

Supplementary Materials

S2. Materials and Methods

S2.1. Measures

Table S1. Reliability coefficients and item translations of the Indonesian measures.

Measure	Item	Indonesian translation
Career Ambiguity Aversion ($\alpha = .82$)	Item 1	Saya mencoba menghindari tugas pengambilan keputusan karir yang rumit.
	Item 2	Saya merasa sulit untuk mengambil keputusan karir karena segala sesuatunya tidak dapat diprediksi dengan jelas.
	Item 3	Saya takut memilah aspek-aspek rumit dalam karir.
	Item 4	Proses pengambilan keputusan karir yang melibatkan begitu banyak pertimbangan memang menakutkan.
	Item 5	Saya mencoba menghindari karir yang prospeknya tidak dapat diramalkan dengan jelas.
	Item 6	Perspektif orang-orang yang berbeda atau terkadang bertentangan mengenai karir membuat saya tidak nyaman.
Resilience ($\alpha = .73$)	Item 1	Saya cenderung bangkit kembali dengan cepat setelah masa-masa sulit.
	Item 2	Saya kesulitan melewati peristiwa yang penuh tekanan (REV).
	Item 3	Tidak butuh waktu lama bagi saya untuk pulih dari peristiwa yang membuat saya stres.
	Item 4	Sulit bagiku untuk kembali bangkit ketika sesuatu yang buruk terjadi (REV)
	Item 5	Saya cenderung membutuhkan waktu lama untuk mengatasi kesulitan dalam hidup saya (REV).
Avoidance Coping ($\alpha = .67$)	Item 1	Saya telah membuat lelucon tentang hal itu.
	Item 2	Saya telah mengolok-olok situasi ini.
	Item 3	Saya sudah menyerah untuk mencoba menghadapinya.
	Item 4	Saya sudah menyerah dalam upaya untuk mengatasinya.
	Item 5	Saya sudah berkata pada diri saya sendiri "ini tidak nyata".
	Item 6	Saya selama ini menolak untuk percaya bahwa hal itu telah terjadi.
	Item 7	Saya telah mengkritik diri saya sendiri.
	Item 8	Saya telah menyalahkan diri sendiri atas hal-hal yang terjadi.
	Item 9	Saya telah beralih ke pekerjaan atau aktivitas lain untuk mengalihkan pikiran saya dari berbagai hal.
	Item 10	Saya telah melakukan sesuatu untuk tidak terlalu memikirkannya, seperti pergi ke bioskop, menonton TV, membaca, melamun, tidur, atau berbelanja.
	Item 11	Saya telah mengatakan banyak hal untuk menghilangkan perasaan tidak menyenangkan.
	Item 12	Saya telah mengungkapkan perasaan negatif saya.
Approach Coping	Item 1	Saya telah mendapatkan dukungan emosional dari orang lain.
	Item 2	Saya telah mendapatkan kenyamanan dan pengertian dari seseorang.
	Item 3	Saya telah mendapatkan bantuan dan nasihat dari orang lain.

$(\alpha = .78)$	Item 4	Saya telah mencoba untuk mendapatkan saran atau bantuan dari orang lain tentang apa yang harus dilakukan.	
	Item 5	Saya telah mencoba melihatnya dari sudut pandang yang berbeda, untuk membuatnya tampak lebih positif.	
	Item 6	Saya telah mencari sesuatu yang baik dalam apa yang terjadi.	
	Item 7	Saya telah menerima kenyataan bahwa hal itu sudah terjadi.	
	Item 8	Saya telah belajar untuk hidup dengannya.	
	Item 9	Saya telah memusatkan upaya saya untuk melakukan sesuatu terhadap situasi yang saya alami.	
	Item 10	Saya telah mengambil tindakan untuk mencoba membuat situasi menjadi lebih baik.	
	Item 11	Saya telah mencoba membuat strategi tentang apa yang harus dilakukan.	
	Item 12	Saya telah berpikir keras tentang langkah apa yang harus diambil.	
	Career Anxiety $(\alpha = .88)$	Item 1	Saya khawatir tentang lapangan kerja di masa depan karena potensi resesi ekonomi.
		Item 2	Saya khawatir tentang lapangan kerja di masa depan karena persaingan yang ketat di pasar kerja.
		Item 3	Saya khawatir mengenai pekerjaan di masa depan karena lingkungan kerja di masa depan tidak sebaik yang diharapkan.
Item 4		Saya khawatir mengenai pekerjaan di masa depan karena gaji saya mungkin tidak akan sebaik yang saya harapkan.	
Item 5		Saya khawatir mengenai lapangan kerja di masa depan karena meningkatnya angka pengangguran yang diberitakan oleh media massa.	
Item 6		Saya khawatir mengenai pekerjaan di masa depan karena saya tidak yakin dengan keahlian dan minat saya	
Item 7		Saya khawatir tentang pekerjaan di masa depan karena saya mungkin tidak dapat menemukan pekerjaan yang saya minati	
Item 8		Saya khawatir bahwa saya tidak dapat menerapkan apa yang telah saya pelajari pada pekerjaan saya.	
Item 9		Saya khawatir tentang pekerjaan di masa depan karena saya tidak memiliki keterampilan profesional yang mumpuni.	

$n = 64$.

Tables S2 and S3 report the results of our previous study, which investigated the antecedents of sustainable career indicators among young people. Similar to the present study, our previous study used a multicountry sample, which included participants from Norway ($n = 123$), Indonesia ($n = 123$), and Bangladesh ($n = 123$), and employed the same measures of career ambiguity aversion, resilience, avoidance coping, approach coping, and career anxiety in the data collection. Table S2 shows the results of the confirmatory factor analyses that were run in each country subsample for the said measures.

Table S2. Confirmatory factor analyses of each measure reported per country: Model fit indices.

Measure	Country	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA	90% CI
Career Ambiguity Aversion	Norway	.998	.034	.016	.000 to .106
	Indonesia	.988	.067	.045	.000 to .113
	Bangladesh	.999	.027	.015	.000 to .104
Resilience	Norway	.982	.024	.101	.000 to .233

	Indonesia	.997	.015	.061	.000 to .258
	Bangladesh	.997	.097	.025	.000 to .141
Avoidance Coping	Norway	.921	.072	.066	.030 to .095
	Indonesia	.906	.089	.080	.053 to .107
	Bangladesh	.983	.049	.033	.000 to .070
	Norway	.930	.063	.079	.049 to .107
Approach Coping	Indonesia	.934	.054	.071	.040 to .100
	Bangladesh	.898	.070	.080	.052 to .106
	Norway	.925	.049	.116	.082 to .151
Career Anxiety	Indonesia	.978	.039	.068	.020 to .107
	Bangladesh	.952	.049	.088	.050 to .126

CFI = Comparative Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CI = confidence interval.

Table S3 details the results of the multigroup confirmatory factor analyses that were conducted to test for measurement invariance across the three mentioned countries based on the models of each study construct. The recommended criteria to evaluate measurement invariance is to assess model differences (Δ) in fit indices when an unconstrained model (i.e., configural) is tested against constrained models (e.g., metric; Darwish et al. 2024; Putnick and Bornstein 2016). The chi-square statistic is regarded as an absolute fit index in which a nonsignificant change indicates measurement invariance (Darwish et al. 2024). We also considered alternative fit indices to indicate invariance when the observed model differences are lower than the following cutoff criteria: .010 change in the Comparative Fit Index; .030 change in the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; .015 change in the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (Chen 2007).

Table S3. Tests for measurement invariance across country groups of respondents.

Model	Measure	χ^2	df	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA	90% CI
Configural Invariance	Career Ambiguity Aversion	35.523	27	.986	.033	.051	.000 to .093
	Resilience	8.582	6	.994	.028	.060	.000 to .142
	Avoidance Coping	250.858**	144	.901	.078	.079	.062 to .095
	Approach Coping	256.898**	144	.914	.061	.081	.065 to .097
	Career Anxiety	208.734**	81	.926	.056	.115	.096 to .134
Metric Invariance	Ambiguity Aversion	43.071	37	.990	.053	.037	.000 to .077
	Resilience	12.029	10	.995	.033	.041	.000 to .112
	Avoidance Coping	283.119**	166	.892	.091	.077	.061 to .092
	Approach Coping	283.707**	166	.911	.088	.077	.061 to .092
	Career Anxiety	221.445**	93	.925	.071	.107	.089 to .126
		$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf	ΔCFI	$\Delta SRMR$	$\Delta RMSEA$	
Metric - Configural	Ambiguity Aversion	7.548	10	.004	.020	-.014	
	Resilience	3.447	4	.001	.005	-.019	
	Avoidance Coping	32.261	22	-.009	.013	-.002	
	Approach Coping	26.809	22	-.003	.027	-.004	
	Career Anxiety	12.711	12	-.001	.015	-.008	

** $p < .01$; χ^2 = Chi-Square Statistic; df = Degrees of Freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error Of Approximation; CI = Confidence Interval.

S3. Results

S3.1. Serial mediation analyses with country control variables

The serial mediation analyses conducted with different country controls (Indonesia, Norway, Bangladesh) demonstrated substantial consistency in core relationships while revealing notable differences in specific pathways. The total effect of career ambiguity aversion on career anxiety remained stable across all models ($\beta = .57$ to $.61$, $p < .001$), with R^2 values ranging from $.32$ to $.35$, indicating robust explanatory power regardless of control specifications. Several direct effects showed consistent patterns: the negative relationship between career ambiguity aversion and resilience ($\beta = -.32$ to $-.35$, $p < .001$), the protective effect of resilience on career anxiety ($\beta = -.25$ to $-.31$, $p < .001$), and the negligible effect of approach coping on career anxiety ($\beta = -.03$ to $.03$). The indirect effect through resilience also remained stable across models ($\beta = .08$ to $.11$, $p < .05$). However, notable differences emerged in avoidance coping pathways, particularly the effect of avoidance coping on career anxiety, which was weaker in the Indonesia control model ($\beta = .21$) compared to the Norway control and Bangladesh control models ($\beta = .26$, $p < .01$). Similarly, the indirect effect through avoidance coping varied from $\beta = .04$ ($p < .05$) in the ID control model to $\beta = .05$ ($p < .05$) in the other specifications.

Table S4. Unstandardized regression coefficient, direct and indirect effects (with Norway as control variable).

Effects	Avoidance Coping (Model 1)				Approach Coping (Model 2)			
	B	SE	CI (95%)		B	SE	CI (95%)	
			Lower	Upper			Lower	Upper
Direct effects								
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Career Anxiety	.44**	.08	.28	.59	.49**	.08	.34	.64
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience	-.32**	.07	-.45	-.18	-.32**	.07	-.45	-.18
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Coping	.21**	.05	.11	.30	.09	.06	-.02	.21
Resilience → Career Anxiety	-.26**	.08	-.42	-.10	-.26**	.08	-.43	-.10
Coping → Career Anxiety	.26**	.12	.02	.50	.00	.10	-.20	.21
Resilience → Coping	-.01	.05	-.12	.09	.11	.09	-.02	.24
Indirect effects								
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience → Career Anxiety	.08**	.03	.03	.16	.08*	.03	.03	.16
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Coping → Career Anxiety	.05*	.03	.00	.13	.00	.01	-.02	.02
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience → Coping → Career Anxiety	.00	.01	-.01	.01	.00	.00	-.01	.01
Total effects								
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Career Anxiety	.57**	.07	.43	.72	.57**	.07	.43	.72
R^2	.35				.35			

$N = 156$; CI = Confidence Interval; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table S5. Unstandardized regression coefficient, direct and indirect effects (with Indonesia as control variable).

Effects	Avoidance Coping		Approach Coping	
---------	------------------	--	-----------------	--

	(Model 1)				(Model 2)			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	CI (95%)		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	CI (95%)	
			Lower	Upper			Lower	Upper
Direct effects								
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Career Anxiety	.43**	.08	.28	.59	.47**	.08	.32	.62
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience	-.35**	.07	-.49	-.22	-.35**	.07	-.49	-.22
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Coping	.18**	.05	.09	.28	.07	.06	-.05	.18
Resilience → Career Anxiety	-.25**	.08	-.41	-.09	-.29**	.08	-.45	-.14
Coping → Career Anxiety	.21	.12	-.03	.45	-.03	.11	-.24	.17
Resilience → Coping	-.02	.05	-.12	.08	.08	.06	-.05	.20
Indirect effects								
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience → Career Anxiety	.10**	.04	.04	.19	.10*	.04	.04	.19
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Coping → Career Anxiety	.04*	.03	-.01	.10	.00	.01	-.03	.01
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience → Coping → Career Anxiety	.00	.00	-.01	.01	.00	.00	.00	.01
Total effects								
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Career Anxiety	.58**	.07	.43	.72	.58**	.07	.43	.72
<i>R</i> ²	.34				.34			

N = 156; CI = Confidence Interval; **p* < .05; ***p* < .01.

Table S6. Unstandardized regression coefficient, direct and indirect effects (with Bangladesh as control variable).

Effects	Avoidance Coping (Model 1)				Approach Coping (Model 2)			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	CI (95%)		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	CI (95%)	
			Lower	Upper			Lower	Upper
Direct effects								
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Career Anxiety	.45**	.08	.30	.61	.50**	.08	.35	.65
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience	-.35**	.07	-.48	-.22	-.35**	.07	-.48	-.22
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Coping	.19**	.05	.10	.29	.10	.06	-.02	.22
Resilience → Career Anxiety	-.30**	.08	-.46	-.13	-.31**	.08	-.48	-.14
Coping → Career Anxiety	.26**	.12	.01	.50	.03	.10	-.17	.24
Resilience → Coping	-.06	.09	-.16	.05	.05	.07	-.08	.18
Indirect effects								
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience → Career Anxiety	.10**	.05	.04	.20	.11*	.04	.04	.21
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Coping → Career Anxiety	.05*	.03	.00	.12	.00	.01	-.02	.03
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience → Coping → Career Anxiety	.00	.01	.00	.02	.00	.00	-.01	.01
Total effects								

Career Ambiguity Aversion → Career Anxiety	.61**	.07	.47	.76	.61**	.07	.47	.76
<i>R</i> ²	.32				.32			

N = 156; CI = Confidence Interval; **p* < .05; ***p* < .01.

S3.2. Alternative models

We tested 2 alternative models to evaluate the relationships among career ambiguity aversion, resilience, coping strategies, and career anxiety. We compared our primary model with two alternative models to evaluate the robustness and explanatory power of our findings regarding the relationships among career ambiguity aversion, resilience, coping strategies, and career anxiety.

Alternative model 1 incorporated moderated mediation via resilience influencing the coping strategies' mediation, tested with the "PROCESS" macro, model 8 (Hayes 2018), in IBM-SPSS version 27, with bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals (CI; *n* = 5,000). Although it showed significant direct and indirect effects consistent with avoidance coping as a mediator, the moderation effects of resilience were not supported, indicating resilience did not significantly alter the mediated relationships. This suggested that while coping plays a role, resilience's moderating effect may be limited in this context.

Model 2 proposed a serial mediation pathway involving resilience and career anxiety leading to coping behaviors, tested with the "PROCESS" macro, model 6 (Hayes 2018), in IBM-SPSS version 27, with bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals (CI; *n* = 5,000). This model revealed a small but significant full chain mediation and confirmed the negative impact of ambiguity aversion on resilience and further on career anxiety. However, the indirect effects on approach coping remained insignificant, similar to Model 1.

Table S7. Summary of alternative model 1 result.

Model / Path	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	CI (95%)		<i>F</i>	<i>R</i> ²
				Lower	Upper		
Model Summary							
Avoidance Coping (M1)						3.92**	.14
Approach Coping (M2)						3.71**	.13
Career Anxiety (Y)						14.81**	.45
Direct Effects							
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Avoidance Coping (<i>a</i> ₁)	.18	.20	.88	-.22	.57		
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Approach Coping (<i>a</i> ₂)	.28	.23	1.23	-.17	.74		
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Career Anxiety (<i>c'</i>)	.39	.29	1.32	-.19	.97		
Avoidance Coping → Career Anxiety (<i>b</i> ₁)	.25	.13	1.89	-.01	.51		
Approach Coping → Career Anxiety (<i>b</i> ₂)	-.07	.11	-.63	-.30	.15		
Moderation Effects							
Career Ambiguity Aversion × Resilience → Avoidance Coping	.00	.06	-.01	-.12	.12		
Career Ambiguity Aversion × Resilience → Approach Coping	-.05	.07	-.78	-.19	.08		
Career Ambiguity Aversion × Resilience → Career Anxiety	.01	.09	.07	-.16	.18		
Conditional Direct Effects							

(Career Ambiguity Aversion → Career Anxiety)					
Low Resilience (-1 SD = 2.53)	.40	.10	3.89**	.20	.61
Mean Resilience (3.25)	.41	.08	5.01**	.25	.57
High Resilience (+1 SD = 3.97)	.41	.10	4.06**	.21	.61
Index of Moderated Mediation					
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Avoidance Coping → Career Anxiety	.00	.02		-.03	.04
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Approach Coping → Career Anxiety	.00	.01		-.02	.04
Covariates					
Gender	.32	.13	2.36*	.05	.58
Age	-.03	.02	-2.02*	-.07	.00
Unemployment Index	.17	.08	2.05*	.01	.34

CI = Confidence Interval; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; Bootstrap samples = 5,000 for indirect effects and indices.

Table S8. Unstandardized regression coefficient, direct and indirect effects alternative model 2

Effects	Y = Avoidance Coping (Model 1)				Y = Approach Coping (Model 2)			
	CI (95%)							
	B	SE	Lower	Upper	B	SE	Lower	Upper
Direct effects								
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Coping	.13**	.06	.01	.24	.11	.07	-.03	.24
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience	-.40**	.07	-.54	-.25	-.40**	.07	-.54	-.25
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Career Anxiety	.44**	.08	.29	.60	.44**	.08	.29	.60
Resilience → Coping	.01	.06	-.11	.12	.09	.07	-.04	.22
Career Anxiety → Coping	.10	.06	-.02	.03	.01	.06	-.12	.14
Resilience → Career Anxiety	-.30**	.08	-.46	-.14	-.30**	.08	.29	.60
Indirect effects								
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience → Coping	.00	.06	-.03	.20	-.04	.03	-.10	.01
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Career Anxiety → Career Anxiety	.07	.05	-.01	.18	.00	.03	-.05	.07
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Resilience → Career Anxiety → Coping	.02	.01	.00	.05	.00	.01	-.02	.02
Total effects								
Career Ambiguity Aversion → Coping	.18**	.05	.09	.28	.07	.06	-.04	.19
R ²	.14				.12			

N = 156; CI = Confidence Interval; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$.