Career Success View retrospective from a traditional career to an unlimited career

Brian Soke, Arthur Smith, Lingka
University of South Africa
Email: briansokee@unisa.ac.za

Abstract

This research is to see how career problems are increasingly changing the nature of careers and causing the emergence of a more autonomous and independent career without boundaries. Generally in various forms of careers without limit is mobility. Individuals who move psychologically and physically begin to manage their careers in terms of their pursuits. In such a caIn such environment, the nature of career success has also changed. A career becomes an important and subjective thing that is only emphasized more than objective career success because individuals themselves meaningfully define and assess their career success by referring to the standards, needs, and values that they set themselves in an unstable environment. With the transmission of individual career responsibilities, it is necessary to develop competencies to find out why, know whose competencies, and know-how competencies emerge to survive and be successful. This study reviews the theoretical background of careers and the concept of a new career as a career without boundaries, in a constantly changing environment where it is impossible to be successful unless acquiring new competencies and methods of survival. New approaches to career success and the main reasons for emphasizing the development of subjective career success will also be examined

Keywords: Boundaryless Career, Physical and Psychological Mobility, Career Competencies, Career Success, Career Management

Introduction

The economic and social structure of the world has been changed radically with the global competition, emergence of multinational companies, development of the new communication technologies, rapid technological innovations, and the rise of knowledge work. Organizations are increasingly required to be more flexible and adaptable to survive and become successful in this constantly changing global economy (Pulakos et al., 2000; Volberda, 1996). To enhance flexibility and adaptability, all levels of organizations have to be involved in initiating and implementing change (Beer, 1999; Mohrman, 1999). Organizations often have to change their strategic, structural, and staffing levels to stay competitive (Armenakis and Bedeian, 1999; Cascio, 1995).

The changes in the global economy and social structure have also caused important changes in the way people work especially since the late 1980s. With the changes in working conditions, a dramatic change has been observed in the fundamental nature of careers. Although careers were traditionally built within the boundaries of one or two organizations, today individuals transcend organizational boundaries and develop their careers through various organizations, divisions, locations, and even industries (Sullivan, 1999). The need for flexibility has shifted the psychological contract between employers and employees (DiRenzo, 2010; Rousseau, 1995). Employers have become hesitant to invest in long-term relationships with their employees whose skill sets may not match those required by the organization in the future, to remain flexible in turbulent times (Greenhaus, et al., 2008; Nicholson, 1996). They have no longer secured long-term employment and job security for their employees. Employers and employees have started to establish short-term, transactional contracts, in which individual productivity is exchanged for the opportunity to develop career competencies and to increase marketability (Hall and Moss, 1998; Mirvis and Hall, 1994).

These new organizational structural systems have transferred career responsibility to individuals and encouraged them to plan their careers. The traditional career, planned by the organization and characterized by purely internal and vertical growth, has been transferred to independently created and self-directed careers (DiRenzo, 2010).

Individuals have started to plan their careers in terms of their er objectives, expectations for work and life balance, personal preferences, family obligations, perspectives on the meaning of life, and so on. Throughout the career path, they sometimes have changed their jobs, the regions or countries they work in, and even occupations concerning their preferences and changing needs.

Existing career theories have become insufficient to explain new careers after the 1990s. The need to re-examine the nature of careers and develop new perspectives on the concept of career has become unavoidable and new studies about the subject have started to be seen in the career literature. In this period new concepts such as boundaryless career - a career that unfolds over time in multiple employment settings - have emerged in career studies as a solution to explain the new career formation.

The shift from traditional organizational careers and the changes in psychological contracts between employers and employees have increased researchers' interest in boundaryless careers. This study examines the tendencies of individuals to proactively and autonomously shape their careers regardless of organizational boundaries, as well as the specific behaviors that may arise from this inclination and the effect on career outcomes and new perspectives on career success. This study aims to review the career literature and recent articles about the career to give an insight into the changing nature of careers, the emergence of the boundaryless career as a new career concept, and new definitions and perspectives on

career success. The main objectives of this study are to examine the way the concept has evolved from traditional to boundaryless career and the reasons behind it, to understand individuals' survival methods in the changing era, and the emergence of career competencies as a new predictor of career success, and to explore the new perspectives on career success as the emphasis shifts from objective career success to subjective career success. First, the definition and historical perspectives on the career concept and by various disciplines of social sciences will be examined. Second, traditional career concepts and the emergence of the boundaryless career as a new career concept will be discussed. Third, the career competencies and the definition of career such, cess as new perspectives on the concept will be reviewed in a detailed way.

The Concept of "Career"

In this section, the different perspectives on the definition of a career are reviewed in detail. Perspectives on traditional careers and the emergence of new career concepts will be discussed in the next section. The root of the term career comes from the French word 'carriere' which means road, racetrack. Etymologically, the word carriere comes from the Latin word '(via) cararia' which means road, carriageway, and Lawrence, 1984), which comes from another Latin word 'carrus', which means 'carriage'. In many of their studies, the concept of a career is associated with sustainable paths, pathways, and movements

Career is always considered an important concept in social sciences, which is not just interested in organizational studies but also in various disciplines as such psychology, sociology, political sciences, economy, anthropology, and educational sciences. Unlike many social science concepts, the concept of "career" is not the property of any theoretical or disciplinary view; it is shared among a diversity of perspectives (Arthur et al. 1989). Indeed, before it has become a field in organizational studies, it has mostly studied in the disciplines of sociology and psychology. Only aesthete 1970s70's, organizatiostudiesies' researchers have developed career theories and defined them once from their perspectives. We come across variable definitions of a career with distinguishing emphasis, within the literature of different social science disciplines. As Bird (1994) suggests, the definition of f career varies as the term crosses disciplinary boundaries. Arthur, et al. (1989) identify 11 separate descriptions of careers within different disciplines. These descriptions are shown in Table 1. A career is recently defined as the evolving sequence of a person's work experiences over time by Arthur et al. (1989). They especially emphasized the themes *'work'* which can be seen as how we see and experience other people, organizations, and society, and *'time'* which gives a career a moving g perspective on the unfolding interaction between person and society. His definition reflects the relationship between people and the providers of official positions, namely institutions or organizations, and how these relationships fluctuate over time.

The definition of a career also changes through time with the changing nature of the concept. Arthur and Lawrence (1984) believe that early definitions of career are not sufficient to explain the term in the contemporary world. According to Arthur and Lawrence (1984), in the earlier definitions of career, themes 'work' and 'meaning to life' are stand out in such a way that people are engaged in some consistent occupational activity that has personal consequences, such as remarkable incidents, progress, or advancement and these two themes are also associated in the public consciousness – witness the related notions of identity as 'I am what I do' or 'My life is my work'. They conclude that historically these themes were necessarily interwoven. 'Life was working ich indicates that individuals identify themselves

with their work. However, with the emergence of industrialization, modern technology, and the possibility to work in various kinds of jobs, individuals been have gchoiceshoice and conflicts, which were unknown before. They have started to question the meaning of their job and search for new opportunities to make a change in their job and seek more control over the environments that surround their careers (Arthur and Lawrance, 1984). Hirsh et al. (1995) define a career as the sequence of work experiences, that individuals have over their working lives. CA career could also be seen as the sequence of employment-related positions, roles, activities, and experiences encountered by a person. Bird (1994), defines a career as the accumulation of information and knowledge embodied in skills, expertise, and relationship networks acquired through an evolving sequence of work experiences over time. Hall (1976), on the other hand, emphasizes the term 'perception' in his definition and gives a slightly different definition of a career as the individually perceived sequence of attitudes and behaviors associated with witwork-related experiences and activities throughout the person's life. Tams and Arthur (2010) suggest that career development could be seen as the lifelong process of working out a synthesis between individual interests and (environmental) opportunities (or limitations).

The moving perspective of a career offers a link between the individual's initial identity and final integritthroughoutof his or her adult life (Arthur, 1994). Recently, there is a sharper focus on the individual and the personal *'odyssey'* involved in career journeys that are more idiosyncratic in their engagement with the changing world of work over time in the literature (Dany, et al., 2010).

Changing Nature of Careers and New Perspectives

In this section, the definitions of the traditional (organizational) career, and the changes through which new career concepts, especially boundaryless careers are unfolding, will be discussed historically way.

The Traditional (Organizational) Career

Studies in the career literature show that the modern view of the traditional career has emerged during the era of prosperity in the decades following the end of World War II, as the industrialized world has experienced unprecedented economic growth, demand for human capital soared and individuals had an abundance of job opportunities (Greenhaus et al., 2010). Early studies of career emphasize dominant large firms, lifetime employment, and imperative. Almost all articles over the 1980s80's assume a stable, rather than changing environment, and more than three-quarters of the articles over bothe 1980s0's and early 1990s, focus on intra-organizational issues and restrict themselves to managerial, professional, or hierarchical careers (Arthur, 1994). Career has unfolded as an orderly progression up a hierarchy for the individuals who have worked in large, highly structured organizations in this prosperous era, in which large companies manage the business world (Hirsh et al., 1995). This was the expected career path, especially for the managers and professionals.

A traditional (organizational) career is defined as a planned progression of working life, often within one organization and always following an upward direction towards a summit (Tyson and York, 1989). The notion of the organizational career is implicit in Weber's conceptualization of the 'ideal bureaucracy' with its well-defined hierarchy of authority and selection and promotion based on technical competence (Clarke, 2013, p. 684). The concept of

'organizational man' developed by Whyte (1956) is a manifestation of an organizational career in which the individual not only works for the organization but also belongs to the organization. However, after the 1990s, career scholars have started to discuss the shift from the traditional "organization man" view of employment (Whyte, 1956) to a more "self-directed employment" and "boundaryless career" (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996; Hall, 1976). Traditional career research coincided with hierarchical, position-oriented, and bounded organizations in which promotions, income differentials, rank, and job retention were relevant to individuals bound to one organization throughout their career journey (Hall and Chandler, 2005).

The emphasis on traditional careers is on their conception to progress in a linear stage (Levinson, 1978). A traditional career is seen as climbing up a ladder, which was reflected by the structure of the organizations in the past. Traditionally, high performance is rewarded by promotion, compensation, an increase in ranking and/or salary, etc. (McDougall and Vaughan, 1996). The mutual psychological contract of loyalty between employee and employer, regular promotions that allowed for linear, upward advancement within the organization, and well-defined retirement pensions are the basic characteristics of traditional careers. In this kind of career, giving of loyalty by the employee would be rewarded as job security and the opportunity to move through jobs with increasing responsibility, skill, status, and reward by the organization. Working under such a psychological contract, wherein there was a presumption of mutual loyalty between the employer and employee, a career has been viewed as relatively stable and consistent in the latter half of the 20th century (Greenhaus et al., 2010). Traditional careers were 'managed' not by the employees but by large organizations through fairly well-understood and often elaborate processes, including promotion boards, distinct career streams, and succession plans (Hirsh et al., 1995).

Therefore, the responsibility of career management was at the organizational rather than individual level in the traditional careers. These management processes are named 'organizational career management' (Hirsh et al., 1995). The term organizational career management is also defined as various policies, deliberately established by organizations, to improve the career effectiveness of their employees.

Traditional career management generally included establishing what employees want from their careers, providing appropriate career opportunities for employees, identifying which employees deserve these opportunities, and then providing them and evaluating the outcomes of career management plans. The counterpart to organizational career management is individual career management which is defined as the personal efforts made by individuals to advance their own career goals, which may or may not coincide with those their organizations have for them. Hirsh et al. (1995) argue that at the level of practice, there have been fairly well-defined career paths in many organizations. There have also been accepted ways of managing career experience and training of individuals inside large organizations to meet current and future needs. However, as the environment has changed, established career paths no longer seem appropriate, and resourcing patterns were hard to see. One particular response has been to export individuals to take responsibility for their careers and development (Hirsh et al., 1995).

The Reasons for Change in Careers

Many scholars are interested in the changing nature of careers and the reasons behind it in career studies (Hall, 1996; Harley et al. 2004; Maryhofer et al. 2004; Nicholson 1996; Sullivan, 1999; Van Buren III, 2003). Tams and Arthur (2010) emphasize that changes in the industrial economy, regional advantage based on employment mobility, and new firm

formations are important factors of change. They argue that one of the most important trends is reconfiguring organizational fields and employment, as large organizations refocus on core activities, delayering middle management, and rapidly outsourcing previously in-house service and production activities, adding to evidence of systemic change in earlier, primarily organizationally defined employment arrangements.

The main implementations of change are planned elimination of positions or jobs by downsizing (Cascio, 1993), restructuring hierarchies by reducing managerial layers and relying more heavily on collaborative work groups and self-managed teams, and decentralization with skilled workers that could coordinate themselves (Perrow, 1996), and outsourcing their less essential business functions. Because of these implementations, as Miles and Snow (1996) acknowledge, mainly, the tall, multi-layered, functionally organized structural characteristics of many large companies have changed.

Downsizing and delayering have made it nearly impossible to pursue a traditional organizational career because organizations have fewer levels in the status hierarchy. Because of the downsizing, many employees were made redundant. Many organizations have greatly reduced the size and significance of their head offices partly because of cost-cutting and delayering. Mergers, liquidations, and restructurings were frequent and rapid.
The combined effects of mass downsizings of numbers of workers, the resultant loss of job security, and the well-documented decline in loyalty between employers and employees over the past three decades have wreaked havoc on traditional organizational careers where the expectation of job stability, security, and advancement had been the norm (Cohen, 2001). Hirsh et al. (1995) confirm that downsizing has swept away established career paths. The belief in employment security has evaporated and many organizations have told the employees that they could no longer expect a career for life. Feldman (1995, p.190) argues that many successful, profitable organizations are downsizing today not because 'the wolf is at the door', but out of a desire to increase productivity, to gain some competitive advantage, or in reaction to stagnating profits rather than to absolute losses. These rapid and largely unforeseen changes in demand for staff leave both organizations and individuals lacking the confidence to plan for the future (Hirsh et al., 1995).

Decentralization is one of the other important change implementations. It is defined as the locus of decision-making authority that is delegated to the general manager of the strategic business unit by his/her corporate seniors (Govindarajan, 1986, p.844). Hirsh et al. (1995) argue that the decentralization of large organizations into smaller business units has built high barriers to movement between areas of work. The decentralization coupled with the passing of responsibility for career development from the human resources function (now itself fragmented) to line managers has also led in many cases to the collapse of the old systems for managing job moves and development (Tams and Arthur, 2010). Decentralization has caused the disappearance of the middle-level management and the expectation of hierarchical promotion. Arthur (1994) argues that large firm decentralization including decentralization of the employment authority creates a hidden boundaryless career effect unreported in aggregate employment statistics.

Outsourcing is one of the other important reasons for changes in careers. According to Belcourt (2006, p. 269), outsourcing refers to a contractual relationship for the provision of business services by an external provider. Lei and Hitt (1995, p.836) define outsourcing as the reliance on external sources for manufacturing components and other value-adding activities. In outsourcing practices, employees are not employed by the organization. Instead, they are employed by another organization holding a contract to deliver a certain service. Organizations are increasingly turning to outsource in an attempt to enhance their competitiveness, say Gilley

and Rasheed (2000, p.763). The main reasons for outsourcing could be identified as cost-saving, strategically focusing on their core competence, improving their technical services and the other services such as human resources, etc. Organizations have always outsourced some of their functions however what is different now is the scale of the outsourcing (Belcourt, 2006). In recent years outsourcing has increased more than ever. Organizations have started to outsource everything apart from their core activities as public relations, human resources, and information technology functions.

All of these changes have led to the need to reduce individuals' dependence on any single organization since the reliance on stable employment within large organizations is an increasingly problematic assumption (Tams and Arthur, 2010). The idealized vision of a traditional "organizational career", in which one expects advancement and stability within his/her career, has disappeared. Traditionally, most companies had hierarchical structures with multiple layers of managers, and success was defined as promotion up in the organizational hierarchy and a salary increase. In t980 the idea was that the '*core*' workforce of a large organization would still have a high degree of employment security. Beginning in the 1980s and accelerating in the 11990s career paths within organizations have become more unstructured and unpredictable because of the increasing likelihood that jobs would be eliminated, outsourced, or substantially changed (Greenhaus et al., 2010).

The common perception was that no job is *'safe'*, and indeed many organizations have told their employees that they can no longer expect *'a career for life'* (Hirsh et al., 1995). According to Hirsch et al. (1995), first and foremost, security and promotion the *'reward'* side of the *'career bargain'* were being delivered less frequently to the employees. With slower growth, promotion opportunities have become more restricted and unpredictable in most large organizations.

The psychological contract between firms and workers has also changed (Sullivan, 1999, p. 458). Under the new contract, workers exchange performance for continuous learning and marketability (Altman, and Post, 1996; Mirvis, and Hall, 1996; Rousseau, 1989; Rousseau, and Wade-Benzoni, 1995). The change in the psychological contract has caused decreased job security (Batt, 1996; Beckman, 1996; Scott, et al., 1996) and decreased employee loyalty (Goffee, and Scase, 1992; Murrell, et al., 1996). On the other hand, the increasing effect of globalization on the world economy is another important reason for the change in careers. Global organizations in today's business world require international employees, especially managers who understand and can respond to various customers, governments, and competitors (Stanek, 2000).

International organizations assign their employees to different countries to work and they prefer to hire employees who could work internationally. Formal international placement programs are growing within the human resource function in organizations. Large multinational enterprises are developing knowledge networks consisting of workers from different countries who collaborate on product/service innovations, growth, and structural cost reduction (Stanek, 2000). According to Chew and Zhu (2002), in terms of organizational perspective, some of the reasons for the direction of their employees to international careers are to develop high potential managers, enhance the gaorganization'slobal perspectivecontrolng overseas subsidiaries, transfer technology, and set up new operations. In terms of personal perspective, international assignments are accepted for several reasons as personal interest in internalization and related search for new experiences, challenges, economic motives, personal development, and intrinsic anding career opportunities (Suutari, 2003).

Moreover, contemporary careers are shaped not only by the developments in the social,

economic, and organizational realms but also by developments in individual identities (Baruch, 2006). Baruch (2006) argues that the global macro-economic and social conditions increased the number of global careers, making it possible for the introduction of females and minorities to different job positions, major restructuring of organizations, and generally a less stable business environment. At the micro-level, the new norms, values, and attitudes to life and work which are reflected in new behaviors of individuals are developed by these global macro-economic and social conditions. Individuals should strengthen their responsibility for the development of their competencies within increasingly flexible and uncertain career contexts. Also, the awareness is growing that a more networked and global economy could provide opportunities for careers to proactively contribute to and shape the economy.

The emergence of New Career Concepts

Changes in organizational structure and psychological employment contract has resulted in reexaminations of careers across multiple firms and boundaries, by many scholars (Arthur, and Rousseau, 1996; Osterman, 1996; Sullivan, 1999). Over the last two decades, more than a dozen *'new'* or *'contemporary'* career concepts have been presented in the career literature (Gubler et al., 2014). In response to the wider economic, social, and technological developments, these concepts generally assume that individuals are, or should be, increasingly *'mobile'* and *'self-directed'* in their careers. Gubler et al. (2014) conclude that these concepts have mainly been constructed as opposites of what is variously called the *'old'*, *'traditional'*, or *'organizational'* career, for which hierarchical advancement, organizational career management, and low mobility are main characteristics.

Among the new career concepts, the popular ones are boundaryless careers, (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996), protean careers (Hall, 1996), capitalist careers (Inkson and Arthur, 2001), portfolio careers (Handy, 1994), and free-agent careers (Heckscher, 1995). Two of these concepts namely, boundaryless (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996) and protean career concepts (Hall, 1996) have become widely acknowledged (Gubler et al., 2014). According to Inkson and Arthur (2001), capitalist careers mean reversing the common view that companies invest in people, and instead of seeing individuals as investors in companies. They state that to be a career capitalist is to manage one's career investments.

Portfolio careers consist of different roles rather than one defined job at a single organization. According to Handy (1994), individuals would be required to develop portable skill sets to meet the needs of a fast-moving future workplace. In free agency careers, each person tries to make the best deal for himself/herself as a free agent as the obligations of employees and companies are limited to specific legally binding contracts (Heckscher, 1995). The free agency model could be seen as a coping method for broken contracts. Hall (1976) defines a protean career as a process, which is managed by the person, not the organization. The protean career is not what happens to the person in any one organization. The protean person's own career choices and search for self-fulfillment are the unifying or integrative elements in his or her life. It is shaped more by the individual than by the organization and may be redirected from time to time to meet the changing needs of the person. Hall (1976) argues that in the protean career framework, career success - traditionally represented by growing salaries and hierarchical advancement - was increasingly defined by "psychological success," that is, "the feeling of pride and personal accomplishment that comes from knowing that one has done one's 'personal best' " (Mirvis, and Hall, 1996).

A Boundaryless career, on the other hand, is simply defined as the sequence of job opportunities that go beyond the boundaries of single employment settings (DeFillippi &

Arthur, 1996). The focus is on independence from the boundaries of any organization. In this concept, both psychological and physical mobility is given high importance. The protean career concept predominantly focuses on individual motives to follow a particular career path whereas the boundaryless career concept mainly concerns different forms of mobility (Gubler et al., 2014). Although both models are considered important and influential since it is more comprehensive, the boundaryless career concept has received considerably greater coverage (e.g., Arnold, and Cohen, 2008; Greenhaus, et al., 2008; Inkson, 2006; Sullivan, 1999).

A Closer Look at The Boundaryless Career

The first use of the term boundaryless career was seen in a symposium proposal on "Boundaryless Career " which was given raised by the theme of "Boundaryless Organization in the annual meeting of the Academy of Management in 1993. After the proposal, the Journal of Organizational Behavior published a special issue and wider book collection on this subject, in 2010. With the emergence of boundaryless organizations, career scholars have started to discuss the shift from the traditional "organization man" view of employment (Whyte, 1956) to a more "self-directed employment" and "boundaryless career" (Arthur, and Rousseau, 1996; Hall, 1976). Boundaryless career has emerged with boundaryless organizations (DeFlippi and Arthur, 1994).

The boundaryless career concept is based primarily on the writings of M. Arthur and his colleagues that began in the mid -the 1990s (Greenhaus et al., 2010, p.23). Their studies (Arthur, 1994; Arthur, and Lawrence, 1989; Arthur, and Rousseau, 1996; DeFilippi, and Arthur, 1996; DiRenzo, and Greenhaus, 2011; Rousseau, 1995) have important contributions to the development of boundaryless career concepts Boundaryless career, as defined by Arthur (1994), is simply the antonym of a "bounded" or "organizational" career. It is also explained by Arthur and Rousseau (1996) as one of independence rather than dependence on traditional organizational career arrangements. In the literature, a boundaryless career has been mainly considered to be characterized by observable, purposeful mobility, driven both by changing organizational conditions and by particular attitudes of career actors (Inkson, 2006).

A Boundaryless career is representative of work-life in modern organizations that place less emphasis on internal boundaries (such as hierarchical levels and functional partitions) and require the passage across boundaries between the organization and the myriad of networks it establishes with other organizations and individuals. In this sense, boundaryless careers are disconnected from a single employment setting and its existing career paths and unrestrained from traditional organizational career arrangements. A Boundaryless career is also defined as the sequence of job opportunities that go beyond the boundaries of single employment settings (DeFillippi and Arthur, 1996). Inkson (2006, p.53) states that if we take the term 'boundaryless career' literally, it is a career either with no limits to territory into which it can extend, or at least no clear line or barrier marking, where those limits are. A career actor could design his or her career path and living conditions regardless of the boundaries of an organization and even a country. Careers have become flexible, and transitional, the dynamics of the restructuring blur the tidy and former routes for success (forcing a new perspective of what is a success) and career systems have become multi-directional from linear (Baruch, 2006). Boundaryless careers involve a range of forms that are distinct from careers built upon traditional employment assumptions, such as the promise of vertical career trajectories in large, stable firms (Arthur, and Rousseau, 1996).

Arthur (1994) specifically suggests six forms of boundaryless careers:

1. *Careers that involve mobility across the boundaries of separate employers*
2. *Careers that draw validation or marketability from outside the current employer*
3. *Careers that depend more on external networks and information than internal structures*
4. *Careers where hierarchical reporting and advancement principles are broken*
5. *Careers that are primarily constructed around personal and family commitments*
6. *Careers that individuals perceive to be relatively free from structural constraints*

He concludes that the common theme to all these meanings is the independence from, rather than dependence on, traditional organizational career principles. The main idea in his work is that boundaryless careers may make better sense for both firms and employees trying to adapt to the modern economic era. He emphasizes that the old picture of stable employment and associated organizational careers is fading and a new picture of dynamic and boundaryless careers calls for attention. He also suggests that the intention is not to question organizational career as a legitimate base of research but rather to promote a second, alternative point of departure that acknowledges the unpredictable, market-sensitive world in which so many careers now unfold.

Boundaryless Career versus Traditional Career

According to Greenhaus et al. (2010) boundaryless career involves three different perspectives that can be contrasted with traditional careers. The first perspective is boundaryless career involves mobility patterns that depart from a traditional career whereby individuals pursued continuous advancement with a single organization. The second perspective is that a boundaryless career requires the use of competencies or strategies that are different from those used in traditional careers. As proposed by Arthur and his colleagues, these career competencies necessitate looking outside the organization for identity, marketability, and the establishment of networks of information and influence (Greenhaus et al., 2010, p.24). With these competencies individuals psychologically or physically cross the boundary from one organization to another by pursuing job contracts or leads, expanding knowledge and skills, and establishing connections with a wide network of influential people outside the employing organization.

The third perspective is that a boundaryless career involves the need for individuals to maintain a high degree of self-responsibility for their career choices and to follow personally meaningful values in making career decisions. In this sense, the boundaryless career means that individuals should be adaptable and proactive in managing their careers as a way to attain personally meaningful values and goals, especially in times of personal or organizational change. This perspective is in contrast with a traditional career where the individual looks to the organization to determine the career path to be followed.

According to Sullivan (1999, p.458);

"Some of the hallmarks of a boundaryless career could be summarized as portable skills, knowledge, and abilities across multiple firms (Arthur, Claman, and DeFilippi, 1995; Baker, and Aldrich, 1996; Bird, 1996); personal identification with meaningful work (Mirvis, and Hall, 1996b; Mohrman, and Cohen, 1995); on-the-job action learning (McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988); the development of multiple networks and peer learning relationships (Hall, 1996; Kram, 1996; Raider, and Burt, 1996); and individual responsibility for career management (Brousseau, Driver,Eneroth, and Larsson, 1996; Hall, 1996)".

Table 2 summarizes the differences between the traditional career and the boundaryless career (Sullivan, 1999).

Table 2: Comparisons of Traditional Career and Boundaryless Career

	Traditional Career	**Boundaryless Career**
Employment relationship:	Job Security	Employability for performance and flexibility
Boundaries:	One of two firms	Multiple Firms
Skills:	Firm-specific	Transferable
Success measured by:	Pay, Promotion, Status	Psychologically meaningful work
ɔnsibility for careermanagement:	Organizational	Individual
Training:	Formal Programs	On-the-job
Milestones:	Age-related	Learning-related

Source: Sullivan, (1999)

Going Mobile: Psychological Mobility and Physical Mobility

Arthur's (1994) definition of a boundaryless career involves six different dimensions. Almost all of the dimensions are about mobility. Mobility in the boundaryless career is examined in terms of two dimensions psychological mobility and physical mobility. Psychological mobility means the perception of the capacity to make transitions and physical mobility means transition across boundaries. After the work of Arthur and Rousseau (1996), many researchers have focused on physical mobility across boundaries. Compared to physical mobility, few researchers have focused on mobility across psychological boundaries. Two possible reasons could be inferred for the emphasis on physical mobility. The first one is that researchers appear to perceive boundaryless careers as only physical mobility. They have examined physical mobility between jobs, employ, ye, rs, or industries.

They undermine psychological mobility. The second one is that researchers may find it easier to measure physical mobility (e.g., counting the number of times someone changed jobs, employ, years or occupations) than to measure perceptions about psychological mobility. Therefore, according to Sullivan and Arthur (2006), it is not surprising that most studies have operationalized boundaryless careers in terms of physical mobility. They suggest a definition of a boundaryless career as one that involves physical and/or psychological career mobility. Such a career can be then viewed as, characterized by varying levels of physical and psychological mobility. Having a boundaryless career is not an "either-or" proposition as suggested by some studies. Rather, a boundaryless career can be viewed and operationalized by the degree of mobility exhibited by the career actor along both the physical and psychological continua. Both physical and psychological mobility — and the interdependence between them — can thereby be recognized and subsequently measured.

Career Competencies and Survival Strategies in the Boundaryless Career

With the disappearance of a traditional (organizational) career which generally secures life-long employment with a career plan which is developed by the organization through which employer will climb up the ladders of hierarchy with the psychological contract between employer and employee which gives employment security to the employee in return to loyalty,

employees should have to find new ways to develop their careers and to become successful. The shift from traditional organizational careers to new forms of careers especially boundaryless and protean careers together with the changes in the psychological contract have led to an increase in the scholarly interest in individuals as "agents of their career destinies" (Inkson and Baruch, 2008). There is now an acceptance of employment insecurity, unpredictable job moves, international careers, lateral movements, individual career ownership, and maintenance employability (Herriot et al., 1997). In such a condition, Arthur, et al. (1995) suggest that individuals were advised to develop their career management plan by themselves to survive. Wolfe's (1998) inference is that that e new conditions employees have developed a high sense of consciousness around their individualism and started to become their cr managers. Emp oyees can have ownership of their careers, and the company's role can be reduced to supporting individual career self-development and learning (Inkson and Arthur, 2001). DiRenzo (2010) suggests that there is a need and ability to increase certain career-related competencies to maintain personal employability, acquire a sense of work-life balance and achieve subjective career success. These competencies dividided into three classes of variables, knowing why competencies, knowing whom competencies, ad knowing how competencies.

Knowing why competencies answer the question "why" as it relates to career motivation, personal meaning, and identification (DeFlippi and Arthur, 1994). This competency reflects an individual's motivational energy to understand oneself, explore different possibilities, and adapt to constantly changing work situations (Arthur et al., 1995). Individuals can stay open to new possibilities and career experiences by decoupling their identity with their employers by knowing why competencies. Taking into consideration the changes in the working environment, employees' abilities to make sense of their constantly changing work agenda and to integrate their work experiences into a coherent self-picture are important criteria to survive and be successful therefore knowing why competencies are an important capital (Mirvis and Hall, 1994). Individuals separated their identities from the jobs and work settings they experience (Weick and Berlinger, 1989). They may define themselves through career identity, which is independent roofer employers (e.g., 'I am a software engineer'); the accumulation of employer-flexible know-how (e.g., how to work in an innovative, efficient, and/or quality-enhancing way); or situated within occupational or industry-based inter-organizational networks (Currie, et al., 2006).

This sense-making was shaped by knowing why career competencies may involve occupational or non-work identification or achievement or it may involve personal interests such as balancing work and family demands. According to Bailyn (1993), it may also involve getting free from hierarchical authority over the nature and content (or hours) of one's work. Knowing whom competencies are associated with the career-related networks and contacts (Arthur et al., 1995; DeFillippi & Arthur, 1994). Knowing whom competencies include both the relationships with others related to the ionization in which individual works (suppliers, customers, etc.) and personal connections independent from the organization (social acquaintances, and, etc,.) (Parker & Arthur, 2000) Network could be as a resource to draw on the separate expertise of other firms. It could be seen as a repository for attained reputation and through it the flow of new business. It could also be a source of new learning and thereby improved competitive advantage in the boundaryless career environment. Contacts drawn from personal experiences with family, friends, colleagues, fellow alumni, and outside teachers and mentors who could be instrumental in facilitating job search and occupational attainment (Granovetter, 1973; Lin, and Dumin, 1986). Knowing whom competencies reflect the breadth and diversity of an individual's social network that can be drawn upon to foster career growth

(DiRenzo, 2010). Knowing how competencies, reflect career-relevant skills and job-related knowledge (Nelson and Winter, 1982). It underlies how people contribute to a firm's repertoire of overall capabilities.

DeFilippi and Arthur (1994) state that changes in all organizational contexts encourages the emergence of new career competencies. From a knowing why standpoint, organizational contexts are disconfirming traditional beliefs about the stability of jobs and employment. From a knowing how standpoint, emerging organizational contexts are demanding continuous change in people's skills and knowledge, including the pursuit of new knowledge through the supplier, customer, or other inter-firm arrangements. From knowing whom standpoint, revised expectations about information gathering and exchange relationships are exposing people to new career possibilities, regarding both their overall competency accumulation and their choice of employment setting.

Thus, individuals should develop their knowing why, knowing whom, and knowing how competencies, to survive in today's working conditions. According to Inkson, and Arthur (2001), these three competencies are complementary forms and they function interdependently. They state that, when individuals first engage in the world of work, they bring knowing why competencies that is the energy, sense of purpose, motivation, and identification with their work to their career. Then, in the early experience, they accumulate new assets which are called knowing how, that is, in the skills, expertise, tacit and explicit knowledge. On the other hand, individuals also have the opportunity to gain further assets in knowing whom, that is in the attachments, relationships, reputation, sources of information, and mutual obligations that they gather as they pursue their careers. In a conclusion, a boundaryless career can provide full benefits only to individuals who can acquire and develop desirable competencies and skill sets and develop their career path.

Career Success: Objective Career Success versus Subjective Career Success

Success descends from the Latin word 'succedere', which means 'to succeed' or 'to follow' (Webster, 1996). Success in the sense of 'follow' can be what happens, either good or bad. Since the sixteenth century, however, it has also meant something more explicitly positive as the prosperous achievement of something attempted, the attainment of an object according to one's desire, often with particular reference to the attainment of wealth or position (Oxford English Dictionary, 1989). Success, then, can either be a consequence or a favorable outcome, which are two very different things. Most people probably think of it in its latter sense, with the implication that lack of success is something they don't want to experience (Gunz, and Heslin, 2005).

In a broader meaning, it is well known that what is seen as a success, by some people in the sense of a good outcome can look quite the opposite to others (Bartolome, and Evans, 1980). Accordingly, as Gunz and Heslin (2005) suggest, things happen to people in their working lives; what is interesting is how they and others evaluate these outcomes as 'good' or 'bad' and how these evaluations might shift over time. According to Schein (1978), it is important to determine if people considered having hierarchical and financial success are also satisfied with their careers. According to Gattiker, and Larwood (1988), subjective career success criteria reflect personal standards and preferences, such as whether an individual prefers to have solitude or social stimulation. In traditional careers, mostly another referent objective criterion is used to evaluate career success (Brousseau et al., 1996). People continually assess their career attainment relative to those of other people in traditional careers, which focused on progressive steps upward in the n organizational hierarchy to positions of

greater authority. However, those engaged in the boundaryless career are much more inclined to set their career agenda and determine the yardsticks by which their success is measured (Heslin, 2005, p. 127). Boundaryless careers are mostly evaluated by more self-referent and subjective criteria. Heslin (2005) states, *"while many people aspire to high pay, status, and regular promotions, attaining these things does not necessarily make them feel successful"* (Heslin, 2005, p. 377). He also argues that objective success can cause both alienation and depression at work. Under certain conditions, objective success can even lead to psychological failure (Hall, and Chandler, 2005).

Objective Career Success

Objective career success is defined by Nicholson (1996) as verifiable accomplishments like salary, salary growth, promotions, and occupational status, which have long been considered the hallmarks of career success across a wide range of societies, observable valued outcomes of the career path. Arthur et al. (2005) also define objective career success as an external perspective that delineates more or less tangible indicators of an individual's career situation. These may involve occupation, family situation, mobility, task attributes, income, and job level. The objective of career success is publicly accessible and concerned with social role and official position.

Comparative anthropology would suggest that six objective career success outcomes recur as follows (Nicholson, and Waal-Andrews, 2005, p. 140):

1. Status and rank (hierarchical position)
2. Material success (wealth, property, earning capacity)
3. Social reputation and regard, prestige, influence
4. Knowledge and skills
5. Friendships, network connections
6. Health and well-being

These objective measures can have the substantial benefits of being readily available by existing records, standardized, and easy to collect in the career studies (Heslin, 2005). They are free from self-serving and common method variance if they are collected by means other than self-record. Arthur and Rousseau (1996) have found that, in major interdisciplinary journals published between 1980 and 1994, more than 75 percent of the career-related articles focused on the objective of career success. Arthur et al. (2005) draw attention to the issue that career theorists speak increasingly of boundaryless careers where career opportunities transcend any single employer, and of the personal meaning of career success, on the other hand, still several researchers continue to focus on career success in terms of a person's organizational position, or of attained promotions between positions during the last two decades.

This contrast was sharpened by further reports that traditional vehicles for organizational career success, namely hierarchies, have been flattening, and that external labor markets have gained increasing influence over today's employment landscape. The new applications such as downsizing, delayering, and outsourcing by organizations have lessened the scope and relative desirability of hierarchical progression through promotion. Increasingly, individuals are experiencing involuntary job loss, lateral job movement both within and across organizational boundaries, and career interruptions (Eby, et al., 2003, p. 689).

Subjective criteria have increasingly been adopted within career success research over the last decade although objective criteria have dominated much of the subsequent career success literature (Heslin, 2005; Greenhaus, 2003; Hall, 2002). The relevance of some traditional

objective incidents of career success has diminished over the last two decades, because of the changes in the organizations and the conceptualization of careers (Heslin, 2005).

Subjective Career Success

Subjective career success is defined as an individual's reactions to his or her unfolding career experiences (Hughes, 1937, 1958*).* Arthur et al. (2005) give a more detailed definition of subjective career success as an individual's internal apprehension and evaluation of his or her career, across any dimensions that are important to that individual. They believe the idea that people have different career aspirations, and place different values on such factors as income, employment security, location of work, status, progression through different jobs, access to learning, the importance of work versus personal and family time, and so on. They also argue that the subjective careers of people in similar social and employment circumstances - such as women, minorities, white males, doctors, secretaries, and construction workers - may overlap, but as they quote Bailyn (1993), it would be a mistake to assume that all members in a particular social category would share the same subjective career orientations.

Theoretical and empirical studies also suggest that, employees today base job opportunity and transition decisions on personal and family concerns in addition to opportunities for advancement and increases in pay (DiRenzo, 2010; Arthur, and Rousseau, 1996; Galinsky and Friedman, 1993). Perceptions of success are highly rooted in personal values (DiRenzo, 2010). Subjective career success consists of utilities that are only identifiable by introspection, not by observation or consensual validation. Private fulfilfulfillmentersonal meanings come into this category (Nicholson, and Waal-Andrews, 2005, p. 141). Nicholson and Waal-Andrews (2005)figure out six objective career success as follows:

1. Pride in achievement
2. Intrinsic job satisfaction
3. Self-worth
4. Commitment to work role or institution
5. Fulfilling relationships
6. Moral satisfaction

Unlike objective success criteria, subjective measures may detect important career outcomes that are not readily accessible from personnel records or by expert raters (Gattiker, and Larwood, 1988). Subjective career success includes feelings of satisfaction and accomplishment in one's career (Seibert, et al., 1999). A sense of identity, purpose and work-life balance are also important criteria for subjective career success (Heslin, 2005). Hall, and Chandler(2005, pp.158) state that subjective career success develops cyclically as a result of setting and attaining challenging goals. The traditional notion of a single life-long career cycle with a series of stages has been replaced with a series of shorter learning cycles. (Hall, and Chandler, 2005). In the boundaryless career perspective, career success is an important concept and the conceptualization of career success has expanded beyond that typically studied in traditional careers (objective measures of success, e.g., promotions, salary) (Arthur, and Rousseau, 1996). In the boundaryless career perspective, scholars are mostly interested in subjective measures of success, while simultaneously de-emphasizing external or objective measures of success (Parker, and Arthur, 2000). They emphasize subjective measures of success because they believe that only individuals themselves can meaningfully define and assess their career success concerning their self-defined standards, needs, values, career stages, and aspirations in the highly heterogeneous, mobile, and unique career paths. Career success is defined as the positive psychological or work-related outcomes or achievements one

accumulates as a result of work experiences in a boundaryless career (Seibert, et al.,1999, p. 417). According to Hall, and Chandler (2005), subjective career measures, such as job satisfaction, self-awareness, adaptability, work-life balance, marketability, and learning, essentially individual-level factors rather than organizational-level factors, have taken on greater salience in today's environment.

Career satisfaction

Career satisfaction is one of the most important subjective measures of career success and includes employees' perceptions of satisfaction with their overall career goals, goals for income, goals for advancement, and goals for the development of new skills (Greenhaus, et al., 1990). Career satisfaction is defined by Jen (2010) as the level of overall happiness experienced through one's choice of career. According to Greenhaus, et al. (1990), career satisfaction is a subjective measure that includes employees' perceptions of their satisfaction with their overall career goals, goals for income, goals for advancement, and goals for the development of new skills. According to Judge et al. (1995), career satisfaction is commonly assessed as subjective career success. According to Barnett, and Bradley (2007), significant predictors of career satisfaction include goal-specific environmental support and resource, which provides social and material support for employees' personal goals.

Career satisfaction is an important concept, especially after the 1980s in the literature and it has been related to many important organizational outcomes, such as organizational commitment (e.g., Carson et al., 1996; Igbaria, 1991), intentions to leave, or turnover intention (Igbaria, 1991), and support for organizational change (Gaertner, 1989). Sriknth and Israel (2012) argue that career satisfaction may be attributed to the development of competencies associated with one's job that may provide an opportunity for career advancements. They further argue that low-performance ratings, low overall rankings, less challenging assignments, fewer responsibilities, and less recognition compared to other colleagues can lead to low career satisfaction. On the other hand, Korman et al. (1981) believe that career dissatisfaction can lead to employee disengagement. The disengaged employees are less engaged in their work and are likely to exhibit lower performance than satisfied employees.

The Balance of work and life

Work-life balance, which means individuals' abilities to meet their work and family commitments, as well as other non-work responsibilities and activities, is gaining importance as another measure of subjective career success. Employees started to measure their career success according to their satisfaction and good functioning at work and home with minimal role conflict. In general, work-life balance is defined as individuals' ability to meet their work and family commitments, as well as other non-work responsibilities and activities (Delecta, 2011). It is also defined as satisfaction and good functioning at work and home with a minimum role conflict (Greenhaus, 2003). Much of the intellectual energy behind the debate on work-life balance comes from the United States, notably through Schor's (1991) influential study The Overworked American (White, et al., 2003, p. 177). She claims that average working hours are isarencreasing in advanced industrial economies. The increase is even much more for women than men. This condition creates a time squeeze, especially for double-earner couples.

According to Delecta (2011), work-life balance corresponds to the relationship between the

institutional and cultural times and spaces of work and non-work in societies where income is predominantly generated and distributed through labor markets. Aycan et al. (2007), confined the subject only to work and family and put forward the concept of 'life balance' with a broader perspective. In the work-life balance concept, especially three basic areas of life are taken into consideration work, family, and private. Work demands work hours, work intensity, and the proportion of working hours spent in work (Delecta, 2011). Family demands consist of the roles of individuals (e.g. father, mother, etc.) and family responsibilities (e.g. childcare, elderly care, house works, etc.). The other demands to balance work and life are relaxation, vacation, sports, and personal interests. Work-life balance is a subjective phenomenon and changes from person to person. While some adopt the philosophy of 'working to live' and see work as the objective, others consider "living to work" and situated work in the center of life (Delecta, 2011).

The main determinants of work-life balance are considered to be individual preferences, family, work and organization, and social environment. In terms of individual preferences, more work orientation could hurt work-life balance. According to Porter (1996) workaholics who are considered obsessives, neglect their families, friends, relations, and other social responsibilities and they suffer from alienation, family, and health problems.
According to Heslin (2005) work-life balance is an important component of subjective (psychological) career success. The imbalance of work-life could cause stress on individuals, family and health problems, and also inefficiency at work. According to White et al. (2003), additional work hours subtracted from home time with high work intensity or work pressure may result in fatigue, anxiety, or other adverse physiological consequences that affect the quality of home and family life.

Internal and external marketability

Individual marketability is one of the other important criteria for career success (Arthur, and Rousseau, 1996). Because jobs and career patterns are less long-term and stable, individuals who can remain value-added to their present employer and who are viewed as marketable by other organizations are considered successful (Eby et al., 2003). Therefore, perceived marketability in one's organization (a belief that one is valuable to his or her current employer) and perceived marketability in the external marketplace (a belief that one is valuable to other employers) are important measures of subjective career success. The volatile economic and organizational conditions that characterize a boundaryless world have produced diminishing feelings of job security (DiRenzo, and Greenhaus, 2011, p. 570; Davis et. al., 1997; Kalleberg, 2009; Smith, 2010). Workers believe that psychological contracts are increasingly short-term, transactional, and characterized by diminished trust in employers (Herriot, et al., 1997; Smithson, and Lewis, 2000). The decline in job security causes individuals increasingly to recognize the importance of their marketability in a dynamic economy. Successful individuals are those who can remain value-added to their present employer and are viewed as marketable by other organizations (Bird, 1994; Sullivan, et al., 1998). Employees focus on staying continuously aware of their value in the workforce and potential avenues for career development (Eby, et al., Smith, 2010). Marketability could be examined as internal marketability and external marketability. Internal marketability refers to the extent to which employees have skills that are valued by their current employers and external marketability refers to skills that are valued by outside employers (Torres-Coronas, and Arias- Olivia, 2005).
With jobs and career patterns being less long-termed stable, unsuccessful individuals are

those who arcanemain value-added to their present employer and are viewed as marketable by other organizations (Eby, et al., 2003, p. 690; Bird, 1994; and Sullivan, et al., 1998).

Conclusion

Globalization of the world, technological innovations, developments in communication technologies, and a stable economic environment lead to changes in the organizational structures of the companies. They are required to be more flexible and adaptable to survive in such conditions. Many companies started to use strategies such as downsizing, decentralization, delayering, and outsourcing. These strategies result in changing working conditions, questioning the definition of career concepts, and existing career theories together with the changes in the economic and social structures of societies. Employment security offered by the employer and loyalty offered by the employee which is arisuaranteed by a psychological contract is also not possible anymore in these conditions.

Additionally, because of the new organizational strategies, the opportunity to rise in the hierarchical levels is not possible too. In the new employment conditions, employers offer job opportunities in which employees could develop their career capital in return for their labor. The responsibility of career management is transformed from organizational management to the shoulders of employees. Boundaryless career concepts emerged in such conditions after the 1990s. Boundaryless careers are conceptualized as new forms of careers as the sequences of job opportunities that go beyond the boundaries of single employment settings (DeFillippi, and Arthur, 1996). It consists of psychological and physical mobility. On the other hand, the responsibility for career development has been transmitted to the shoulders of employees with the shift from a traditional career to a boundaryless career, along with the changes in psychological contracts.

In the period of new organizational structure, working conditions, and changes in career definitions, it is expected that employees should adapt to unexpected changes, ups, and downs through their career path. Employees should develop their career capital to survive and become successful in these new working conditions which no longer offer a career promise and employment security. In the new working conditions, career success is also reconceptualized and subjective career success as career satisfaction, work-life balance, internal marketability, and external marketability is more emphasized.

References

Altman, B. W., & Post, J. E. (1996). *Beyond the social contract: An analysis of the executive view at twenty-five larger companies.*

(D. T. Hall, Ed.). The career is dead — long live the career. Jossey Bass. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED404482

Arnold, J., & Cohen, L. (2008). The psychology of careers in industrial and organizational settings: A critical but appreciative analysis. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 23, 1- 44. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470773277.ch1

Arthur, M. B. (1994). The Boundaryless Career: A New perspective for organizational inquiry. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 15, 295-306. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2488428

Arthur, M. B., Claman, P. H., & DeFilipp, R. J. (1995). Intelligent enterprise, intelligent careers. *Academy of Management Executive*. 9, 7-22. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1995.9512032185

Arthur, M. B., Hall, D. T., & Lawrence, B. S. (Eds.). (1989). *Handbook of career theory.* Cambridge

University Press.https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511625459

Arthur, M. B., & Lawrence, B. S. (1984). Environment and career. *Special Issue of Journal of Occupational Behavior*. 5(1), 1-81.http://www.jstor.org/stable/3000305

Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (Eds.). (1996). *The boundaryless career*: *A new employment principle for a new organizationalera.* Oxford University Press.

Arthur, M.B., Khapova, S.N., & Wilderom, C.PM. (2005). Career Success in a boundaryless career world. *Journal ofOrganizational Behavior.* 26(2), 177-202. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.290

Armenakis, A. A., & Bedeian, A.G. (1999). Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*. 25(3), 293-315. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500303

Aycan, Z., Al-Hamadi, A. B., Davis, A., & Budhwar, P. (2007). Cultural orientations and preferences for HRM policies andpractices: The case of Oman. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management.* 18(1), 11-32. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190601068243

Bailyn, L. (1980). *The 'slow burn' way to the top: Some thoughts on the early years in organizational careers.* (C.B. Derr, Ed.),Work, family, and the career: New frontiers in theory and research. Praeger.

Bailyn, L. (1993). *Breaking the mold*: *Women, men, and time in the new corporate world.* Free Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393723

Baker, T., & Aldrich, H. E. (1996). *Prometheus stretches Building identity and cumulative knowledge in multi-employer careers.*(M. B. Arthur, & D. M. Rousseau Eds.). The boundaryless career: The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era. Oxford University Press.

Barnett, B.R., & Bradley, L. (2007). The impact of organizational support for career development on career satisfaction. *Career Development International*. 12(7), 617-36. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430710834396

Bartolome, F., & Evans, P.A.L. (1980). Must success cost so much? *Harvard Business Review*. 58, 137-148.https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430710834396

Baruch, Y. (2006). Career development in organizations and beyond: Balancing traditional and contemporary viewpoints. *Human Resources Management Review.* 16, 125-138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2006.03.002

Batt, R. (1996). *From bureaucracy to the enterprise? The changing jobs and careers of managers in telecommunications service.* (P.Osterman Ed.). Broken Ladders: Managerial Careers in the new economy. Oxford University Press. https://hdl.handle.net/1813/77053

Beckman, S.L. (1996). *Evolution of management roles in a networked organization.* (P. Osterman Ed.). Broken Ladders:Managerial Careers in the new economy. Oxford University Press.

Beer, M. (1999). *Leading learning and learning to lead: An action learning approach to developing organizational fitness.* (J. A. Conger, G. M Spreitzer, & Edward E. Lawler III. Eds.). Leader's change handbook: An essential guide to setting direction and taking action. Jossey Bass. https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=49939

Belcourt, M. (2006). Outsourcing: The benefits and the risks. *Human Resource Management Review.* 16, 269-279.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2006.03.011

Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. (1967). *The American occupational structure.* Wiley. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED066526

Bird, A. (1994). Careers as repositories of knowledge: A new perspective on boundaryless careers. *Journal of OrganizationalBehavior*. 15, 325-344. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150404

Bird, A. (1996). *Careers as repositories of knowledge: Considerations for boundaryless careers.* (M. B. Arthur, & D. M. RousseauEds.). The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era. Oxford University Press.

Brousseau, K. R., Driver, M. J., Eneroth, K., & Larsson, R. (1996). Career pandemonium: Realigning

organizations and individuals. *Academy of Management Executive*. 10, 52-66. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4165353

Carson, K. D., Carson, P. P., Phillips, J. S., & Roe, C. W. (1996). A career entrenchment model: Theoretical development andempirical outcomes. *Journal of Career Development*. 22, 273-288. https://doi.org/10.1177/089484539602200405

Cascio, W.F. (1993). Downsizing: What do we know? What have we learned? *The Executive.* 7(1), 95-104.https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/4165111

Cascio, W.F. (1995). Whither industrial and organizational psychology in a changing world of work? *American Psychologist*. 50,928-936. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.50.11.928

Chew, I.K.H., & Zhu, W. (2002). Factors influencing Singapore managers' career aspiration in international assignments. *Career Development International*. 7(2), 96-108. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430210421623

Cohen, L. (2001). *Careers*. (T. Redman, & A. Wilkinson, Eds.). Contemporary human resource management*.* Prentice-Hall. Clarke, M. (2013). The organizational career: Not dead but in need of redefinition. *The International Journal of Human Resource*

Management. 24(4), 684-703. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.697475

Currie, G., Tempest, S., & Starkey, K. (2006). New careers for old? Organizational and individual responses to changingboundaries. *International Journal of Human Resource Management.* 17(4), 755-774. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190600581733

Dany, F., Mallon, M., & Arthur, M.B. (2010). The odyssey of career and the opportunity for international comparison. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 14(5), 705-712. https://doi.org/10.1080/0958519032000080758

Davis, S. J., Haltiwanger, J. C., & Schuh, S. (1997). *Job creation and destruction.* MIT Press.

DeFillippi, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1994). The boundaryless career: A competency-based perspective. *Journal of OrganizationalBehavior.* 15, 307-324. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150403

DeFillippi, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (Eds). (1996). *Boundaryless context and careers: A competency-based perspective.* OxfordUniversity Press. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150403

DiRenzo, M. S., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2011). Job search and voluntary turnover in a boundaryless world: A control theory perspective. *Academy of Management Journal.* 36 (3), 567-589. 10.5465/AMR.2011.61031812

Doeringer, P. B., & Piore, M. J. (1971). I*nternal labor markets and manpower analysis.* Heath. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED048457.pdf

Eby, L., Butts M., & Lockwood A. (2003). Predictors of success in the era of the boundaryless career. *Journal of OrganizationalBehavior*. 24, 689-708. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.214

El-Sawad, A. (2005). Becoming a 'lifer'? Unlocking career through metaphor. *Journal of Occupational and OrganizationalPsychology*. 78, 23-41. https://doi.org/10.1348/0963117904X22917

Featherman, D. L., & Hauser, R. M. (1978). *Opportunity and change.* Academic.

Feldman, D.C. (1995). The impact of downsizing on organizational career development activities and employee career development opportunities. *Human Resource Management Review.* 5(3), 189-221. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(95)90002-0

Galinsky, E., & Friedman, D. (1993). *A national study of the changing workforce.* Families & Work Institute.https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(95)90002-0

Gattiker, U.E., & Larwood, L. (1988). Predictors of managers' career mobility, success, and satisfaction. *Human Relations*. 41,569-591.https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678804100801

Gilley, M.K., & Rasheed, A. (2000). Making more by doing less: An analysis of outsourcing and its effects on firm performances.

Journal of Management. 26(4), 763-790. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600408 Glasser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1971). *Status passage: A formal theory.* Aldine. https://www.routledge.com/Status-Passage/Strauss/p/book/9780202363387

Goffee, R., & Scase, R. (1992). Organizational change and the corporate career: The restructuring of managers' job aspirations.

Human Relations. 45, 363-385. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679204500404

Goodman, P.S. (1974). An examination of referents used in the evaluation of pay. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 12, 170-195. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(74)90045-2

Govindarajan, V. (1986). Decentralization, strategy, and effectiveness of strategic business units in multibusiness organizations.

Academy Management Review. 11(4), 844-856. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4284099

Greenhaus, J. H. (2003). *Career dynamics*. (W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski, Eds.). Comprehensive handbook of psychology. (Vol.12) Industrial and Organizational Psychology.

Greenhaus, J. H., Callagan, G. A., & Godshalk V.M. (2010). *Career management,* (4th Edn.). Sage Publications.

Greenhaus, J. H., Callanan, G. A., & DiRenzo, M. S. (2008). *A boundaryless perspective on careers.* (C. L. Cooper, & J. Barling,Eds.). Handbook of organizational behavior. Sage Publications.

Greenhaus, J.H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W.M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance,evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal.* 33(1), 64-85. https://doi.org/10.5465/256352

Holland, J.L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments.* Prentice-Hall.https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1997-08980-000

Kaufmann, H. (1960). *The forest ranger: A study in administrative behavior.* Johns Hopkins University Press.

Parasuraman, S., Greenhaus, J. H., & Linnehan, F. (2000). *Time, person-career fit, and the boundaryless career.* (C.L. Cooper, &

D.M. Rousseau, Eds.). Trends in organizational behavior. John Wiley & Sons.

Gaertner, K. N. (1989). Winning and losing: Understanding managers' reactions to strategic change. *Human Relations*. 42, 527-546. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678904200604

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strengths of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology.* 78, 1360-1380. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2776392

Gubler, M, Arnold, J., & Coombs, C. (2014). Reassessing the protean career concept: Empirical findings, conceptual components,and measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 35, 23-40. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1908

Gunz, H.P., & Heslin, P.A. (2005). Reconceptualizing career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 26 (2), 105-111.https://www.jstor.org/stable/4093973

Hall, D. T. (2002). *Careers in and out of organizations*. Sage Publications. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452231174

Hall, D. T. (1996). *The new role of the career practitioner.* (D. T. Hall, Ed.). The career is dead – long live the career. Jossey-Bass.https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED404482

Hall, D. T. (1976). *Careers in organizations.* Goodyear.

Hall, D. T., & Chandler, D. E. (2005). Psychological success: When the career is a calling. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 26,155-176. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4093976

Hall, D. T., & Moss, J. E. (1998). The new protean career contract: Helping organizations and employees to adapt. *Organizational Dynamics*. 26, 22-37.https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(98)90012-2

Handy, C. (1994). *The empty raincoat: Making sense of the future.* Hutchinson.

Harley, S., Muller-Camen, M., & Collin, A. (2004)., From academic communities to managed organizations: The implications for academic careers in UK and German universities. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 64, 329-345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2002.09.003

Heckscher, C. (1995). *White-collar blues: Management loyalties in an age of corporate restructuring.* Basic Books.

Herriot, P., Manning, W. E. G., & Kidd, J. M. (1997). The content of the psychological contract. *British Journal of Management*. 8,151-162. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.0047

Heslin, P. A. (2005). Conceptualizing and evaluating career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 26, 113-136.https://doi.org/10.1002/job.270

Hirsh, W., Jackson C., & Jackson C. (1995). *Careers in organizations: Issues for the future.* The Institute for Employment Studies.Hughes, E. C. (1958). *Men and their work*. Free Press.

Hughes, E. C. (1937). Institutional office and the person. *American Journal of Sociology*. 43, 404-413. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2768627

Igbaria, M. (1991). Job performance of MIS professionals: An examination of the antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*. 8(2), 141-171. https://doi.org/10.1016/0923-4748(91)90027-O

Inkson, K. (2004). Images of career: Nine key metaphors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior.* 65, 96 – 111. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00053-8

Inkson, K. (2006). Protean and boundaryless careers as metaphors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior.* 69, 48-63.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.004

Inkson, K., & Arthur, M. B. (2001). How to be a successful career capitalist. *Organizational Dynamics*. 30 (1), 48.https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(01)00040-7

Inkson, J, Baruch, Y. (2008). *Organizational Careers.* (C. Cooper, Ed.). Handbook of organizational behavior. (Vol.2). MacroApproaches. Sage Publications.

Jen Ruei-Fu. (2010). Is an information technology career unique? Exploring differences in career commitment and its determinantsamong IT and Non-IT employees. *International Journal of Electronic Business Management*. 8(4), 263-271.

Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D. (1995). An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success. *Personnel Psychology*. 48, 485–519. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01767.x

Kalleberg, A. (2009). Precarious work, insecure workers. *American Sociological Review*. 74, 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240907400101

Korman, A. K., Wittig-Berman, U., & Lang, D. (1981). Career success and personal failure: Alienation in professionals and managers. *Academy of Management Journal*. 24(2), 342-360. https://doi.org/10.5465/255846

Kram, K. E. (1996). *A relational approach to career development.* (D. T. Hall Ed.). The career is dead – long live the career.

Lei, D., & Hitt, M. (1995). Strategic restructuring and outsourcing: The effect of mergers and acquisitions and LBOs on buildingfirm skills and capabilities. *Journal of Management*. 21(5), 835-859. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639502100502

Levinson, D. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. Knopf.

Levinson, D. J. (1984). *The career is in the life structure, the living structure is in the career: An adult development perspective.*(M.B. Arthur, L. Bailyn, D.J. Levinson, H.A. Shephard, Eds) Working With Careers. Columbia University School of Business.

Lin, N., & Dumin, M. (1986). Access to occupations through social ties. *Social Networks*. 8, 365-385. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733(86)90003-1

Maryhofer, W., Meyer, M., Iellatchith, A., & Schiffinger, M. (2004). Careers and human resource management – A European perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management.* 15(1), 180-195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2004.10.006

McCall, M.W., Lombardo, M.M., & Morrison, A.M. (1988). *The lessons of experience.* Lexington Books.

McDougall, M., & Vaughan, E. (1996). Changing expectations of career development: Implications for organizations and social marketing. *Journal of Management Development*. 15, 36-46.

https://doi.org/10.1108/02621719610146248

Miles, R. E., & Snow, C. C. (1996). *Twenty-first-century careers.* (M.B. Arthur, & D.M. Rousseau, Eds.). Boundaryless career: Anew employment for a new principal era. Oxford University Press.

Mirvis, P.H., & Hall, D.T. (1994). Psychological success and the boundaryless career. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 15,365-380. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150406

Mirvis, P. H., & Hall, D. T. (1996). *Psychological success and the boundaryless career.* (M. B. Arthur, & D. M. Rousseau, Eds.).

The boundaryless career: A new employment for a new principal era. Oxford University Press.

Mohrman, S. A. (1999). *Top management is viewed below.* (J. A. Conger, G. M. Spreitzer, & Edward E. Lawler III., Eds.).

Leader's change handbook: An essential guide to setting direction and taking action. (1st ed.). Jossey Bass.

Mohrman, S. A., & Cohen, S. G. (1995). *When people get out of the box: New relationships, new systems.* (A. Howard Ed.). Changing the nature of work.Jossey-Bass.

Murrel, A. J., Frieze, I. H., & Olson, J. E. (1996). Mobility strategies and career outcomes: A longitudinal study of MBA's. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 49, 324-225. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0047

Nelson, R. R., and Winter, S. G. (1982). *An evolutionary theory of economic change.* Harvard University Press.

Nicholson, N. (1996). Career System in Crises: Change and opportunity in the information age. *Academy of Management*. 10(4),40-54. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4165352

Nicholson, N., & Waal-Andrews W. (2005). Playing to win: Biological imperatives, self-regulation, and trade-offs in the game ofcareer success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 26, 137-154. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.295

Osterman, R. (1996). *Broken Ladders*. Oxford University Press. OUP. (1989). *Oxford English dictionary*. Oxford University Press.

Parker, H., & Arthur, M. B. (2000). *Careers, organizing, and community.* (M. A. Peiperl, M. B. Arthur, R. Goffee, & T. Morris,Eds.). Career frontiers: New conceptions of working. Oxford University Press.

Perrow, C. (1996). *A bounded career and the demise of civil society.* (M. B. Arthur, & D. M. Rousseau, Eds.). Theboundaryless career: A new employment for a new principal era. Oxford University Press.

Porter, G. (1996). Organizational impact of workaholism: Suggestions for researching the negative outcomes of excessive work.

Journal of Occupational Health Psychology. 1(1), 70-84. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.1.1.70

Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomyof adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 85(4), 612-624. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.4.612

Raider, H. J, & Burt, R. S. (1996). *Boundaryless career and social capital.* (M. B. Arthur, & D. M. Rousseau, Eds.). Boundarylesscareer: A new employment for a new principal era. Oxford University Press.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding wrote and unwritten agreements*. SagePublications.

Rousseau, D.M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*. 2(2), 121-139. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01384942

Rousseau, D. M., & Wade-Benzoni, K. A. (1995). *Changing individual-organizational attachments: A two-way street.* (A. Howard,Ed.). Changing the nature of work. Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career Dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs.* Addison Wesley. Schlesinger, A.M. Jr. (1965). *A thousand days: John F. Kennedy in the White House.* Houghton-Mifflin. Schor, J. (1991). *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure.* Basic Books.

Scott, E. D., O'Shaughnessy, K .D., & Capelli, P. (1996). *Management jobs in the insurance industry.* (P. Osterman, Ed.). Brokenladders. Oxford University Press.

Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kramier, M. L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success*. Journal of Applied Psychology*. 84,416–427. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.3.416

Shephard, H. A. (1984). *On the realization of human potential: A path with a heart.* (M.B. Arthur, L.Bailyn, D.J. Levinson, & H.A.Shephard, Eds.). Working with careers. Columbia University.

Schneider, B., & Hall, D.T. (1972). Correlates organizational identification as a function of career pattern and organizational type. Academy of Management Proceedings. https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.1972.4981421

Smith, V. (2010). Review article: Enhancing employability: Human, cultural, and social capital in an era of turbulent unpredictability. *Human Relations*. 63, 279-303.https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709353639

Smithson, J., & Lewis, S. (2000). Is job insecurity changing the psychological contract? *Personnel Review*. 29, 680-702.https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480010296465

Srikanth, P.B., & Israel, D. (2012). Career commitment and career success: Mediating role of career satisfaction. *The IndianJournal of Industrial Relations.* 49(1), 137-149.

Srikanth, P.B., & Israel, D. (2012). Career commitment and career success: Mediating role of career satisfaction. *The IndianJournal of Industrial Relations.* 49 (1), 137-149.

Stanek, M.B. (2000). The need for global managers: The business necessity. *Management Decision*, 38(4), 32-42.https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740010326243

Sullivan, S.E. (1999). The changing nature of careers: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 3, 457-484.https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(99)00009-4

Sullivan, S.E., & Arthur, M.B. (2006). The evolution of 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., Carden, W. A., & Martin, D. F. (1998). Careers in the next millennium: Directions for future research. *HumanResource Management Review*. 8, 165-185.

Suutari, V. (2003). Global managers: Career orientation, career tracks, lifestyle implications, and commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 18(3), 185-207.https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940310465225

Tams, S., & Arhur, M. B. (2010). New Directions for boundaryless careers: Agency and interdependence in a changing world.

Journal of Organizational Behavior. 31, 629-646. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.712 Thorndike, E.L. (1934). Prediction of vocational success. Oxford University Press.

Torres-Coronas, T., & Arias-Olivia, M. (2005). *E-human resources management: Managing knowledge people.* Idea GroupPublishing.

Tyson, S., & York, A. (1989). *Personnel management.* (2nd ed.). Houghton Mifflin Company.

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1977). *Career development*. (J. R. Hackman, and J. L. Suttle, Eds.). Improving life at work.

Goodyear.

Van Maanen, J. (1982). Getting into fishing: Observations on the social identities of New England fishermen. *Urban Life.* 11 (1),27-54.

Van Maanen, J., & Barley, S. (1984). *Occupational communities: Culture and control in organizations.* (B. Staw, & L. Cummings,Eds.). Research in organizational behavior. 6. JAI.

Van Buren III, H. J. (2003). Boundaryless careers and employability obligations. *Business Ethics Quarterly*. 13(2), 131-149.https://www.jstor.org/stable/3857656

Volberda, H. W. (1996). Toward the flexible form: How to remain vital in hyper-competitive markets. *Organizational Science*.

7(4), 359-374. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.7.4.359

Warner, W. L., & Abegglen, J. (1955). *Occupational mobility in American business and industry.* University of Minnesota Press.Weick, K. E., & Berlinger, L. R. (1989). Career improvisation in self-designing organizations. (M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall, & B. S.

Lawrence, Eds.). *Handbook of career theory*, Cambridge University Press.

White, M., Hill, S., McGovern, P., Mills, C., & Smeaton, D. (2003). 'High performance' management practices, working hours, andwork-life balance. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*. 41(2), 175-195. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8543.00268

Whyte, W. (1956). *The organization man.* Simon and Schuster.

Wolfe, A. (1998). *One nation after all: What do middle-class Americans think about God, family, poverty, racism, welfare, homosexuality, immigration, the left, the right, and each other*. Viking.

Webster (1996). *Webster's third new international dictionary, unabridged*. Miriam-Webster.