

A retrospective view from traditional to boundaryless career and career success

 **Filiz Karakus**

Independent Researcher, Istanbul, Turkey



ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 11 March 2021

Received in rev. form 17 April 2021

Accepted 20 April 2021

Keywords:

Boundaryless Career, Physical and Psychological Mobility, Career Competencies, Career Success, Career Management.

JEL Classification:

J24, J62

ABSTRACT

An increasingly dynamic career context has changed the nature of careers and led to the emergence of more autonomous and self-directed boundaryless careers. The common idea in different forms of boundaryless careers is mobility. Psychologically and physically mobile individuals start to manage their own careers in terms of their personal pursuits. In such a career environment, the nature of career success has also changed. The importance of subjective career success has been emphasized more than objective career success because only individuals themselves can meaningfully define and assess their career success with reference to their own self-defined standards, needs, and values in such an unstable environment. With the transmission of career responsibility to the individuals, the need to develop career competencies as knowing why competencies, knowing whom competencies, and knowing how competencies emerge in order to survive and become successful. This study reviews the theoretical background of career and the new career concepts as boundaryless career, within a constantly changing environment which makes it impossible to become successful unless gaining new competencies and survival methods. The new approaches to career success and main reasons behind the growing emphasis on subjective career success will also be examined.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Introduction

The economic and social structure of the world has been changed radically with the global competition, emergence of the 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).

Until the 1990s, there was a strong psychological contract between employers and employees in which employees gave their commitment in return for employers' career promises. In this period, organizations had the responsibility for planning and developing the careers of their employees. Under this traditional, relational contract, loyalty was traded for job security (DiRenzo, 2010, p. 2). However, career promises of organizations were broken after the 1990s.

* Corresponding author. ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0081-6478

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, in order 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 own 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 own career 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, and even occupation with respect to 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 have become unavoidable and new studies about the subject have started to be seen in the career literature. In this period new concepts 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 resulting effect on career outcomes and new perspectives on career success. The aim of this study is to review the career literature and recent articles about the career to give an insight regarding the changing nature of careers, emergence of the boundaryless career as a new career concept and new definitions and perspectives on the 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 emergence of career competencies as a new predictors 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 emergence of the boundaryless career as a new career concept will be discussed. Third, the career competencies and the definition of career success and new perspectives on the concept will be reviewed in a detailed way.

The Concept of “Career”

In this section different perspectives on the definition of career are reviewed in detail. The perspectives on traditional careers and emergence of the new career concepts will be reviewed in the next sections.

The roots of the term career comes from the French word 'carriere' which means road, racecourse. Etymologically, the word carriere, comes from the Latin word '(via) cararia' which means by road, carriage way (Arthur and Lawrance, 1984), which is originated from another Latin word 'carrus', meaning, 'wagon'. In many of the career studies, the concept of career is associated with roads, pathways, and an ongoing movement.

Career is always considered as an important concept in social sciences, which is not just interested in organizational studies but also in various disciplines as psychology, sociology, political sciences, economy, anthropology and educational sciences. Unlike many social science concepts, the concept “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 after 1970's, organizational studies' researchers have developed career theories and defined the concept by their own perspectives. We come across variable definitions of career with distinguishing emphasis, within the literature of different social science disciplines. As Bird (1994) suggests, the definition of career varies as the term crosses disciplinary boundaries. Arthur, et al. (1989) identify 11 separate descriptions of career within different disciplines. These descriptions are shown in Table 1.

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 the ways in which we see and experience other people, organizations, and society, and 'time' which gives career a moving perspective in the unfolding interaction between person and society. His definition reflects the relationship between people and the providers of official position, namely institutions or organizations and how these relationships fluctuate over time.

Table 1: Examples of Social Science Perspectives on the Career Concept

Psychology
Career as vocation: a viewpoint accepting the traditional psychological position on stability of personality in adulthood; associated theory is intended to help guide individuals and organizations fill job openings in a mutually satisfactory way (e.g., Holland, 1985). Career as vehicle for self-realization: a humanistic viewpoint focusing on the opportunities a career can provide for further individual growth and how that growth can in turn benefit organizations and society (e.g., Shephard, 1984). Career as a component of the individual life structure: from this viewpoint eras and transitions throughout the career are predictable and are to be accommodated in the work arrangements made (e.g., Levinson, 1984).
Social psychology
Career as an individually mediated response to outside role messages: a viewpoint that studies particular occupational circumstances, such as those of priests (Schneider and Hall, 1972) or scientists and engineers (Bailyn, 1980), for their psychological effects.
Sociology
Career as the unfolding of social roles: this viewpoint overlaps with social psychology but places greater emphasis on the individual's reciprocal contribution to the social order (e.g. Hughes, 1958; Van Maanen and Barley, 1984). Career as social mobility: seeing a person's title as an indicator of social position (e.g., Blau and Duncan, 1967; Featherman and Hauser, 1978; Warner and Abegglen, 1955).
Anthropology
Career as status passages: a viewpoint overlapping with functional sociology about how rites and ceremonies serve to maintain a society or culture over time (e.g., Glasser and Strauss, 1971).
Economics
Career as a response to market forces: a viewpoint emphasizing the near-term distribution of employment opportunities and the long-term accumulation of human capital (Doeringer and Piore, 1971).
Political science
Career as the enactment of self-interest: this view individual needs such as power, wealth, prestige, or autonomy as prominent objects of self-interested behavior in the context of institutional political realities (e.g., Kaufman, 1960).
History
Career as a correlate of historical outcomes: looking at the reciprocal influence of prominent people and period events on each other (e.g., Schlesinger, 1965).
Geography
Career as a response to geographic circumstances: focusing on variables such as availability of raw materials, a natural harbor, or a population ready for work or trade as they affect the way working lives unfold (e.g., Van Maanen, 1982).
Source: Arthur et al. (1989)

The definition of career also changes through the 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 work' which indicates that individuals identify themselves with their work. However, with the emergence of industrialization, modern technology and possibility to work in various kinds of jobs, individuals have given choice 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 Lawrence, 1984). Hirsh et al. (1995) define career as the sequence of work experiences, which individuals have over their working lives. Career could also be seen as the sequence of employment related positions, roles, activities, and experiences encountered by a person. Bird (1994), defines 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 career as the individually perceived sequence of attitudes and behaviors associated with work related experiences and activities over the span of 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 career offers a link between the individual's initial identity and final integrity over the course of 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, definition of the traditional (organizational) career, the changes through which new career concepts, especially boundaryless career are unfolding, will be discussed in a historical way.

The Traditional (Organizational) Career

Studies in the career literature show that 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 1980's assume a stable, rather than changing environment and more than three-quarters of the articles over both 1980's and early 1990's, 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.

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 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 is 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's journey (Hall and Chandler, 2005). The emphasis regarding traditional careers is on its conception to progress in a linear stage (Levinson, 1978). 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 a promotion, compensation, and 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 organization. Working under such a psychological contract, wherein there was a presumption of mutual loyalty between the employer and employee, career has been viewed as relatively stable and consistent in the later 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 as 'organizational career management' (Hirsh et al., 1995). The term organizational career management is also defined as various policies, deliberately established by organizations, to improve 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 own careers and development (Hirsh et al., 1995).

The Reasons of Change in Careers

Many scholars are interested in the changing nature of careers and the reasons behind it in the 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 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 refocusing on core activities, layering 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, 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 layering 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 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, have 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 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 the outsourcing practices, employees are not actually employed by the organization. Instead, they are employed by another organization holding a contract to deliver a certain service. Organizations are increasingly turning to outsourcing in an attempt to enhance their competitiveness, say Gilley and Rasheed (2000, p.763). Main reasons for outsourcing could be identified as cost saving, strategically focusing on their core competence, improving their technical services and the other services as human resources, etc. Actually, 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 individual's 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 increase in salary. In the 1980's the idea was that the 'core' workforce of a large organization would still have a high degree of employment security. Beginning in the 1980's and accelerating in the 1990's, 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 of direction of their employees to international careers are to develop high potential managers, enhancing organization's global perspective, controlling overseas subsidiaries, transferring technology, and setting 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, increasing career opportunities (Suutari, 2003).

Moreover, contemporary careers are shaped not only by the developments in the social, economic, and organizational realms, but also 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 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 personal responsibility for 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.

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) protean career concepts (Hall, 1996) have become widely acknowledged (Gubler et al., 2014). According to Inkson and Arthur (2001), capitalist careers means reversing the common view that companies invest in people, and instead seeing individuals as investors in companies. They state that to be a career capitalist is to manage one's own 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). Free agency model could be seen as a coping method for broken contracts. Hall (1976) defines 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 personal 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).

Boundaryless career, on the other hand, is simply defined as the sequences of job opportunities that go beyond the boundaries of single employment settings (DeFillippi & Arthur, 1996). The focus is on the independence from the boundaries of any organization. In this concept, both psychological and physical mobility are given high importance. 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 as 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 Academy of Management in 1993. After the proposal, Journal of Organizational Behavior published a special issue and wider book collection in 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 the boundaryless organizations (DeFillippi and Arthur, 1994).

The boundaryless career concept is based primarily on the writings of M. Arthur and his colleagues that began in the mid -1990s (Greenhaus et al., 2010, p.23). Their studies (Arthur, 1994; Arthur, and Lawrence, 1989; Arthur, and Rousseau, 1996; DeFillippi, 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, 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).

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. Boundaryless career is also defined as the sequences 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 boundaries of an organization and even a country. Careers have become flexible, transitional, the dynamics of the restructuring blur the tidy and former routes for success (forcing new perspective of what is 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:

- *Careers that involve mobility across the boundaries of separate employers*
- *Careers that draw validation or marketability from outside the current employer*
- *Careers that depend more on external networks and information than internal structures*
- *Careers where hierarchical reporting and advancement principles are broken*
- *Careers that are primarily constructed around personal and family commitments*
- *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 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
Responsibility for career management:	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 boundaryless career involves six different dimensions. Almost all of the dimensions are about mobility. Mobility in the boundaryless career examined in terms of two dimensions as 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 about the emphasis on physical mobility. First one is that researchers appear to perceive boundaryless careers as only physical mobility. They have examined physical mobility between jobs, employers or industries. They undermine psychological mobility. Second one is that researchers may find it easier to measure physical mobility (e.g., counting the number of times someone changed jobs, employers 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 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 traditional (organizational) career which generally secures life-long employment with a career plan which is developed by organization through which employer will climb up the ladders of hierarchy with 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 career 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 own 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, in the new conditions employees have developed a high sense of consciousness around their individualism and started to become their own career managers. Employees can have the 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 divided into three classes of variables, as knowing why competencies, knowing whom competencies, and 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 through knowing why competencies. Taking into consideration of 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 an important criteria to survive and to become 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 from their 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, which is 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 includes both the relationships with others related to the organization in which individual works (suppliers, customers, etc.) and personal connections independent from the organization (social acquaintances, and family 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 encourage the emergence of new career competencies. From knowing why standpoint, organizational contexts are disconfirming traditional beliefs about the stability of jobs and employment. From knowing how standpoint, emerging organizational contexts are demanding continuous change in people's skills and knowledge, including the pursuit of new knowledge through 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 is 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.

As a conclusion, boundaryless career can provide full benefits only to individuals who are able to 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 which 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 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 career. According to Gattiker, and Larwood (1988), subjective career success criteria reflects personal standards and preferences, such as whether an individual most prefers to have solitude or social stimulation. In the traditional careers, mostly other 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 organizational hierarchy to positions of greater authority. However, those engaged in the boundaryless career are much more inclined to set their own career agenda and determine yardsticks by which its 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 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):

- Status and rank (hierarchical position)
- Material success (wealth, property, earning capacity)
- Social reputation and regard, prestige, influence
- Knowledge and skills
- Friendships, network connections
- 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 career success. Arthur et al. (2005) draw attention on 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 a number of 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 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 since the last two decades, because of the changes in the organizations and the conceptualization of career (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, 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, construction workers - may overlap, but as they quote from 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 fulfillments and personal meanings come into this category (Nicholson, and Waal-Andrews, 2005, p. 141). Nicholson and Waal-Andrews (2005) figure out six of subjective career success as follows:

- Pride in achievement
- Intrinsic job satisfaction
- Self-worth
- Commitment to work role or institution
- Fulfilling relationships
- 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 of one's career (Seibert, et al., 1999). A sense of identity, purpose, and work-life balance are also important criterions of subjective career success (Heslin, 2005). Hall, and Chandler (2005, pp.158) state that subjective career success develops in a cyclical fashion 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 with reference to their own self-defined standards, needs, values, career stages, and aspirations in the highly heterogeneous, mobile and unique career paths. Basically, career success is defined as the positive psychological or work-related outcomes or achievements one accumulates as a result of work experiences in the boundaryless career (Seibert, et al., 1999, p. 417). According to Hall, and Chandler (2005), subjective career measures, such as job satisfaction, self-awareness and 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 which 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 a 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 employee's personal goals.

Career satisfaction is an important concept especially after 1980's 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). Srikanth, and Israel (2012) argue that career satisfaction may be attributed to development of competencies associated with one's job that may provide opportunity to career advancements. They further argue that low performance ratings, low overall rankings, less challenging assignments, less responsibilities, less recognition compared to other fellow colleagues can lead to low career satisfaction.

On the other hand, Korman et al. (1981) believe that career dissatisfaction can possibly lead to employee's 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 is increasing in advanced industrial economies. The increase is even much more for women than men. This condition creates 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 with work and family and put forward the concept of 'life balance' with broader perspective. In the work-life balance concept, especially three basic areas of life are taken into consideration including work, family, and private. Work demands work hours, work intensity, and 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 sees work as the objective, others consider "living to work" and situated work into 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 have a negative effect on work-life balance. According to Porter (1996) workaholics who are considered as 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 the 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 subtract 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 of career success (Arthur, and Rousseau, 1996). Because jobs and career patterns are less long term and stable, individuals who are able to 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 market place (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. Individuals who are successful are those who are able to 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-Olivira, 2005).

With jobs and career patterns being less long term and stable, individuals who are successful are those who are able to remain 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 the communication technologies, and unstable economic environment lead to changes in organizational structures of the companies. They are required to be more flexible and adaptable to survive in such conditions. Much of the companies started to use strategies such as downsizing, decentralization, layering, and outsourcing. These strategies result in changing working conditions, questioning of the definition of career concept 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 are guaranteed by 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 which employees could develop their career capital in return to their labor. Responsibility of career management is transformed from organizational management to the shoulders of employees. Boundaryless career concepts emerged in such conditions after the 1990's. Boundaryless career 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 traditional career to 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 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 organizational era*. Oxford University Press.
- Arthur, M.B., Khapova, S.N., & Wilderom, C.P.M. (2005). Career success in a boundaryless career world. *Journal of Organizational 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 1990's. *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 and practices: 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 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 Organizational Behavior*. 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. Rousseau Eds.). 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 and empirical 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 changing boundaries. *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 Organizational Behavior*. 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*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150403>
- Delecta, P. (2011). Work-life balance. *International Journal of Current Research*. 3(4), 186-189. <http://www.journalcra.com>
- DiRenzo, M. (2010). An examination of the roles of protean career orientation and career capital work and life outcomes, *Unpublished Doctoral Thesis*. Drexel University.
- 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). *Internal 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 Organizational Behavior*. 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 Organizational Psychology*. 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(95)90002-0)
- Galinsky, E., & Friedman, D. (1993). *National study of the changing workforce*. Families & Work Institute. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(95\)90002-0](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](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. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Richard-Klimoski/publication/267796178_Handbook_of_Industrial_and_Organizational_Psychology/links/55366e590cf268fd00183fce/Handbook-of-Industrial-and-Organizational-Psychology.pdf
- 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](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 organisations: 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](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](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 successful career capitalist. *Organizational Dynamics*. 30 (1), 48.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(01\)00040-7](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). Macro Approaches. Sage Publications.
- Jen Ruei-Fu. (2010). Is information technology career unique? Exploring differences in career commitment and its determinants among 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. Jossey-Bass.
- Lei, D., & Hitt, M. (1995). Strategic restructuring and outsourcing: The effect of mergers and acquisitions and LBOs on building firm 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 life 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733(86)90003-1)
- Maryhofer, W., Meyer, M., Iellatchith, A., & Schiffringer, 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 for 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: A new 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 viewed from 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 edn.). Jossey Bass.
- Mohrman, S. A., & Cohen, S. G. (1995). *When people get out of the box: New relationships, new systems*. (A. Howard Ed.). Changing nature of work. Jossey-Bass.
- Murrell, 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 of career 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 the civil society*. (M. B. Arthur, & D. M. Rousseau, Eds.). The boundaryless 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 taxonomy of 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.). Boundaryless career: A new employment for a new principal era. Oxford University Press.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Sage Publications.
- 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 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.). Broken ladders. 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 of 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 Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*. 49(1), 137-149. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23509772>
- Srikanth, P.B., & Israel, D. (2012). Career commitment and career success: Mediating role of career satisfaction. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*. 49 (1), 137-149. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23509772>
- 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](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. *Human Resource Management Review*. 8, 165-185. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(98\)80003-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(98)80003-X)

- Suutari, V. (2003). Global managers: Career orientation, career tracks, life-style 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 Group Publishing.
- Tyson, S., & York, A. (1989). *Personnel management*. (2nd edn.). 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124168201100102>
- 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 and work-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 middle-class Americans really 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*. Merdam-Webster.

Publisher's Note: SSBFNET stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478) by SSBFNET is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.