(df = 1) =.03, p= .860	0	QE(df=40) = 584.06, p<.001	41
Embedded-ness	.00	.23	-.18	.860	-.05	.04				
Intercept	.32	.02	13.78	<.001	.28	.37	QM(df = 1) =.15, p = .703	0	QE(df=40) = 591.43, p<.001	41

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Hierarchy	-.01	.02	-.38	.703	-.55	.04				
Intercept	.32	.02	13.83	<.001	.28	.37	QM(df = 1) =.41, p =.522	0	QE(df=40) = 604.53, p<.001	41
Mastery	-.02	.02	-.64	.522	-.06	.03				
Intercept	.32	.02	13.77	<.001	.28	.37	QM(df = 1) =.06, p=.805	0	QE(df=40) = 593.74, p<.001	41
Affective authonomy	.01	.02	.25	.805	-.04	.05				
Intercept	.32	.02	13.79	<.001	.28	.37	QM(df = 1) =.17, p=.679	0	QE(df=40) = 599.84, <.001	41
Intelectual authonomy	.01	.02	.41	.679	-.04	.06				
Intercept	.32	.02	13.77	<.001	.28	.37	QM(df = 1) =.01, p=.922	0	QE(df=40) = 591.35, p<.001	41
Egalirism	.00	.02	.10	.922	-.04	.05				
Social Capital										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.29	.04	7.65	<.001	.22	.37	QM(df=1) = .83, p=.618	0	QE(df=9) = 82.30, p< .001	10
Long Term Orientation	-.04	.04	-.91	.362	-.11	.04				
Intercept	.29	.04	6.64	<.001	.20	.37	QM(df=1) = .15, p=.702	0	QE(df=8) = 91.07, p<.001	10
Power Distance	-.02	.05	-.38	.702	-.11	.07				
Intercept	.29	.04	6.62	<.001	.20	.37	QM(df=1) = .10, p=.747	0	QE(df=8) = 1.65, p<.001	10
Uncertainty Avoidance	-.02	.05	-.32	.747	-.10	.07				
Intercept	.29	.04	6.61	<.001	.20	.37	QM(df=1) = .09, p=.765	0	QE(df=8) = 94.44, p< .001	10
Individualism	.01	.05	.30	.765	-.07	.10				
Intercept	.29	.04	6.59	<.001	.20	.37	QM(df=1) = .05, p=.825	0	QE(df=8) = 97.47, p<.001	10
Masculinity	.01	.05	.22	.825	-.08	.10				
Intercept	.29	.04	7.32	<.001	.21	.37	QM(df=1) = 00, p=.999	0	QE(df=9) = 97.79, p< .001	11

Full results of the moderation analyses

Moderator	*B*	SE_B	*Z*	*p*	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	*K*
Indulgance	.00	.04	.00	.100	-.09	.09				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	.29	.04	7.45	<.001	.22	.37	QM(df=1) = .32, p=.574	0	QE(df=9) = 85.52, p<.001	11
Harmony	-.02	.04	-.56	.574	-.10	.06				
Intercept	.29	.04	7.65	<.001	.22	.37	QM(df=1) = .79, p=.376	0	QE(df=9) = 85.95, p< .001	11
Embeddedness	.04	.04	.89	.376	-.04	.12				
Intercept	.29	.04	7.45	<.001	.22	.37	QM(df=1) = .29, p=.589	0	QE(df=9) = 9.75, p<.001	11
Hierarchy	.00	.04	.54	.590	-.06	.11				
Intercept	.29	.04	7.45	<.001	.22	.37	QM(df=1) = .33, p=.566	0	QE(df=9) = 86.64, p<.001	11
Mastery	.02	.04	.57	.566	-.06	.10				
Intercept	.29	.04	7.45	<.001	.22	.37	QM(df=1) = .31, p= .577	0	QE(df=9) = 99.30, p<.001	11
Affective authonomy	-.02	.04	-.56	.757	-.11	.06				
Intercept	.29	.04	7.51	<.001	.22	.37	QM(df=1) = .46, p=.498	0	QE(df=9) = 88.92, p< .001	
Intelectual authonomy	-.03	.04	-.68	.498	-.11	.05				
Intercept	.29	.03	7.53	<.001	.22	.37	QM(df=1) = .50, p=.478	0	QE(df=9) = 86.13, p<.001	
Egalitarism	-.03	.04	-.71	.478	-.11	.05				
Psychological Capital										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.35	.04	8.78	<.001	.27	.43	QM(df=1) = 1.44, p=.229	2.55	QE(df=18) = 4.10, p<.001	20
Long Term Orientation	-.05	.04	-1.20	.230	-.13	.03				
Intercept	.38	.04	8.89	<.001	.29	.46	QM(df=1) = .01, p=.909	0	QE(df=18) = 481.31, p<.001	20
Power Distance	-.01	.04	-.11	.909	-.09	.08				
Intercept	.37	.04	9.14	<.001	.29	.45	QM(df=1) = 1.06, p=.304	.46	QE(df=18) = 505.12, p<.001	20

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Uncertainty Avoidance	.04	.04	1.03	.304	-.04	.13				
Intercept	.38	.04	8.95	<.001	.29	.46	QM(df=1) = .09, p=.769	0	QE(df=18) = 46.01, p<.001	20
Individualism	-.01	.04	-.29	.769	-.10	.07				
Intercept	.37	.04	9.14	<.001	.29	.45	QM(df=1) = 1.21, p=.271	.81	QE(df=18) = 526.26, p<.001	20
Masculinity	-.05	.04	-1.10	.271	-.13	.04				
Intercept	.35	.04	8.02	<.001	.26	.43	QM(df = 1) = .16, p=.689	0	QE(df=17) = 425.07, p<.001	20
Indulgance	.02	.04	.40	.689	-.07	.11				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	.35	.04	8.59	<.001	.27	.44	QM(df=1) = .09, p=.768	0	QE(df=18) = 434.43, p<.001	20
Harmony	.01	.04	.30	.768	-.07	.09				
Intercept	.35	.04	8.83	<.001	.27	.43	QM(df=1) = 1.36, p=.244	1.8	QE(df=18) = 434.43, p<.001	20
Embedded-ness	-.05	.04	-1.17	.244	-.13	.03				
Intercept	.35	.04	8.84	<.001	.27	.43	QM(df=1) = 1.76, p=.185	4.3	QE(df=18) = 431.37, p<.001	20
Hierarchy	-.06	.04	-1.33	.185	-.14	.03				
Intercept	.35	.04	9.02	<.001	.27	.42	QM(df=1) = 2.82, p=.093	9.45	QE(df=18) = 42.54, p<.001	20
Mastery	-.07	.04	-1.68	.093	-.16	.01	.			
Intercept	.35	.04	8.61	<.001	.27	.43	QM(df=1) = .43, p=.510	0	QE(df=18) = 434.63, p<.001	20
Affective authonomy	.03	.04	.66	.510	-.05	.11				
Intercept	.35	.04	8.98	<.001	.28	.43	QM(df=1) = 1.90, p=.169	5.1	QE(df=18) = 422.27, p<.001	20
Intelectual authonomy	.06	.04	1.38	.169	-.02	.14				
Intercept	.35	.04	8.99	<.001	.27	.43	QM(df=1) = 2.21, p=.137	6.82	QE(df=18) = 42.73, p<.001	20
Egalitarism	.06	.04	1.49	.137	-.02	.15				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.8. Methodological moderators of the relationship between Organizational Resources and Perceived Employability

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Organizational Resources										
Cross-sectional	.20	.04	5.18	<.001	.12	.27	QM(df=1) = .21, p=.64	0	QE(df=41) = 726.94, p<.001	43
Multiple time points	-.03	.07	-.46	.648	-.10	.16				
Internal	.15	.03	5.79	<.001	.10	.20	QM(df=1) = 15.13, p<.001	32.64	QE(df=32) = 364.81, p<.001	39
External	.22	.06	3.89	.000	.11	.33				
Job Authonomy										
Cross-sectional	.27	.07	4.13	<.001	.14	.40	QM(df=1) = 3.94, p=.047	25.39	QE(df=8) = 108.05, p<.001	10
Multiple time points	-.18	.09	-1.99	.047	-.36	.00				
Internal	.20	.07	3.00	.003	.07	.33	QM(df=1) = .46, p=.490	0	QE(df=8) = 112.63, p<.001	10
External	-.08	.12	-.69	.490	-.32	.15				
Supervisory Support										
Cross-sectional	.22	.08	2.69	.01	.06	.37	QM(df=1) =.00, p=.974	0	QE(df=9) = 235.26, p<.001	10
Multiple time points	.00	.13	.03	.97	-.26	.26				
Internal	.07	.07	1.13	.26	-.06	.20	QM(df= 1)=5.29, p=.021	43.45	QE(df=5) = 78.78, p<.001	7
External	.27	.12	2.30	.02	.04	.50				
Job Security										
Cross-sectional	.19	.04	4.79	<.001	.11	.26	QM(df=1) = 2.10, p=.147	4.02	QE(df=20) = 387.56, p<.001	22
Multiple time points	.19	.13	1.45	.147	-.07	.45				
Internal	-.40	.08	-4.88	<.001	-.55	-.24	QM(df=1) = 8.44, p=.004	29.1	QE(df=20) = 6.44, p<.001	22
External	.26	.09	2.91	.004	.08	.43				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.9. Methodological moderators of the relationship between Organizational Resources and Perceived Employability

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\,\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
Organizational Resources										
External	27	21516	.14	.02	**.17**	.13	.12	.23	.00	.35
Internal	7	3312	.36	.06	**.45**	.20	.26	.64	.17	.74
Cross-Sectional	18	10721	.21	.03	**.27**	.14	.20	.34	.09	.46
Multipple timepoints	6	5250	.22	.08	**.27**	.22	.03	.50	-.06	.59
Job Authonomy										
External	7	5328	.19	.06	**.23**	.07	.07	.40	-.02	.48
Internal	3	3319	.12	.04	**.15**	.06	-.09	.38	-.02	.31
Cross-Sectional	6	4519	.18	.05	**.24**	.17	.05	.42	-.01	.48
Multipple timepoints	4	4128	.15	.06	**.18**	.14	-.05	.41	-.05	.41
Supervisory support										
Internal	2	2176	.34	.06	**.43**	.08	-.37	1.23	.18	.63
External	6	3117	.16	.06	**.18**	.19	.02	.38	-.15	.52
Cross-Sectional	7	5630	.25	.05	**.32**	.16	.16	.47	.09	.55
Multipple timepoints	4	2744	.30	.12	**.35**	.29	-.12	.82	-.13	.83
Job Security										
Internal	4	1415	.45	.12	**.51**	.32	-.01	1.03	-.02	1.04
External	18	15503	.13	.03	**.15**	.13	.08	.22	-.02	.32
Cross-Sectional	20	15949	.15	.03	**.19**	.18	.10	.27	-.05	.43
Multipple timepoints	2	1456	.29	.08	**.35**	.11	-.73	1.43	.00	.70

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ.

Table S.3.10. Individual vulnerability as moderator of the relationship between Organizational Resources and Perceived Employability

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Organizational Resources										
Intercept	.19	.03	7.70	<.001	.15	.25	QM(df=1) = 5.57, p=.018	12.71	QE(df=33) = 523.66, p<.001	35
Average sample age	-.02	.03	-2.36	.018	-.11	-.01				
Intercept	.21	.03	7.35	<.001	.15	.26	QM(df=1) = .15, p= .695	0	QE(df=36) = 694.79, p<.001	38
% male	.01	.03	.39	.695	-.05	.07				
Intercept	.21	.03	6.99	<.001	.15	.26	QM(df=1) = 4.94, p= .026	12.18	QE(df=30) = 528.32, p<.001	32
% University degree	.07	.03	2.22	.026	.01	.13				
Job authonomy										
Intercept	.18	.05	3.94	<.001	.09	.27	QM(df=1) = 7.79, p=.005		QE(df=6) = 48.57, p<.001	8
Average sample age	-.14	.05	-2.79	.005	-.23	-.04				
Intercept	.18	.05	3.80	<.001	.09	.27	QM(df=1) = 3.25, p=.071	2.74	QE(df=8) = 92.66, p<.001	10
% male	.09	.05	1.80	.071	-.01	.19				
Intercept	.24	.04	6.47	<.001	.17	.31	QM(df=1) = 18.36, p<.001	86.29	QE(df=3) = 13.743, p=.003	5
% University Degree	-.18	.04	-4.43	<.001	-.27	-.10				
Supervisory Support										
Intercept	.27	.05	5.01	<.001	.16	.37	QM(df=1) = 1.74, p=.187	13.98	QE(df=4) = 38.54, p<.001	6
Average sample age	-.08	.06	-1.32	.187	-.19	2.70				
Intercept	.21	.06	3.53	<.001	.10	.33	QM(df=1) = .03, p=.854		QE(df=6) = 113.78, p<.001	8

Moderator	*B*	SE_B	*Z*	*p*	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	*K*
% male	-.01	.07	-.08	.854	-.14	.12				
Intercept	.25	.07	3.37	<.001	.11	.40	QM(df=1) = 1.61, p=.204	8.57	QE(df=5) = 137.16, p<.001	8
% University degree	.10	.08	1.27	.204	-.06	.26				
					Job Security					
Intercept	.21	.04	5.51	<.001	.14	.29	QM(df=1) = 1.03, p=.310	0	QE(df=19) = 381.00, p<.001	21
Average sample age	-.04	.04	-1.01	.315	-.12	.04				
Intercept	.20	.04	4.88	<.001	.12	.19	QM(df=1) = .00, p=.982	0	QE(df=18) = 398.19, p<.001	
% male	.00	.04	.02	.982	-.08	.09				
Intercept	.21	.04	4.99	<.001	.13	.29	QM(df=1) = 2.90, p=.089	11.33	QE(df=15) = 298.81, p< .001	18
% University degree	.07	.04	1.70	.089	-.01	.19				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.11. Macroeconomic context as moderator of the relationship between Organizational Resources and Perceived Employability

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Organizational resources										
Intercept	.20	.03	7.84	<.001	.15	.25	QM(df=1) = 5.37, p=.020	1.69	QE(df=40) = 683.83, p<.001	42
Unemployement	-.06	.03	-2.32	.02	-.11	-.01				
Intercept	.15	.04	4.28	<.001	.08	.22	QM(df=1) = 5.56, p=.018	12.07	QE(df=37) = 61.52, p<.001	39
EPL	.12	.05	2.36	.018	.02	.23				
Job authonomy										
Intercept	.18	.06	3.18	.002	.07	.29	QM(df=1) = .01, p=.927	0	QE(df=8) = 115.44, p<.001	10
Unemployement	.01	.06	.09	.927	-.11	.12				
Intercept	.08	.05	1.63	.102	-.02	.17	QM(df=1) = 3. 40, p=.065	24.10	QE(df=7) = 48.98, p<.001	9
EPL	.11	.06	1.84	.065	-.01	.23				
Supervisory Support										
Intercept	.22	.06	3.85	.000	.11	.32	QM(df=1) = 2.64, p=.104	15.49	QE(df=9) = 192.35, p<.001	11
Unemployement	-.10	.06	-1.62	.104	-.21	.02				
Intercept	.21	.07	2.96	.003	.07	.36	QM(df=1) = .56, p=.456	0	QE(df=8) = 198.69, p<.001	9
EPL	.10	.13	.75	.456	-.16	.36				
Job Security										
Intercept	.20	.04	5.34	<.001	.13	.28	QM(df=1) = 3.10, p=.078	9.31	QE(df=19) = 384.47, p<.001	21
Unemployement	-.07	.04	-1.76	.078	-.16	.01				
Intercept	.10	.05	2.00	.046	.00	.21	QM(df=1) = 8.65, p=.003	33.52	QE(d=16) = 246.30, p<.001	18
EPL	.22	.08	2.94	.003	.07	.37				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.12. Macroeconomic context as moderator of the relationship between Organizational Resources and Perceived Employability

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\,\bar{r}$	$\hat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
Organizational Resources										
Low EPL	21	19727	.14	.03	**.17**	.15	.10	.24	-.03	.37
High EPL	18	11046	.27	.04	**.33**	.19	.24	.43	.08	.59
Job Authonomy										
Low EPL	4	3143	.10	.04	**.12**	.11	-.07	.30	-.06	.30
High EPL	5	5230	.19	.04	**.23**	.10	.10	.36	.08	.38
Supervisory Suppot										
Low EPL	7	5577	.27	.05	**.32**	.19	.15	.50	.05	.59
High EPL	3	2523	.32	.12	**.39**	.23	-.20	.97	-.05	.82
Job Security										
Low EPL	9	11708	.11	.04	**.13**	.13	.03	.23	-.04	.31
High EPL	9	3703	.33	.06	**.39**	.22	.22	.56	.08	.70

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\hat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ. EPL= Employment protection legislation

Table S.3.13. Cultural context as moderator of the relationship between Organizational Resources and Perceived Employability

Moderator	*B*	SE_B	*Z*	*p*	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	*K*
Organizational Resources										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.20	.02	8.06	<.001	.15	.25	QM(df=1) = 6.49, p=.011	11.41	QE(df=41) = 65.04, p<.001	43
Long Term Orientation	.06	.03	2.55	.012	.01	.11				
Intercept	.20	.03	7.93	<.001	.15	.25	QM(df=1) = 2.81, p=.093	5.33	QE(df=40) = 621.38, p<.001	42
Power Distance	.04	.03	1.68	.093	-.01	.09				
Intercept	.20	.03	8.06	<.001	.15	.25	QM(df=1) = 4.47, p=.034	8.84	QE(df=40) = 673.39, p<.001	42
Uncertainty Avoidance	-.05	.03	-2.11	.035	-.10	.00				
Intercept	.20	.03	8.03	<.001	.15	.25	QM(df=1) = 3.31, p=.069	7.05	QE(df=40) = 674.89, p<.001	42
Individualism	-.05	.03	-1.82	.069	-.097	.004				
Intercept	.20	.03	7.98	<.001	-.10	.00	QM(df=1) = 3.69, p=.054	6.74	QE(df=40) = 644.16, p<.001	42
Masculinity	.05	.03	1.92	.054	.15	.25				
Intercept	.20	.03	7.81	<.001	.00	.10	QM(df=1) = 2.35, p=.126	3.93	QE(df=41) = 7.67, p<.001	43
Indulgance	-.04	.03	-1.53	.126	.15	.25				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	.20	.03	7.67	<.001	.15	.25	QM(df=1) = 1.30, p=.253	1.31	QE(df=41) = 675.41, p<.001	43
Harmony	-.03	.03	-1.14	.254	-.08	.02				
Intercept	.20	.03	7.63	<.001	.15	.25	QM(df=1) = .67, p=.415	0	QE(df=41) = 685.06, p<.001	43

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Embedded-ness	.02	.03	.82	.415	-.03	.07				
Intercept	.20	.02	9.04	<.001	.16	.24	QM(df=1) = 16.21, p<.001	3.72	QE(df=41) = 453.09, p<.001	43
Hierarchy	.09	.02	4.03	<.001	.05	.13				
Intercept	.20	.02	9.01	<.001	.16	.24	QM(df=1) = 15.27, p<.001	29.69	QE(df=41) = 418.82, p<.001	43
Mastery	.09	.02	3.91	<.001	.04	.13				
Intercept	.20	.03	7.74	<.001	.15	.25	QM(df=1) = 1.71, p=.192	2.58	QE(df=41) = 681.51, p<.001	43
Affective authonomy	-.03	.03	-1.31	.192	-.09	.02				
Intercept	.20	.03	7.78	<.001	.15	.25	QM(df=1) = 2.01, p=.156	3.62	QE(df=41) = 62.46, p<.001	43
Intelectual authonomy	-.04	.03	-1.42	.157	-.09	.01				
Intercept	.20	.02	8.40	<.001	.15	.24	QM(df=1) = 8.96, p=.003	18.48	QE(df =41)=597.48, p<.001	43
Egalitarianism	-.07	.02	-2.99	.003	-.12	-.03				
Job Authonomy										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.18	.06	3.19	.001	.07	.29	QM(df=1) = .03, p=.862	0	QE(df=8) = 115.34, p<.001	10
Long Term Orientation	-.01	.06	-.17	.862	-.13	.11				
Intercept	.18	.05	3.59	<.001	.08	.28	QM(df=1) = 2.24, p=.135	1.91	QE(df=8) = 114.46, p<.001	10
Power Distance	.08	.05	1.50	.145	-.03	.18				
Intercept	.18	.05	3.32	<.001	.07	.28	QM(df=1) =.69, p=.407	0	QE(df=8) =117.09, p < .0001	10
Uncertainty Avoidance	.05	.06	.83	.407	-.06	.16				

Moderator	*B*	SE_B	Z	*p*	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	*K*
Intercept	.18	.05	3.28	<.001	.07	.29	QM(df=1) = .51, p=.477	0	QE(df=8) = 117.16, p<.001	10
Individualism	-.04	.06	-.71	.477	-.15	.07				
Intercept	.18	.06	3.19	<.001	.07	.29	QM(df=1) = .04, p=.851	0	QE(df=8) = 117.09, p<.001	10
Masculinity	.01	.06	.19	.851	-.10	.13				
Intercept	.18	.05	3.45	<.001	.08	.28	QM(df=1) = 1.43, p=.232	3.07	QE(df=8) = 116.51, p<.001	10
Indulgance	-.07	.06	-1.20	.232	-.17	.04				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	178.00	.06	3.18	<.001	.07	.29	QM(df=1) = .00, p=.966		QE(df=8) = 115.01, p<.001	10
Harmony	-25.00	.06	-.04	.966	-.12	.11				
Intercept	.18	.05	3.41	<.001	.08	.28	QM(df=1) = 1.24, p=.265	1.12	QE(df=8) = 116.34, p<.001	10
Embedded-ness	.06	.06	1.12	.265	-47.00	.17				
Intercept	.18	.06	3.20	<.001	.07	.29	QM(df=1) = .06, p=.801	0	QE(df=8) = 114.72, p<.001	10
Hierarchy	-.02	.06	-.25	.801	-.13	.01				
Intercept	.18	.05	3.28	<.001	.07	.29	QM(df=1) = .55, p=.457	0	QE(df=8) = 116.60, p<.001	
Mastery	.04	.06	.74	.457	-.07	.15				
	.67	.31	2.18	.029	.07	1.27				10
Intercept	.18	.05	3.37	<.001	.08	.28	QM(df=1) = 1.01, p=.315	0	QE(df=8) = 115.75, p<.001	10
Affective authonomy	-.06	.06	-1.01	.315	-.17	.05				
Intercept	.18	.06	3.18	<.001	.07	.29	QM(df=1) = .01, p=.918	0	QE(df=8) = 115.50, p<.001	10
Intelectual authonomy	-.01	.06	-.10	.918	-.12	.11				

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	.18	.06	3.26	<.001	.07	.29	QM(df=1) = .41, p= .522	0	QE(df=8) = 116.74, p<.001	10
Egalitarianism	-.04	.06	-.64	.522	-.15	.08				
Supervisory Support										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.22	.06	3.47	<.001	.09	.34	QM(df=1) = .38, p=.536	0	QE(df=9) = 239.21, p<.001	10
Long Term Orientation	.04	.07	.62	.536	-.09	.17				
Intercept	.22	.06	3.40	<.001	.09	.35	QM(df=1) = .01, p=.944	0	QE(df=9) = 235.83, p<.001	10
Power Distance	.01	.07	.07	.944	-.13	.14				
Intercept	.22	.06	3.96	<.001	.11	.32	QM(df=1) = 3.19, p=.074	18.85	QE(df=9) = 18.10, p<.001	10
Uncertainty Avoidance	-.10	.06	-1.79	.074	-.21	.01				
Intercept	.22	.06	3.42	. <.001	.09	.34	QM(df=1) = .09, p=.763	0	QE(df=9) = 222.66, p<.001	10
Individualism	-.02	.03	-.30	.763	-.15	.11				
Intercept	.22	.06	3.58	<.001	.10	.34	QM(df=1) = .86, p=.354	0	QE(df=9) = 208.03, p<.001	10
Masculinity	.06	.06	.93	.354	-.07	.18				
Intercept	.22	.06	3.41	<.001	.09	.34	QM(df=1) = .01, p=.921	0	QE(df=9) = 23.20, p<.001	10
Indulgance	.01	.07	.10	.921	-.13	.14				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	.22	.06	3.60	<.001	.10	.33	QM(df=1) = 1.13, p=.288	1.5	QE(df=9) = 206.07, p<.001	11
Harmony	-.07	.06	-1.06	.288	-.19	.06				

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	.22	.06	3.44	<.001	.09	.34	QM(df=1) = .19, p=.665	0	QE(df=9) = 205.27, p<.001	11
Embedded-ness	.03	.07	.43	.664	-.10	.16				
Intercept	.22	.05	4.30	<.001	.12	.32	QM(df= 1) = 5.31, p=.021	31.85	QE(df=9) = 136.24, p<.001	11
Hierarchy	.12	.05	2.30	.021	.02	.17				
Intercept	.22	.06	3.86	<.001	.11	.33	QM(df=1) = 2.53, p=.112	14.16	QE(df=9) = 181.56, p<.001	11
Mastery	.09	.06	1.59	.111	-.02	.21				
Intercept	.22	.06	3.44	<.001	.09	.34	QM(df=1) = .13, p =.719	0	QE(df=9) = 204.08, p<.001	11
Affective authonomy	-.02	.07	-.36	.719	-.16	.11				
Intercept	.22	.06	3.77	<.001	.10	.33	QM(df=1) = 2.07, p=.150	1.25	QE(df=9) = 185.05, p<.001	11
Intelectual authonomy	-.09	.06	-1.44	.150	-.20	.03				
Intercept	.22	.06	3.58	.000	.10	.33	QM(df=1) = .95, p=.329	.07	QE(df=9) = 181.19, p<.001	11
Egalitarism	-.06	.06	-.98	.329	-.19	.06				
Job Security										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.21	.04	4.99	<.001	.13	.30	QM(df=1) = 2.89, p=.089	11.33	QE(df=16) = 298.81, p<.001	18
Long Term Orientation	.08	.04	1.70	.089	-.01	.16				
Intercept	.20	.04	5.22	<.001	.13	.28	QM(df=1) = 2.11, p=.146	6.83	QE(df=19) = 296.32, p<.001	21
Power Distance	.06	.04	1.45	.147	-.02	.14				

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	.20	.04	5.12	<.001	.13	.28	QM(df=1) = 1.48, p=.224	2.99	QE(df=19) = 384.33, p<.001	21
Uncertainty Avoidance	-.05	.04	-1.22	.224	-.13	.03				
Intercept	.20	.04	5.49	<.001	.13	.28	QM(df=1) = 3.70, p=.054	15.16	QE(df=19) = 322.93, p<.001	21
Individualism	-.07	.04	-1.92	.054	-.15	.00				
Intercept	.20	.04	4.97	<.001	.12	.28	QM(df=1) = .35, p=.553	0	QE(df=19) = 342.49, p<.001	21
Masculinity	.03	.04	.59	.553	-.06	.11				
Intercept	.20	.04	5.21	<.001	.13	.28	QM(df=1) = 1.77, p=.184	4.83	QE(df=19) = 352.19, p<.001	21
Indulgence	-.05	.04	-1.33	.184	-.13	.03				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	.57	.58	1.00	.319	-.56	1.70	QM(df=1) = .42, p=.518	0	QE(df=19) = 337.27, p<.001	21
Harmony	-.09	.14	-.65	.518	-.36	.18				
Intercept	-.15	.47	-.32	.748	-1.07	.77	QM(df=1) = .57, p=.450	0	QE(df=19) = 34.93, p<.001	21
Embedded-ness	.10	.14	.76	.451	-.16	.37				
Intercept	.20	.03	6.01	<.001	.14	.27	QM(df=1) = 8.36, p=.004	31.85	QE(df=19) = 199.92, p<.001	21
Hierarchy	.10	.03	2.89	.004	.03	.17				
Intercept	.20	.03	6.02	<.001	.14	.27	QM(df=1) = 7.79, p=.005	3.63	QE(df=19) = 165.79, p<.001	21
Mastery	.10	.03	2.79	.005	.03	.16				
Intercept	.20	.04	5.15	<.001	.13	.28	QM(df=1) = 1.42, p=.234	3.39	QE(df=19) = 343.66, p<.001	21
Affective authonomy	-.05	.04	-1.19	.234	-.13	.03				

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	.20	.04	5.11	<.001	.13	.28	QM(df=1) = .96, p=.326	1.58	QE(df=19) = 294.94, p<.001	21
Intelectual authonomy	-.04	.04	-.98	.326	-.12	.04				
Intercept	.20	.03	6.07	<.001	.14	.27	QM(df=1) = 8.95, p=.003	32.85	QE(df=19) = 01.05, p<.001	21
Egalitarism	-.10	.03	-2.99	.003	-.17	-.04				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.14. Methodological moderators of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Turnover intentions

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Cross-sectional	.11	.08	1.43	.154	-.04	.26	QM(df=1) = 1.37, p=.243	2.03	QE(df=10) = 201.71, p<.001	12
Multiple time points	-.15	.13	-1.17	.243	-.41	.10				
Internal	-.18	.13	-1.36	.175	-.43	.08	QM(df=1) = 4.39, p=.036	28.21	QE(df=9) = 98.13, p<.001	11
External	.30	.15	2.10	.036	.02	.59				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.15. Methodological moderators of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Turnover intentions

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\,\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
Cross-Sectional	8	3316	.00	.09	**.02**	.31	-.25	.29	-.42	.46
Multiple timepoints	4	2406	-.01	.05	**-.01**	.12	-.21	.19	-.20	.18
External	9	3480	.10	.05	**.12**	.17	-.02	.26	-.12	.36
Internal	2	1521	-.20	.12	**-.23**	.21	-2.19	1.73	-.89	.43

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ.

Table S.3.16. Individual vulnerability as moderator of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Turnover intentions

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	.30	.44	.69	.492	-.56	1.17	QM(df=1) = .32, p=.572	0	QE(df=10) = 2.17, p<.001	12
Average sample age	-.01	.01	-.57	.572	-.30	.02				
Intercept	-.06	.13	-.42	.675	-.31	.20	QM(df=1) = .45, p=.505	0	QE(df=9) = 143.49, p<.001	11
% Men	.00	.00	.67	.505	.00	.01				
Intercept	1.06	42.13	.24	.811	-72.51	92.63	QM(df=1) = .06, p= .812	0	QE(df=10) = 198.52, p<.001	12
% University Degree	.11	.11	1.00	.319	-.11	.33	QM(df=1) = .31, p=.580	0	QE(df=6) = 62.72, p<.001	8

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.17. Macroeconomic context as moderator of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Turnover intentions

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	.06	.06	.89	.376	-.07	.18	QM(df=1) = .31, p=.576	0	QE(df=10) = 192.86, p<.001	12
Unemployement	.04	.07	.56	.576	-.09	.17				
Intercept	.10	.07	1.33	.185	-.05	.24	QM(df=1) = 1.95, p=.163	8.77	QE(df=9) = 179.32, p<.001	11
EPL	-.20	.15	-1.40	.163	-.49	.08				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained; EPL= Employment protection legislation

Table S.3.18. Macroeconomic context as moderator of the relationship between

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\,\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
Low EPL	8	4402	.01	.07	**.02**	.24	-.19	.23	-.32	.37
High EPL	3	1046	-.11	.08	**-.16**	.15	-.56	.25	-.44	.12

Perceived Employability and Turnover intentions

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ. EPL= Employment protection legislation

Table S.3.19. Methodological moderators of the relationship Perceived Employability and Productive employees

Moderator	*B*	SE_B	*Z*	*p*	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	*K*
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.06	.06	.92	.357	-.06	.18	QM(df=1) = 1.48, p=.225	2.57	QE(df=10) = 201.26, p<.001	12
Long Term Orientation	-.08	.06	-1.22	.225	-.20	.05				
Intercept	.04	.07	.60	.550	-.09	.18	QM(df=1) = .0`, p=.931	0	QE(df=9) = 183.99, p<.001	11
Power Distance	-.01	.07	-.09	.931	-.15	.14				
Intercept	.04	.06	.61	.541	-.09	.16	QM(df=1) = 1.55, p=.214	5.88	QE(df=9) = 15.41, p<.001	11
Uncertainty Avoidance	.08	.07	1.24	.214	-.05	.22				
Intercept	.04	.07	.61	.544	-.09	.18	QM(df=1) = .18, p=.674	0	QE(df=9) = 164.11, p < .0001	11
Individualism	-.03	.07	-.42	.674	-.17	.11				
Intercept	.04	.07	.65	.519	-.09	.17	QM(df=1) = 1.13, p=.287	2.13	QE(df=9) = 152.46, p<.001	11
Masculinity	-.07	.07	-1.06	.287	-.21	.06				
Intercept	.06	.07	.88	.381	-.07	.18	QM(df=1) = .08, p=.776	0	QE(df=10) = 194.25, p<.001	12
Indulgance	.02	.07	.28	.776	-.12	.15				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	.06	.06	.89	.373	-.07	.18	QM(df=1) = .69, p=.406	0	QE(df=10) = 186.71, p<.001	12
Harmony	-.06	.07	-.83	.406	-.18	.07				
Intercept	.06	.06	.88	.377	-.07	.18	QM(df=1) = .28, p=.597	0	QE(df=10) = 201.58, p<.001	12
Embeddedness	.04	.07	.53	.597	-.10	.17				

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	.06	.06	.89	.371	-.07	.18	QM(df=1) = .85, p=.358	0	QE(df=10) = 178.39, p<.001	12
Hierarchy	-.06	.07	-.92	.358	-.19	.07				
Intercept	.06	.06	.89	.375	-.07	.18	QM(df=1) = .33, p=.564	0	QE(df=10) = 194.72, p<.001	12
Mastery	-.04	.07	-.58	.564	-.17	.09				
Intercept	.06	.07	.87	.383	-.07	.18	QM(df=1) = .01, p= .937	0	QE(df=10) = 19.85, p<.001	12
Affective authonomy	.01	.07	.08	.937	-.13	.14				
Intercept	.06	.06	.88	.379	-.07	.18	QM(df=1) = .45, p=.501	0	QE(df=10) = 189.56, p<.001	12
Intelectual authonomy	.05	.07	.67	.501	-.09	.18				
Intercept	.06	.06	.89	.373	-.07	.18	QM(df=1) = .69, p=.406	0	QE(df=10) = 186.71, p<.001	12
Egalitarism	-.06	.07	-.83	.406	-.18	.07				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.20. Methodological moderators of the relationship Perceived Employability and Productive employees

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
					Productive					
Cross-sectional	.21	.03	6.38	<.001	.14	.27	QM(df = 1) = 45, p=.501	8.72	QE(df = 21) = 333.62, p<.001	23
Multiple time points	-.07	.11	-.67	.501	-.29	.14	.			
External	.20	.04	5.00	<.001	.12	.28	QM(df=1) =.52, p=.469	0	QE(df=18) = 304.63, p<.001	20
Internal	.06	.08	.72	.469	-.10	.21				
					Career Success					
Cross-sectional	.16	.04	4.55	<.001	.09	.23	QM(df=1) =.10, p=.754	0	QE(df = 9) = 73.88, p<.001	11
Multiple time points	-.03	.08	-.31	.754	-.18	.13				
External	.10	.03	2.94	.003	.03	.17	QM(df=1) =1.41, p=.001	61.84	QE(df=7) =27.93, p=.0002	9
Internal	.17	.05	3.23	.001	.07	.27				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.21. Methodological moderators of the relationship Perceived Employability and Productive employees

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	SE $\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
					Productive					
Cross-Sectional	21	12065	.21	.04	**.26**	.19	.17	.35	.01	.52
Multiple timepoints	2	1348	.13	.05	**.17**	.06	-.53	.87	-.02	.35
External	15	8261	.20	.05	**.24**	.22	.12	.37	-.05	.54
Internal	5	3549	.25	.03	**.32**	.08	.20	.43	.20	.44
					Career Success					
Cross-Sectional	9	5818	.15	.04	**.20**	.15	.08	.32	-.01	.40
Multiple timepoints	2	1348	.13	.05	**.17**	.06	-.53	.87	-.02	.35
External	5	3370	.09	.03	**.11**	.09	-.02	.24	-.03	.25
Internal	4	2576	.27	.04	**.36**	.13	.13	.59	.14	.58

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\ \bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ.

Table S.3.22. Individual vulnerability as moderator of the relationship Perceived Employability and Productive employees

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
					Productive					
Intercept	.21	.03	6.26	<.001	.14	.27	QM(df=1) =.00, p= .980	0	QE(df=19) = 316.47, p<.001	21
Average sample age	.00	.03	-.03	.980	-.07	.07				
Intercept	.21	.03	6.12	<.001	.14	.27	QM(df=1) =.36, p= .548	0	QE(df=19) = 315.22, p<.001	21
% Men in sample	-.02	.04	-.60	.549	-.09	.05				
Intercept	.19	.04	5.44	<.001	.12	.26	QM(df=1) =.07, p= .786	0	QE(df=14) = 131.44, p<.001	16
% University	-.01	.04	-.27	.786	-.08	.06				
					Career Success					
Intercept	.16	.04	4.19	<.001	.08	.23	QM(df=1) =.04, p=.836	0	QE(df=7) =64.56, p <.001	9
Average sample age	-.01	.05	-.21	.836	-.12	.10				
Intercept	.14	.03	4.65	<.001	.08	.20	QM(df=1) =1.90, p=.168	14.31	QE(df=8) = 55.64, p <.001	10
% Men in sample	-.04	.03	-1.38	.168	-.11	.02				
Intercept	.13	.04	3.52	.000	.06	.20	QM(df=1) =1.13, p=.288	0	QE(df=4) = 1.69, p=.030	6
% University	.12	.11	1.06	.288	-.10	.34				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.23. Methodological moderators of the relationship Perceived Employability and Productive employees

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
					Productive					
Intercept	.21	.03	6.65	<.001	.14	.27	QM(df=1) =.10, p=.755	0	QE(df=21) =328.94, p<.001	23
Unemployement	-.01	.03	-.31	.755	-.08	.06				
Intercept	.14	.04	3.54	.000	.06	.22	QM(df=1) =.64, p=.424	0	QE(df=28) = 308.37, p<.001	30
EPL	.05	.06	.80	.424	-.07	.16				
					Career Success					
Intercept	.15	.03	4.91	<.001	.09	.21	QM(df=1) =.68, p=.411	0	QE(df=9) =72.72, p<.001	11
Unemployement	-.02	.02	-.82	.411	-.06	.03				
Intercept	.16	.04	3.85	.000	.08	.24	QM(df=1) =.03, p=.855	0	QE(df=9) =74.44, p<.001	11
EPL	-.01	.06	-.18	.856	-.14	.11				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained; EPL= Employment protection legislation

Table S.3.24. Macroeconomic context as moderator of the relationship Perceived Employability and Productive employees

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\,\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
					Productive					
Low EPL	12	7611	.17	.04	**.22**	.19	.09	.34	-.04	.47
High EPL	9	4340	.18	.03	**.22**	.09	.14	.29	.10	.33
					Career Success					
Low EPL	6	5019	.15	.05	**.20**	.15	.03	.36	-.02	.42
High EPL	5	2147	.14	.04	**.18**	.11	.02	.33	.00	.35

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ.

Table S.3.25. Cultural context as moderator of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Productive employees

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Productive										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.20	.03	6.60	<.001	.14	.27	QM(df=1) =.00, p= .966	0	QE(df=21) =329.62, p<.001	23
Long Term Orientation	.00	.03	.04	.966	-.06	.06				
Intercept	.20	.03	6.69	<.001	.14	.26	QM(df=1) =.62, p= .432	0	QE(df=21) =312.22, p<.001	23
Power Distance	.03	.03	.79	.432	-.04	.09				
Intercept	.20	.03	6.62	<.001	.14	.27	QM(df=1) =.09, p= .759	0	QE(df=21) =315.79, p<.001	23
Uncertainty Avoidance	-.01	.03	-.31	.759	-.07	.05				
Intercept	.20	.03	6.63	<.001	.14	.27	QM(df=1) =.20, p= .659	0	QE(df=21) =322.48, p<.001	23
Individualism	-.01	.03	-.44	.659	-.08	.05				
Intercept	.20	.03	6.71	<.001	.14	.26	QM(df=1) =.77, p= .380	0	QE(df=21) =308.71, p<.001	23
Masculinity	.03	.03	.88	.380	-.03	.09				
Intercept	.20	.03	6.72	<.001	.15	.26	QM(df=1) =.78, p= .377	0	QE(df=21) =306.17, p<.001	23
Indulgance	-.03	.03	-.88	.377	-.09	.03				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	.20	.03	6.94	<.001	.15	.26	QM(df=1) =2.14, p=.143	6.73	QE(df=21) =245.44, p<.001	23
Harmony	-.04	.03	-1.46	.143	-.10	.02				
Intercept	.21	.03	6.84	<.001	.15	.27	QM(df=1) =.96, p=.328	0	QE(df=21) =291.78, p<.001	23

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Embededness	.03	.03	.98	.328	-.03	.10				
Intercept	.20	.03	6.66	<.001	.14	.26	QM(df=1) =.37, p=.542	.35	QE(df=21) =308.36, p<.001	23
Hierarchy	.02	.03	.61	.542	-.04	.08				
Intercept	.20	.03	6.66	<.001	.14	.26	QM(df=1) =.38, p=.537	0	QE(df=21) =306.64, p<.001	23
Mastery	.02	.03	.62	.537	-.04	.08				
Intercept	.21	.03	6.79	<.001	.15	.27	QM(df=1) =.89, p=.345	0	QE(df=21) =295.85, p<.001	23
Affective authonomy	-.03	.03	-.95	.345	-.08	.03				
Intercept	.21	.03	6.99	<.001	.15	.27	QM(df=1) =1.65, p=.200	3.8	QE(df=21) =272.70, p<.001	23
Intelectual authonomy	-.04	.03	-1.28	.200	-.11	.02				
Intercept	.20	.03	6.94	<.001	.15	.26	QM(df=1) =2.14, p=.143	6.73	QE(df=21) =245.44, p<.001	23
Egalirism	-.04	.03	-1.46	.143	-.10	.02				
Career Success										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.16	.03	4.93	<.001	.09	.22	QM(df=1) =.15, p=.70	0	QE(df=9) =72.89, p<.001	11
Long Term Orientation	-.01	.03	-.38	.702	-.07	.05				
Intercept	.15	.03	4.83	<.001	.09	.22	QM(df=1) =.00, p=.96	0	QE(df=9) =74.42, p<.001	11
Power Distance	.00	.03	-.05	.957	-.060	.06				
Intercept	.15	.03	4.23	<.001	.09	.22	QM(df=1) = .01, p=.91	0	QE(df = 9)=73.78, p<.001	11
Uncertainty Avoidance	.00	.03	-.11	.909	-.07	.06				

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	.15	.03	5.19	<.001	.09	.21	QM(df=1) =.69, p=.41	12.26	QE(df=9) =63.39, p<.001	11
Individualism	.04	.03	1.52	.130	-.01	.09				
Intercept	.15	.03	4.86	<.001	.09	.22	QM(df=1) =2.29, p=.13	0	QE(df = 9) = 56.51, p<.001	11
Masculinity	.01	.03	.25	.801	-.06	.07				
Intercept	.16	.03	4.93	<.001	.09	.22	QM(df = 1) = .03, p = .80	0	QE(df=9) =7.65, p < .0001	11
Indulgance	-.01	.03	-.38	.702	-.07	.05				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	.15	.03	5.41	<.001	.10	.21	QM(d=1) = 1.77, p=.18	16.08	QE(df=9) =45.61, p<.001	11
Harmony	-.04	.03	-1.33	.183	-.10	.02				
Intercept	.16	.03	5.02	<.001	.10	.22	QM(df=1) =.30 p= .59	0	QE(df=9) =68.04, p<.001	11
Embedded-ness	.02	.03	.54	.587	-.05	.08				
Intercept	.15	.03	4.81	<.001	.09	.22	QM(df=1) =.07, p=.79	0	QE(df=9) =72.85, p<.001	11
Hierarchy	.01	.03	.27	.790	-.04	.06				
Intercept	.15	.03	4.89	<.001	.09	.21	QM(df=1) =.42, p=.52	0	QE(df=9) =65.55, p<.001	11
Mastery	.02	.02	.65	.517	-.03	.06				
Intercept	.16	.03	4.77	<.001	.09	.22	QM(df=1) =.00, p=.99	0	QE(df=9) =74.51, p<.000	11
Affective autonomy	.00	.03	-.01	.990	-.06	.06				
Intercept	.16	.03	5.45	<.001	.10	.21	QM(df=1) =1.62, p=.20	1.81	QE(df=9) = 52.35, p<.001	11
Intellectual autonomy	-.04	.03	-1.27	.204	-.09	.02				

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	.15	.03	4.77	<.001	.09	.22	QM(df=1) =.04, p=.85	0	QE(df=9) =73.78, p<.001	11
Egalitarism	-.01	.03	-.19	.851	-.06	.05				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.26. Methodological moderators of the relationship of Perceived Employability and Happy Employees

Moderator (indented)	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
					Happy					
Multiple time points	.20	.15	1.30	.194	-.10	.49	QM (df=1) =.61, p=.690	0	QE (df=16) = 407.60, p<.001	18
Cross-sectional	-.06	.16	-.40	.690	-.37	.25				
External	.14	.05	2.64	.008	.04	.25	QM (df=1) =1.,p=.180	5.25	QE (df=16) = 404.05, p<.001	18
Internal	.18	.14	1.34	.180	-.09	.45				
					Job Satisfaction					
Internal	.48	.16	3.02	.003	.17	.79	QM (df=1) = 6.51, p=.011	41.21	QE (df=7) = 281.34, p<.001	9
External	-.46	.18	-2.55	.011	-.81	-.11				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.27. Methodological moderators of the relationship of Perceived Employability and Happy Employees

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\,\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
					Happy					
Cross-Sectional	16	8964	.13	.05	**.16**	.25	.03	.29	-.17	.49
Multiple timepoints	2	268	.22	.22	**.28**	.37	-3.20	3.76	-.87	1.43
External	15	8062	.15	.06	**.19**	.25	.05	.33	-.15	.52
Internal	3	1170	.36	.11	**.42**	.21	-.12	.96	.02	.81
					Job Satisfaction					
Internal	2	1086	.39	.10	**.47**	.16	-1.03	1.98	-.02	.97
External	7	4001	.08	.11	**.10**	.33	-.21	.40	-.38	.57

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ.

Table S.3.28. Individual vulnerability as moderator of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Happy Employees

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
					Happy					
Intercept	.15	.06	2.65	.008	.04	.27	QM (df=1) = 2.05, p=.152	6.6	QE (df=13) = 497.01, p<.001	15
Average sample age	-.09	.06	-1.43	.152	-.21	.03				
Intercept	.17	.05	3.67	.000	.08	.26	QM (df=1) = 2.18, p= .139	6.16	QE (df=18) = 497.62, p<.001	20
% Men in sample	-.07	.05	-1.48	.140	-.16	.02				
Intercept	.09	.09	.94	.346	-.09	.27	QM (df=1) = .02, p=.932	0	QE (df=6) = 23.19, p<.001	8
% University	-.01	.10	-.09	.932	-.20	.18				
					Job Satisfaction					
Intercept	-.11	.85	-.13	.898	-1.76	1.55	QM (df=1) = .05, p=.831	0	QE (df=6) = 275.39, p<.001	8
Average sample age	.01	.02	.21	.831	-.04	.05				
Intercept	.17	.17	.98	.328	-.17	.49	QM (df = 1) = .21, p=.647	0	QE (df = 8) = 331.09, p<.001	10
% Men in sample	.00	.00	-.46	.647	-.01	.00				
Intercept	.08	.20	.41	.681	-.31	.48	QM (df = 1) = .00, p= .978	0	QE(df = 6) = 239.41, p<.001	8
% University	.00	.01	-.03	.978	-.01	.01				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.29. Methodological moderators of the relationship of Perceived Employability and Happy Employees

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
					Happy					
Intercept	.17	.05	3.64	.000	.08	.26	QM(df=1) =1.33, p=.250	1.59	QE(df=18) = 532.74, p<.001	20
Unemployement	-.06	.05	-1.15	.250	-.16	.04				
Intercept	.15	.05	2.85	.004	.05	.25	QM(df=1) = .06, p=.800	0	QE(df=17) = 414.09, p<.001	19
EPL	.03	.13	.25	.800	-.23	.29				
					Job Satisfaction					
Intercept	.10	.07	1.39	.163	-.04	.24	QM(df=1) =2.33, p=.127	12.4	QE(df=8) = 33.61, p<.001	10
Unemployement	-.12	.08	-1.53	.127	-.27	.03				
Intercept	.00	.07	.05	.958	-.14	.15	QM(df=1) =1.77, p=.18	6.47	QE(df=7) = 164.99, p<.001	9
EPL	.21	.16	1.33	.184	-.10	.51				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained; EPL= Employment protection legislation

Table S.3.30. Macroeconomic context as moderator of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Happy Employees

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\,\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
					Happy					
Low EPL	16	8531	.15	.05	**.18**	.25	.04	.31	-.16	.51
High EPL	3	1011	.09	.10	**.12**	.20	-.41	.66	-.26	.51
					Job Satisfaction					
Low EPL	7	3744	.03	.08	**.04**	.25	-.19	.27	-.31	.39
High EPL	2	874	.09	.16	**.11**	.26	-2.32	2.54	-.70	.92

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ; EPL= Employment protection legislation

Table S.3.31. Cultural context as moderator of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Happy Employees

Moderator	*B*	SE_B	*Z*	*p*	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	*K*
Happy										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.17	.05	3.51	.001	.08	.27	QM (df=1) = .10, p= .750	0	QE(df=18) = 53.64, p<.001	20
Long Term Orientation	-.02	.05	-.32	.751	-.11	.08				
Intercept	.17	.05	3.52	.000	.08	.27	QM (df=1) = .24, p= .622	0	QE(df=18) = 544.15, p<.001	20
Power Distance	-.02	.05	-.49	.622	-.12	.07				
Intercept	.17	.05	3.72	.000	.08	.26	QM (df=1) = 2.15, p=.143	6.98	QE(df=18) = 421.00, p<.001	20
Uncertainty Avoidance	-.07	.05	-1.47	.143	-.16	.02				
Intercept	.17	.05	3.50	.001	.08	.27	QM (df=1) = .14, p=.713	0	QE(df=18) = 535.03, p<.001	20
Individualism	-.02	.05	-.37	.713	-.12	.08				
Intercept	.17	.05	3.71	.000	.08	.26	QM (df=1) = 1.91, p=.167	5.31	QE(df=18) = 461.46, p<.001	20
Masculinity	.07	.05	1.38	.167	-.03	.16				
Intercept	.17	.05	3.56	.000	.08	.26	QM (df=1) = .62, p=.432	0	QE(df=18) = 506.53, p<.001	20
Indulgance	-.04	.05	-.79	.432	-.14	.06				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	.17	.05	3.52	.000	.075	.265	QM (df=1) = .19, p=.664	0	QE(df=18) = 469.24, p<.001	20
Harmony	-.02	.05	-.43	.664	-.12	.08				
Intercept	.17	.05	3.51	.000	.08	.27	QM (df=1) = .12, p=.730	0	QE(df=18) = 484.30, p<.001	20
Embeddedness	.02	.05	.35	.730	-.08	.12				

Full results of the moderation analyses

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	.17	.05	3.59	.000	.08	.26	QM (df=1) = .99, p= .319	.63	QE(df=18) = 459.91, p<.001	20
Hierarchy	.05	.05	1.00	.319	-.05	.14				
Intercept	.17	.05	3.59	.000	.08	.26	QM (df=1) = .81, p= .367	0	QE(df=18) = 448.91, p<.001	20
Mastery	.04	.05	.90	.367	-.05	.14				
Intercept	.17	.05	3.52	.000	.08	.27	QM (df=1) = .23, p=.632	0	QE(df=18) = 491.57, p<.001	20
Affective authonomy	-.02	.05	-.48	.632	-.12	.07				
Intercept	.17	.05	3.52	.000	.08	.27	QM (df=1) = .18, p=.675	0	QE(df=18) = 478.35, p<.001	20
Intelectual authonomy	-.02	.05	-.42	.675	-.12	.08				
Intercept	.17	.05	3.59	.000	.08	.26	QM (df=1) = .86, p=.353	0	QE(df=18) = 453.51, p<.001	20
Egalirism	-.05	.05	-.93	.353	-.14	.05				
Job Satisfaction										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	.10	.08	1.25	.212	-.06	.25	QM (df=1) = .71, p=.401	0	QE(df=8) = 341.84, p<.001	10
Long Term Orientation	.07	.08	.84	.401	-.09	.23				
Intercept	.10	.08	1.20	.229	-.06	.25	QM (df=1) = .02, p= .900	0	QE(df=8) = 332.77, p<.001	10
Power Distance	.01	.08	.13	.900	-.15	.18				
Intercept	.10	.08	1.29	.196	-.05	.24	QM (df=1) = 1.04, p=.308	1.45	QE(df=8) = 248.75, p<.001	10
Uncertainty Avoidance	-.08	.08	-1.02	.308	-.23	.07				
Intercept	.10	.07	1.37	.172	-.04	.23	QM (df=1) = 2.73, p=.098	16.55	QE(df=8) = 253.05, p<.001	10
Individualism	-.12	.07	-1.65	.098	-.26	.02				

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	.10	.08	1.24	.216	-.06	.25	QM (df=1) = .33, p=.564	0	QE(df=8) = 341.23, p<.001	10
Masculinity	.05	.08	.58	.564	-.11	.21				
Intercept	.10	.06	1.64	.102	-.02	.21	QM (df=1) = 7.53, p=.006	43.2	QE(df=8) = 191.31, p< .000	10
Indulgance	-.17	.06	-2.74	.006	-.28	-.05				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	.10	.08	1.21	.228	-.06	.25	QM (df=1) = .05, p=.816	0	QE(df=8) = 321.34, p<.001	10
Harmony	.02	.09	.23	.817	-.15	.19				
Intercept	.10	.08	1.21	.226	-.06	.25	QM (df=1) = .09, p= .759	0	QE(df=8) = 323.92, p<.001	10
Embeddedness	-.03	.09	-.31	.759	-.19	.14				
Intercept	.10	.08	1.23	.219	-.06	.25	QM (df=1) = .37, p=.541	0	QE(df=8) = 283.30, p<.001	10
Hierarchy	.05	.08	.61	.541	-.11	.21				
Intercept	.10	.08	1.20	.229	-.06	.25	QM(df=1) =.00, p= .987	0	QE(df=8) = 318.17, p<.001	10
Mastery	.00	.09	-.02	.987	-.17	.16				
Intercept	.10	.08	1.25	.210	-.05	.24	QM (df=1) = .82, p=.366	0	QE(df=8) = 248.26, p<.001	10
Affective authonomy	-.07	.08	-.90	.366	-.23	.08				
Intercept	.10	.08	1.24	.214	-.06	.25	QM (df=1) = .54, p= .464	0	QE(df=8) = 342.93, p<.001	10
Intelectual authonomy	.06	.08	.73	.465	-.10	.22				
Intercept	.10	.08	1.23	.219	-.06	.25	QM (df=1) = .28, p= .596	0	QE(df=8) = 27.04, p<.001	10
Egalitarism	-.04	.08	-.53	.596	-.21	.12				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.32. Methodological moderators of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Healthy Employees

Moderator (indented)	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
					Healthy					
Cross-sectional	.18	.02	7.67	<.001	.13	.22	QM(df=1) = 3.18, p=.075	0	QE(df=23) = 88.06, p<.001	25
Multiple time points	-.08	.04	-1.78	.075	-.17	.01				
					Psychological Distress					
Cross-sectional	-.13	.06	-2.15	.031	-.25	-.01	QM(df=1) = 1.44, p=.230	2.21	QE(df=12) = 172.17, p<.001	14
Multiple time points	-.14	.12	-1.20	.230	-.37	.09				
					Burnout					
Cross-sectional	-.18	.04	-4.03	<.001	-.26	-.09	QM(df=1) = 1.38, p=.240	4.33	QE(df=11) = 55.90, p<.001	13
Multiple time points	.08	.07	1.18	.240	-.05	.20				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Table S.3.33. Methodological moderators of the relationship of Perceived Employability and Happy Employees

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	SE $\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
					Healthy					
Cross-Sectional	18	7613	.18	.02	.21	.11	.15	.27	.07	.35
Multiple timepoints	7	3074	.10	.03	.12	.07	.04	.20	.02	.22
					Psychological Distress					
Cross-Sectional	10	4588	-.12	.05	-.15	.20	-.29	.00	-.42	.13
Multiple timepoints	4	964	-.20	.13	-.26	.29	-.74	.23	-.74	.22
					Burnout					
Cross-Sectional	7	3130	-.17	.04	-.19	.11	-.30	-.08	-.35	-.03
Multiple timepoints	6	2625	-.10	.04	-.13	.10	-.25	-.01	-.28	.02

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\ \bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ.

Table S.3.34. Individual vulnerability as moderator of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Healthy Employees

Moderator	*B*	SE_B	Z	*p*	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	*K*
					Healthy					
Intercept	.15	.02	8.53	<.001	.12	.18	QM(df=1) = 1.03, p=.310	5.37	QE(df=23) = 65.03, p<.001	25
Average sample age	-.02	.02	-1.02	.310	-.05	.02				
Intercept	.15	.02	7.74	<.001	.11	.19	QM(df = 1) = .99, p= .320	1.95	QE(df=22) = 87.01, p<.001	24
% Men in sample	-.02	.02	-.99	.320	-.06	.02				
Intercept	-.10	.07	-1.38	.168	-.24	.04	QM(df=1) = .20, p=.657	.000	QE(df=13) = 35.64, p=.001	15
% University	.00	.00	.17	.867	.00	.00				
Students	.28	.07	4.14	<.001	.15	.41	QM(df =1)=5.04, p=.080	16.49	QE(df=22) = 81.75, p<.001	23
Unemployed	-.07	.09	-.73	.465	-.24	.11				
Employed	-.14	.07	-2.01	.045	-.28	.00				
					Psychological Distress					
Intercept	.03	.32	.10	.924	-.59	.65	QM(df=1) = .39, p=.534	0	QE(df=10) = 13.81, p<.001	12
Average sample age	-.01	.01	-.62	.534	-.02	.01				
Intercept	-.13	.21	-.65	.514	-.54	.27	QM(df =1) = .04, p=.839	0	QE(df=11) = 169.02, p<.001	13
% Men in sample	.00	.00	-.20	.839	-.01	.01				
Intercept	-.25	.15	-1.68	.093	-.53	.04	QM(df=1) = .31, p=.578	0	QE(df=7) = 142.08, p<.001	9
% University	.00	.00	.56	.578	.00	.01				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Unemployed	-.41	.10	-3.97	<.001	-.62	-.21	QM(df=1) = 6.56, p=.010	33.95	QE(df=11) = 141.16, p<.001	13
Employed	.30	.12	2.56	.010	.07	.53				
					Burnout					
Intercept	-.38	.15	-2.58	.010	-.67	-.09	QM(df=1) = 2.46, p = .117	19.64		12
Age	.01	.00	1.57	.117	.00	.01				
Intercept	-.35	.13	-2.66	.008	-.61	-.09	QM(df=1) = 2.89, p=.089	23.34	QE(df=9) = 36.57, p<.001	11
% Men in sample	.00	.00	1.70	.089	.00	.01				
Intercept	-.07	.07	-1.00	.318	-.21	.07	QM(df=1) = .52, p=.472	0	QE(df=5) = 16.85, p=.005	7
% University	.00	.00	-.72	.472	.00	.00				

Table S.3.35. Individual vulnerability as moderator of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Healthy Employees

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\,\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
					Healthy					
Unemployed	2	887	.28	.01	**.32**	.00	.31	.33	.32	.32
Students	4	516	.22	.05	**.26**	.07	.07	.45	.15	.37
Employed	19	9284	.14	.02	**.16**	.10	.11	.22	.03	.29
					Psychological Distress					
Unemployed	3	416	-.42	.14	**-.48**	.27	-1.19	.23	-1.00	.03
Employed	10	4916	-.12	.05	**-.14**	.19	-.28	.00	-.40	.13

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ.

Table S.3.36. Macroeconomic context as moderator of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Healthy Employees

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	%R^2	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
					Healthy					
Intercept	.16	.02	8.05	<.001	.12	.19	QM(df=1) = .00, p=.971	0	QE(df=25) = 1.178, p<.001	27
Unemployement	.00	.02	.04	.971	-.04	.04				
Intercept	.12	.02	5.14	<.001	.08	.17	QM(df=1) = 4.49, p=.034	16.73	QE(df=24) = 86.84, p<.001	26
EPL	.08	.04	2.12	.034	.01	.15				
					Psychological Distress					
Intercept	-.17	.05	-3.65	.000	-.27	-.08	QM(df=1) = 4.26, p=.039	21.37	QE(df=12) = 141.96, p<.001	14
Unemployement	-.10	.05	-2.06	.039	-.20	-.01				
Intercept	-.09	.07	-1.34	.180	-.23	.04	QM(df=1) = 2.67, p=.102	13.05	QE(df=12) = 135.09, p<.001	14
EPL	-.16	.10	-1.63	.102	-.36	.03				
					Burnout					
Intercept	-.14	.03	-4.83	<.001	-.20	-.08	QM(df=1) = 4.66, p=.031	26.25	QE(df=11) = 51.51, p<.001	13
Unemployement	-.07	.03	-2.16	.031	-.13	-.01				
Intercept	-.12	.04	-3.07	.002	-.20	-.12	QM(df=1) = .76, p=.384	0	QE(df=11) = 6.91, p<.001	13
EPL	-.06	.07	-.87	.384	-.21	-.06				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; %R^2 = Percentage of variance explained; EPL= Employment protection legislation

Table S.3.37. Macroeconomic context as moderator of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Healthy Employees

Moderator	K	n	$\bar{r}$	$SE\,\bar{r}$	$\widehat{\rho}$	SD_ρ	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	80% CV Lower	80% CV Upper
					Healthy					
Low EPL	14	7715	.13	.02	**.15**	.09	.10	.21	.04	.27
High EPL	12	4917	.20	.02	**.23**	.09	.16	.30	.11	.35
					Psychological Distress					
Low EPL	7	3479	-.07	.06	**-.09**	.19	-.28	.10	-.37	.19
High EPL	7	2073	-.25	.06	**-.30**	.19	-.49	-.11	-.57	-.02
					Burnout					
Low EPL	9	4422	-.13	.04	**-.15**	.11	-.25	-.06	-.30	-.01
High EPL	4	1333	-.17	.06	**-.19**	.12	-.41	-.03	-.39	.01

Note. k = number of samples included in meta-analysis, n = total sample size, $\bar{r}$ = mean observed correlation, $SE\,\bar{r}$ = standard error of correlations, $\widehat{\rho}$ = mean correlation corrected for unreliability in both measures (in bold), $SD\rho$= observed standard deviation of corrected correlations; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for ρ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for ρ. EPL= Employment protection legislation

Table S.3.38. Cultural context as moderator of the relationship between Perceived Employability and Healthy employees

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
					Healthy					
					Hofstede's cultural dimensions					
Intercept	.16	.02	8.05	<.001	.12	.19	QM(df = 1) = .22, p= .649	0	QE(df = 25) = 102.22, p<.001	26
Long Term Orientation	.01	.02	.46	.649	-.03	.05				
Intercept	.16	.02	8.24	<.001	.12	.20	QM(df = 1) = .06, p= .802	0	QE(df = 24) = 97.05, p<.001	26
Power Distance	-.01	.02	-.25	.803	-.04	.03				
Intercept	.16	.02	8.24	<.001	.12	.20	QM(df = 1) = .00, p= .949	0	QE(df = 24) = 97.353, p<.001	26
Uncertainty Avoidance	.00	.02	.06	.949	-.04	.04				
Intercept	.16	.02	8.26	<.001	.12	.20	QM(df = 1) = .15, p= .694	0	QE(df = 24) = 96.56, p<.001	26
Individualism	.01	.02	.39	.694	-.03	.05				
Intercept	.16	.02	8.22	<.001	.12	.20	QM(df = 1) = .23, p= .635	0	QE(df = 24) = 97.35, p<.001	26
Masculinity	-.01	.02	-.47	.635	-.05	.03				
Intercept	.16	.02	8.39	<.001	.12	.19	QM(df=1) =1.85, p=.174	3.62	QE(df=25) = 97.97, p<.001	26
Indulgance	-.02	.02	-1.14	.174	-.06	.01				
					Schwartz's cultural value orientations					
Intercept	.16	.02	8.94	<.001	.12	.19	QM(df =1) = 5.62, p= .018	2.32	QE(df=25) = 84.91, p<.001	27
Harmony	.04	.02	2.37	.018	.01	.08				
Intercept	.16	.02	8.06	<.001	.12	.19	QM(df = 1) = .39, p=.531	0	QE(df=25) = 101.32, p<.001	27
Embeddedness	-.01	.02	-.63	.531	-.05	.03				

Moderator	*B*	SE_B	*Z*	*p*	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	*K*
Intercept	.16	.02	8.27	<.001	.12	.19	QM(df = 1) = 1.58, p=.209	0	QE(df=25) =96.80, p<.001	27
Hierarchy	-.03	.02	-1.26	.209	-.06	.01				
Intercept	.16	.02	8.10	<.001	.12	.19	QM(df = 1) = .59, p=.441	0	QE(df=25) = 1.75, p<.001	27
Mastery	-.02	.02	-.77	.441	-.05	.02				
Intercept	.16	.02	8.13	<.001	.12	.19	QM(df = 1) = .32, p=.570	0	QE(df=25) = 99.98, p<.001	27
Affective authonomy	-.01	.02	-.57	.570	-.05	.03				
Intercept	.16	.02	8.19	<.001	.12	.19	QM(df = 1) = 1.02, p=.312	0	QE(df=25) = 98.54, p<.001	27
Intelectual authonomy	.02	.02	1.01	.312	-.02	.06				
Intercept	.16	.02	8.11	<.001	.12	.19	QM(df = 1) = .29, p=.590	0	QE(df=25) = 99.40, p<.001	27
Egalirism	.01	.02	.54	.590	-.03	.05				
Psychological Distress										
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	-.17	.05	-3.15	.002	-.28	-.07	QM(df=1) = .24, p= .627	0	QE(df=12) = 169.32, p<.001	14
Long Term Orientation	.03	.06	.49	.627	-.08	.14				
Intercept	-.17	.06	-3.14	.002	-.28	-.07	QM(df = 1) = .12, p= .745	0	QE(df=12) = 171.78, p<.001	14
Power Distance	.02	.06	.33	.745	-.09	.13				
Intercept	-.17	.06	-3.13	.002	-.28	-.06	QM(df=1) = .03, p= .856	0	QE(df = 12)=171.12, p<..0001	14
Uncertainty Avoidance	-.01	.06	-.18	.856	-.12	.10				
Intercept	-.17	.06	-3.15	.002	-.28	-.07	QM(df=1) = .22, p= .638	0	QE(df=12) = 177.36, p<.001	14
Individualism	-.03	.06	-.47	.638	-.14	.08				

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Intercept	-.17	.05	-3.18	.002	-.28	-.07	QM(df=1) = .45, p= .502	0	QE(df=12) = 174.59, p<.001	14
Masculinity	-.04	.06	-.67	.503	-.15	.07				
Intercept	-.17	.05	-3.37	.001	-.27	-.07	QM(df=1) = 1.99, p=.158	7.91	QE(df=12) = 145.60 , p<.001	14
Indulgance	.08	.05	1.41	.158	-.03	.18				
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	-.17	.05	-3.33	.001	-.27	-.07	QM(df=1) = 1.63, p=.202	3.82	QE(df=12) = 169.19, p<.001	14
Harmony	-.07	.05	-1.28	.202	-.17	.04				
Intercept	-.17	.06	-3.15	.002	-.28	-.07	QM(df=1) = .18, p=.673	0	QE(df=12) = 163.66, p<.001	14
Embeddedness	-.02	.06	-.42	.673	-.14	.09				
Intercept	-.17	.05	-3.21	.001	-.28	-.07	QM(df=1) = .68, p=.410	0	QE(df=12) = 176.69, p<.001	14
Hierarchy	.05	.06	.82	.410	-.06	.16				
Intercept	-.17	.05	-3.17	.002	-.28	-.07	QM(df=1) = .37, p=.545	0	QE(df=12) = 176.72, p<.001	14
Mastery	.03	.06	.61	.546	-.08	.14				
Intercept	-.17	.05	-3.52	.000	-.27	-.08	QM(df = 1) = 3.16, p=.075	15.91	QE(df=12) = 134.71, p<.001	14
Affective authonomy	.09	.05	1.78	.076	-.01	.19				
Intercept	-.17	.05	-3.24	.001	-.28	-.07	QM(df=1) = .85, p=.356	0	QE(df=12) = 169.56, p<.001	14
Intelectual authonomy	-.05	.06	-.92	.356	-.16	.06				
Intercept	-.17	.05	-3.21	.001	-.28	-.07	QM(df=1) = .68, p=.411	0	QE(df=12) = 177.07, p<.001	14
Egalitarism	-.05	.06	-.82	.411	-.16	.06				
Burnout										

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Hofstede's cultural dimensions										
Intercept	-.14	.03	-4.14	<.001	-.21	-.07	QM(df=01) =.25, p=.618	0	QE(df=11) = 55.44, p<.001	13
Long Term Orientation	.02	.04	.50	.618	-.05	.09				
Intercept	-.14	.04	-4.09	<.001	-.21	-.07	QM(df=1) = .00, p=.992	0	QE(df=11) = 61.65, p<.001	13
Power Distance	.00	.04	-.01	.992	-.07	.07				
Intercept	-.14	.03	-4.23	<.001	-.21	-.08	QM(df=1) = .90, p=.342	0	QE(df=11) = 6.64, p<.001	13
Uncertainty Avoidance	-.03	.04	-.95	.342	-.10	.04				
Intercept	-.14	.04	-4.10	<.001	-.21	-.07	QM(df=1) = .01, p=.940	0	QE(df=11) = 62.32, p<.001	13
Individualism	.00	.04	.08	.940	-.07	.07				
Intercept	-.14	.03	-4.68	<.001	-.20	-.08	QM(df=1) = 3.97, p=.046	22.11	QE(df=11) = 53.79, p<.001	13
Masculinity	.06	.03	1.99	.046	.00	.12				
Intercept	-.14	.03	-4.28	<.001	-.21	-.08	QM(df=1) = 1.01, p=.314	0	QE(df=11) = 61.59, p<.001	13
Indulgance										
Schwartz's cultural value orientations										
Intercept	-.14	.03	-4.76	<.001	-.20	-.08	QM(df=1) = 4.44, p=.035	24.52	QE(df=11) = 51.92, p<.001	13
Harmony	-.07	.03	-2.11	.035	-.13	-.01				
Intercept	-.14	.03	-4.15	<.001	-.21	-.08	QM(df=1) = 1.24, p=.626	0	QE(df=11) = 60.995, p<.001	13
Embeddedness	-.02	.04	-.49	.626	-.09	.05				
Intercept	-.14	.03	-4.31	<.001	-.21	-.08	QM(df=1) = 1.41, p= .235	2.38	QE(df=11) = 58.26, p<.001	13
Hierarchy	.04	.03	1.19	.235	-.03	.11				
Intercept	-.14	.03	-4.23	<.001	-.21	-.08	QM(df=1) = .94, p=.332	0	QE(df=11) = 59.93, p<.001	13
Mastery	.03	.04	.97	.332	-.03	.10				
Intercept	-.14	.03	-4.27	<.001	-.21	-.08	QM(df=1) = .88, p=.347	0	QE(df=11) = 6.15, p<.001	13

Full results of the moderation analyses

Moderator	B	SE_B	Z	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Test of moderators	$\%R^2$	Test for residual heterogeneity	K
Affective authonomy	.03	.04	.94	.347	-.04	.10				
Intercept	-.14	.04	-4.09	<.001	-.21	-.07	QM(df=1) = .01, p=.924	0	QE(df=11) = 62.44, p<.001	13
Intelectual authonomy	.00	.04	.10	.924	-.07	.07				
Intercept	-.14	.04	-4.10	<.001	-.21	-.07	QM(df=1) = .00, p=.951	0	QE(df=11) = 62.37, p<.001	13
Egalitarism	.00	.04	-.06	.951	-.07	.07				

Note. B = regression weight; SE_B = standard error for B; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B; $\%R^2$ = Percentage of variance explained