

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR BOUNDARYLESS AND PROTEAN CAREERS: WHAT DO HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGERS MAKE DIFFERENTLY?

Meltem ONAY*

Burcin ATASEVEN**

Abstract

This study seeks to present a guideline to human resources managers in order to help them while planning their employees' careers. Survey method was conducted to 223 employees in foreign invested and domestic companies in order to determine their career attitudes (values-driven career attitude, self-directed career attitude, organizational mobility and boundaryless mindset), personality characteristics (career authenticity, openness to experience, proactive personality, goal orientation), and demographic indicators (gender, age, marital status, education, having children, job status, job turnover, organization tenure, job tenure). Our research consists of three sections. In first section there were no differences between foreign invested and domestic companies based on *career attitudes preferences*. In second section the results found support for that the people with "career authenticity" and "goal orientation" prefer "*psychological satisfaction*" while the people with "proactive personality" and "openness to experience" prefer "*physical satisfaction*". In last section there were differences only between *age* groups and employees *having children* based on their career attitudes and personality characteristics.

* Assoc. Prof. Dr., University of Celal Bayar School of Applied Sciences.

** PhD Student, University of Celal Bayar School of Applied Sciences.

1. Login

It is a reality of management science that a person and its efforts in today's working life are main elements of all organizations' success. The qualified personnel's expectations from the organization and their viewpoints to the job relationships have changed significantly. Sabuncuğlu in (2000:27) said the following: A person can not be adapted to some measures and standards unlike other inputs in the organization can not be ordered, measurement of its quality is not easy as expected, and employing a person at full capacity can not be programmed as a machine.

For companies not only the employees' doing their jobs is important but also they should improve and develop themselves continuously and should assign to teamwork. However, for employees the factors such as making progress in their jobs, earning more money, taking responsibility, prestige, esteem and power are getting more important. Soysal's (2007:95) study stated the following: Realization of the changes and innovations is possible only by developing the knowledge, skills, competencies and motives of the employees and by planning their careers in the organization. In this regard, efficient career planning and development activities are necessary for employees to be more productive, to get knowledge and skills in order to cope with new economic changes, and for human resources managers to encourage the employees' creativities and to increase their effectiveness.

According to Gürüz and Gürel (2006:233), "Career planning is a process requiring a person's evaluation of its own knowledge, interest, values, strengths and weaknesses, defining of career opportunities within and outside the organization, determining of short, middle and long term objectives, establishing of activities plans, and applying of these activities. Career planning is a problem solving and decision making process intending to set the most suitable relationship between the employees' values, needs and job experiences and opportunities. In career planning not only the employees, but also the organization management and human resources managers have responsibility". In addition to their responsibilities, they have to find new ways to frame their understandings of new concepts, definitions, theories and methodologies about career and various career development measures.

Within this broad field of interest in career, the human resources managers face a major problem in career planning as Collin (1998:413) stated “if you can’t measure it, you can’t manage it”.

The only way to measure career is understanding of the employees’ career attitudes. Unless the managers and the employees understand exactly the employees’ career attitudes preferences and their personality characteristics, then it can be said that career planning in that organization would be meaningless. According to Werther & Davis (1996:310), “When employees in the organizations ask questions such as “*which career attitude do I prefer?*” and “*what is my personality characteristics?*”, then the career planning activities will be started by the organization”.

This research questions initiate this study. Our argument divided into three parts. The first part reviews the career concept, including boundaryless and protean career, and key attributes of career theory (personality characteristics, demographic indicators) which are relevant to career planning. The second part looks at the extent to which these attributes have differentiated in domestic and foreign invested companies. Finally, in the last part our study offers a guideline for Human Resources Managers to select the personnel more consciously and/or to increase the current personnel’s job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness through an efficient career planning.

2. Boundaryless Career

The concept of the boundaryless career, first introduced in a special edition of the Journal of Organizational Behavior (Arthur, 1994; Pringle, & Mallon, 2003), and further developed in a 1996 edited collection (Arthur, & Rousseau, 1996) has proved to be a remarkably popular concept. It has resonated with theorists and practitioners alike, perhaps because it emerged at a time of uncertainty about career futures. Workers outside of the traditional career model, who have “boundaryless careers”, are becoming the norm rather than the exception (Arthur, & Rousseau, 1996; DeFilippi, & Arthur, 1994; Hall, 1996; Miles, & Snow, 1996; Osterman, 1984; Osterman, 1994). Whereas the traditional career was defined as professional advancement within one or two firms, a boundaryless career is defined as Sullivan

(1999:458) stated “..... a sequence of job opportunities that go beyond the boundaries of a single employment setting”.

Boundaryless careers are broadly described as Arthur, & Rousseau (1996:5) said “the opposite of organizational careers - (that is, of) careers conceived to unfold in a single employment setting”. Indeed, Arthur, & Rousseau use the term to characterize “a range of possible forms that defies traditional employment assumptions”. Boundaryless careers’ theorizing has enlivened career research since 1994. It promises a more flexible frame for conceptualizing careers beyond organizational boundaries.

The notion of boundaryless careers arose from attempts to transform the ways in which we think, talk and practice careers and had its main expression in the Arthur and Rousseau book *The Boundaryless Career*. At the hearth of “boundaryless careers” is the definition of all careers as Pringle, & Mallon said “sequences of work experiences over time”. This is consistent with the definition used in the handbook of career theory (Arthur, Hall, & Lawrence, 1989:6).

The term boundaryless career was developed to distinguish such careers from the “bounded” or “organizational career” and thus to avoid the subordination of the meaning of careers to those which unfold mainly in large, stable firms. Arthur, Hall, & Lawrence’s (1989:6) study expressed the following: The general meaning of boundaryless careers involves several specific meanings and go on to suggest six much meaning: moving across organizations and employers; drawing validation and marketability from outside the present employer; being sustained by external networks; where traditional organizational career boundaries have been broken; where patterns of paid work are broken for family or personal reasons; where an individual perceives a boundaryless future regardless of structural constraints. The meanings all have in common the notion of “independence from, rather than dependence on, traditional organizational career arrangement”.

3. Protean Career

These perspectives on boundaryless careers are consistent with similar categorizations of careers, specifically protean careers (Mirvis, & Hall, 1996; Dowd, & Kaplan, 2005). According to Arthur (1994:304), “The au-

thors' focus on psychological success returns career scholars to a familiar viewpoint, but through lenses distinctly crafted from boundaryless career materials". Some authors have considered the boundaryless career as involving only physical changes in work arrangements. In contrast, other authors have considered the protean career concept as involving only psychological changes. However, Sullivan, & Arthur (2006:20) said that "this separation between physical (or objective) career changes and psychological (or subjective) career changes neglects the interdependence between the physical and psychological career worlds". Hall's (1996:8) study stated the following: Psychological success involves making sense of forever-changing organizational attachments. The ultimate goal of the career is psychological success, the feeling of pride and personal accomplishment that comes from achieving one's most important goals in life, be they achievement, family happiness, inner peace, or something else. This is in contrast to vertical success under the old career contract, where the goal was climbing the corporate pyramid and making a lot of money. While there is only one way to achieve vertical success (making it to the top), there are infinite ways to achieve psychological success, as many ways as there are unique human needs.

According to Arthur (1994:304), "Identities less dependent on the firm, and employment contracts more transactional than relational, each shift the locus of responsibility to the career actor. Emergent questions invite new kinds of career research, and a greater emphasis on a "protean" or self-developing conception of the career actor". The career of the 21st century will be protean; a career that is driven by the person, not the organization, and that will be reinvented by the person from time to time, as the person and the environment change (Hall, 1996).

Dowd, & Kaplan (2005:702) stated that "a key element of protean careers, to be considered here, is the role of the organization in career development. This concept is built on the belief that individuals, not organizations, are responsible for managing their own careers". Pursuing the protean career requires a high level of self-awareness and personal responsibility. Many people cherish the autonomy of the protean career, but many others find this freedom terrifying, experiencing it as a lack of external support. Hall (1996:10) expressed the following: The positive potential of the new protean career is described by David Noer: "The relationship is still win-win,

but it is more equal. The employee does not blindly trust the organization with his or her career. The organization does not assume an unassumable burden. The tremendous energy once required to maintain relationships can be turned to doing good work. The common ground, the meeting point, is not the relationship but the explicit task. This task-focused relationship is not only healthier for the individual and the organization, it also facilitates the diversity necessary for future survival, since the emphasis is on the task, not on the gender, race or traits of the person performing the task”.

The protean career centers on Hall’s 1976, 1996, 2002 conception of psychological success resulting from individual career management, as opposed to career development by the organization. A protean career has been characterized as Briscoe et al. (2006:31) stated “involving greater mobility, a more whole-life perspective, and a developmental progression”. Scholars have emphasized physical mobility across boundaries at the cost of neglecting psychological mobility and its relationship to physical mobility.

4. Empirical Researches on the Protean and Boundaryless Career

Since the publication of Arthur and Rousseau’s book, a number of researchers have focused on boundaryless and protean career. Dowd, & Kaplan’s research (2005) developed a typology of four academic career types that identifies what differentiates tenure-track individuals who perceive themselves as having either bounded or boundaryless careers in academia.

Marler, Barringer, & Milkovich (2002:426) found support for distinguish between two types of contingent workers; boundaryless and traditional result also show that the performance of traditional temporaries is more sensitive to attitudes than boundaryless temporaries and after controlling for level of work satisfaction, traditional temporaries reported higher task and contextual performance. They discussed the implications of these findings for theory development, organization practice and public policy.

Gunz, Evans, & Jalland (2000) explored the boundaries, structural and personal, that constrain the individual’s career path. They took a labor market perspective of boundaries as an imperfection in the free and unfettered flow of labor. They used these similarities and differences to begin the process of developing a contingency theory of career boundaries.

Counsell (1999:47) explored the career perceptions and behaviors of Ethiopian careerists and, compared their career strategies with those of UK careerists.

Goffee, & Scase (1992:365) explored in their paper the attitudes of managers toward their careers in the context of restructuring processes which limit opportunities for hierarchical advancement and which also reduce job security and they discussed the ways in which those whose career expectations have been frustrated develop coping strategies.

Murrell, Frieze, & Olson (2002:326) examined in their research the impact of work and non-work related mobility on salary, promotions, job satisfaction and organizational commitment among 671 male and female managers over a 7-year period.

Hall, & Moss (1998:25) addressed in their research the question, “how an organization and its employees can adapt in a satisfying and productive way to new dynamics?”, by sharing the “observations from the trenches” of 49 people they interviewed about changes in what can be called the “psychological contract” in their organizations. To gain a balanced picture, they interviewed individuals in organizations selected to represent a range of adjustment periods, i.e. length of time elapsed since a major business crisis or environmental shock to the present.

As previously noted, it is relatively easy to measure physical mobility, but it is more difficult to measure psychological mobility. Briscoe et al. (2006:31) constructed and developed four new scales to measure protean and boundaryless career attitudes. They have characterized protean career as involving a values-driven attitude (using own values to guide career) and a self-directed attitude (taking independent role in managing vocational behavior) toward career management. And they have characterized boundaryless career as involving boundaryless mindset attitude (one’s general attitude to working across organizational boundaries) and organizational mobility attitude (the strength of interest in remaining with a single or multiple employer.

5. Key Attributes of Boundaryless and Protean Career

Following more conventional approaches to careers, researches have tended to focus on the question: “What factors, such as personality and demographic characteristics, influence an individual’s preference related to their boundaryless and protean career attitudes?”. Much of the work on this question has concentrated on gender, age, marital status, having children, education, tenure, and job turnover as demographic indicators and on proactive personality, openness to experience, goal orientation and career authenticity as personality characteristics.

6. The Model, Participants, and Measures of the Study

The model developed to define the factors which are influential in the protean and boundaryless career attitudes preferences is illustrated in Figure 1. According to the study’s model it is thought that Human Resources Managers should consider three variables while planning the employees’ careers. These variables are employees’ career attitude preferences, personality characteristics, and employees’ demographic indicators.

6.1. Participants

The study was done in four companies in Manisa which is a fourth biggest city in Turkey. The two of given companies are domestic companies; the other two are foreign invested companies. The first of domestic companies is an organization doing business in public sector. The second is a huge company developing fast in white goods/electronics sector and making exports to the world market with 14000 employees.

The one of foreign invested companies is a company which has entered to Turkish market newly in tobacco sector. The other is a company in white goods/electronics sector which is doing business in Turkish market for several years. The reasons to choose these four companies as sample group are:

- Four companies are in the same city,

- In order to explain the differences two companies, one domestic and the other foreign invested, were chosen from the same sector as total two sectors and therefore four companies,
- These companies gave permissions us to do study (random sampling).

General information about the four companies was given in Appendix. The demographic indicators of the employees were shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Indicators of the Employees

	Frequency	Percentage		Frequency	Percentage
<u>Companies</u>			<u>Education</u>		
Tekel	45	20,2	Primary School	1	0,5
Vestel 1	88	39,4	High School	66	29,8
Vestel 2	28	12,6	University	128	57,9
Imperial	41	18,4	Master Degree	25	11,3
Indesit	21	9,4	PhD.	1	0,5
Total	223	100	Total	221	100
<u>Age</u>			<u>Organization Tenure</u>		
≤ 20	1	0,5	< 1 year	19	8,7
21-30	99	44,7	1-5 years	89	40,6
31-40	75	34	6-10 years	33	15,1
41-50	34	15,4	11-15 years	33	15,1
≥ 51	12	5,4	≥ 16 years	45	20,5
Total	223	100	Total	219	100
<u>Gender</u>			<u>Job Tenure</u>		
Woman	85	38,6	< 1 year	6	2,7
Man	135	61,4	1-5 years	51	23,1
Total	220	100	6-10 years	47	21,3
			11-15 years	52	23,5
			≥ 16 years	65	29,4
			Total	221	100
<u>Marital Status</u>			<u>Job Turnover</u>		
Married	137	62,6	1 job	77	35,6
Single	72	32,8	2 jobs	63	29,2
Divorced	10	4,6	3 jobs	46	21,3
Total	219	100	≥ 4 jobs	30	13,9
			Total	216	100
<u>Having Children</u>			<u>Job Status</u>		
Yes	113	51,8	High Level Managers	7	3,2
No	105	48,2	Middle Level Managers	41	18,7
Total	218	100	Specialist	87	39,7
			Asis. Specialist	23	10,5
			Staff	44	20,1
			Other	17	7,8
			Total	219	100

6.2. Measures and Procedures

The study was started in January 2008 and ended in February. Before beginning the study, an interview was made with the companies' Human Resources Managers and required permissions were taken. At the questionnaire process, Human Resources Managers brought the employees together who were selected before in a convention room and distributed them the questionnaires. The researchers were in the same room and answered the questions the employees asked by making some required explanations. For that reason, it is thought that the research results would be reliable. In the study;

- "Career Attitudes Scale" developed by Briscoe et al. (2006) was used in order to measure the employees' career attitudes preferences, (α coefficients; for self-directed score 0,81; for values-driven score 0,80; for boundaryless mindset score 0,82; for organizational mobility 0,76)
- "Proactive Personality" was measured using a 17-item scale (Bateman, & Crant, 1993). "Openness to experience" was measured using a 10-item scale (Benet-Martinez, & John, 1998). "Career authenticity" was measured using a 5-item scale (Sheldon et al., 1987). "Goal orientation" was measured using a 20-item scale (Button et al., 1996). (α coefficients; for career authenticity score 0,64; for proactive personality score 0,78; for goal orientation score 0,84; for openness to experience 0,80)
- The employees' "age, marital status, having children, organization tenure, job position, gender, education, job tenure, job turnover" variables were taken into account in order to explore the differences between the employees' demographic indicators and career attitudes preferences.

The questionnaire form consists of three sections. In the first section there are questions about the employees' demographic indicators. In the second section there are 27 questions intended to measure the employees' career attitudes preferences. The career attitudes preference is evaluated in two subgroups as "protean" and "boundaryless" career. The one of the two variables aimed to explain protean (psychological) career attitudes is to be "self-directed" and the other is to be "values-driven". There are 14 items to meas-

ure these two variables in the questionnaire. An example of a self-directed item is “*When development opportunities have not been offered by my company, I’ve sought them out on my own.*” One values-driven item is “*What I think about what is right in my career is more important to me than what my company thinks.*” The one of the two variables explaining the boundaryless (physical) career attitudes is “boundaryless mindset” and the other is “organizational mobility”. There are 13 items to measure these two variables in the questionnaire. An example of boundaryless mindset item is “*I would enjoy working on projects with people from across many organizations.*” One organizational mobility item is “*I prefer to stay in a company I am familiar with rather than look for employment elsewhere.*”

In the third section the employees’ personality characteristics are examined in four subgroups:

- Career authenticity (An example item is “*I am only this way because I have to be*”)
- Proactive personality (*I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life*)
- Goal orientation (*I’m happiest at work when I perform tasks on which I know that I won’t make any errors*)
- Openness to experience (*I am a person who is original and comes up with new ideas*)

5-likert scale was used in the questionnaire, so the employees should give an answer between “strongly disagree (1)” and “strongly agree (5)”.

7. Results and Discussions

The research consists of three sections.

Section 1: According to the answers 220 employees in the sample group gave related to their protean and boundaryless career attitudes preferences it is seen that they marked mostly “neither agree nor disagree” option (means = protean career attitudes 3,5252; boundaryless career attitudes 3,2942). So, it can be seen that employees in the sample prefer neither boundaryless career attitudes nor protean career attitudes. Its reason may be derived from the fact

that the employees are not aware of the boundaryless and protean career concepts. Table 2 displays the results of correlation analysis between the four career attitudes. In Table 3 the results of the correlation analysis by sample are given in order to determine the relationship between the employees' career attitudes.

Table 2: Correlation Analysis

Variable	1	2	3	4
Self-directed	1			
Values-driven	0,327**	1		
Boundaryless mindset	0,399**	0,273**	1	
Organizational mobility	- 0,209**	0,105	0,080	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3: Correlation Analysis by Sample

Variable	1	2	3	4
Tekel				
Self-directed	1			
Values-driven	0,280	1		
Boundaryless mindset	0,609**	0,389**	1	
Organizational mobility	- 0,441**	-0,069	0,086	1
Vestel 1				
Self-directed	1			
Values-driven	0,246*	1		
Boundaryless mindset	0,251*	0,213*	1	
Organizational mobility	-0,100	0,179	0,247*	1
Vestel 2				
Self-directed	1			
Values-driven	0,602**	1		
Boundaryless mindset	0,738**	0,506**	1	
Organizational mobility	0,211	0,179	0,045	1
Imperial				
Self-directed	1			
Values-driven	0,305	1		
Boundaryless mindset	0,350*	-0,049	1	
Organizational mobility	-0,288	0,213	-0,271	1
Indesit				
Self-directed	1			
Values-driven	0,462*	1		
Boundaryless mindset	0,262	0,666**	1	
Organizational mobility	-0,209	0,292	0,237	1

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

In the research four hypotheses were developed in order to explore whether there is any difference between domestic and foreign invested companies based on the employees' boundaryless and protean career attitudes. These are;

Hypothesis 1: "There are differences between domestic and foreign invested companies based on the employees' self-directed career attitudes preferences."

Hypothesis 2: "There are differences between domestic and foreign invested companies based on the employees' values-driven career attitudes preferences."

Hypothesis 3: "There are differences between domestic and foreign invested companies based on the employees' boundaryless mindset career attitudes preferences."

Hypothesis 4: "There are differences between domestic and foreign invested companies based on the employees' mobility career attitudes preferences."

According to the answers the employees gave related to their protean and boundaryless career attitudes preferences it is seen that there isn't any difference between the companies. In Table 4 the means and the results of ANOVA analysis are given.

Table 4: Means and the Results of ANOVA analysis

	Companies					Sig.
	Tekel	Vestel 1	Vestel2	Imperial	Indesit	
Self directed	3.87	3.63	3.72	3.91	3.64	,075
Value driven	3.53	3.21	3.42	3.24	3.23	,156
Boundaryless mindset	3.92	3.90	3.92	3.76	3.99	,635
Organizational mobility	2.45	2.73	2.87	2.75	2.83	,180
Protean career	3.70	3.42	3.57	3.58	3.44	,071
Boundaryless career	3.19	3.31	3.40	3.25	3.41	,380

Protean career attitude and boundaryless career attitude are theoretically related. Therefore, correlation analyses were conducted to assess the relationships between the four subgroups based on the companies. Because the sample was composed of five different groups (Tekel, Vestel 1, Vestel 2, Imperial, Indesit), correlations were also conducted separately by group to determine how the relationships may differ by sample (Table 3).

Table 2 displays the results of correlation analysis between the four career attitudes for the total sample. As would be expected, significant correlation exists between the two scores representing a protean career attitude; self-directed and values-driven ($r=0,327$, $p<0,01$). These two scores in turn showed significant correlation with boundaryless mindset score (self-directed $r=0,399$, $p<0,01$; values-driven $r=0,273$, $p<0,01$). However, in the combined sample, the values-driven score and the boundaryless mindset score showed no significant correlation with organizational mobility, and self-directed score and organizational mobility actually exhibited a negative correlation ($r= - 0,209$, $p<0,01$).

Because the five samples represent individuals in varied career stages, the underlying relationships of interest between these variables could occur differently in the different samples. Table 3 displays the correlations between the four career attitudes for each subsample. While the two protean career attitude scores correlate significantly with each other in Vestel 1, Vestel 2 and Indesit (Vestel 1 $r=0,246$, $p<0,05$; Vestel 2 $r=0,602$, $p<0,01$; Indesit $r=0,462$, $p<0,05$) they exhibit no correlation in Tekel and Imperial. The two boundaryless career attitude scores exhibit moderate correlation in only Vestel 1 ($r=0,247$, $p<0,05$). Meanwhile, the protean career attitude scores show significant correlations with boundaryless mindset in Tekel and Vestel 2 (Tekel self-directed $r=0,609$, $p<0,01$; values-driven $r=0,389$, $p<0,01$; Vestel 2 self-directed $r=0,738$, $p<0,01$; values-driven $r=0,506$, $p<0,01$), moderate correlations with this boundaryless career attitude score in Vestel 1 (self-directed $r=0,251$, $p<0,05$; values-driven $r=0,213$, $p<0,05$). In Imperial only self-directed score shows moderate correlation with boundaryless mindset ($r=0,350$, $p<0,05$), and in Indesit only values-driven score shows significant correlation with the same boundaryless career attitude score ($r=0,666$, $p<0,01$). However, in looking at the correlations between the protean career attitude score and the organizational mobility score across the

five groups, significant negative correlation was found only between self-directed and organizational mobility in Tekel ($r = -0,441$, $p < 0,01$).

According to the ANOVA analysis results done to assess which one of the protean and boundaryless career attitudes the employees prefer more in domestic and foreign invested companies it is seen that there isn't any difference between the companies (Table 4);

“There are differences between domestic and foreign invested companies based on the employees' self-directed career attitudes preferences” statement as stated in Hypothesis 1 can be rejected because of the ANOVA analysis result where significant value $p = 0.075 > 0.05$.

“There are differences between domestic and foreign invested companies based on the employees' values-driven career attitudes preferences” statement as stated in Hypothesis 2 can be rejected because significant value $p = 0.156 > 0.05$.

“There are differences between domestic and foreign invested companies based on the employees' boundaryless mindset career attitudes preferences” statement as stated in Hypothesis 3 can be rejected because significant value $p = 0.635 > 0.05$.

“There are differences between domestic and foreign invested companies based on the employees' mobility career attitudes preferences” statement as stated in Hypothesis 4 can be rejected because significant value $p = 0.180 > 0.05$.

Section 2: While looking at the descriptive statistics, it is seen that the employees in the sample gave high points to “to be goal oriented” of four personality characteristics (mean=4.0694, Table 5).

In order to determine whether there is any difference between companies based on the employees' personality characteristics one hypothesis is developed:

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of Personality Characteristics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Career authenticity	223	1.60	5.00	3.8007	.71632
Proactive personality	223	2.47	4.88	3.8045	.41863
Goal orientation	223	1.90	5.00	4.0694	.42397
Openness to experience	218	2.20	5.00	3.8766	.55770

Hypothesis 1: “There is a difference between companies based on the employees’ personality characteristics”. According to the descriptive statistics done to explore the personality characteristics of the employees in each of the companies it is seen that (Table 6);

Table 6: The Personality Characteristics of the Employees in the Companies

	Sector					Sig.
	Tekel	Vestel 1	Vestel 2	Imperial	Indesit	
Career authenticity	3.37	3.85	4.07	4.00	3.78	,000
Proactive personality	3.81	3.81	3.87	3.80	3.71	,790
Goal orientation	4.09	4.08	4.04	4.08	4.00	,390
Openness to experience	3.78	3.88	3.97	3.98	3.77	,075

- The individuals who can change their careers by being affected from outside (career authenticity) are in “X2 company”,
- The individuals with proactive personality are in “X2 company”,
- The individuals who are goal oriented are in “W company”,
- The individuals who are open to experience are in “Y company”.

In order to test Hypothesis 1, ANOVA analysis was done. According to the result it is seen that there is a difference between companies only based on the “career authenticity” ($p=0.000<0.05$). It means that the employees in Vestel 2 are more authentic in their careers. However, Hypothesis 1 can be rejected, because there is a difference between companies based on only one personality characteristic.

The correlation analysis results done to determine the relationships between personality characteristics and career attitudes preferences will be explained in discussion (Table 7).

Table 7: Correlation Analysis Between Personality Characteristics and Boundaryless and Protean Career Attitudes

	Self directed	Value driven	Boundaryless mindset	Organizational mobility	Protean career	Boundaryless career
Career authenticity	.285(**)	-.070	.086	.059	.112	.096
Proactive personality	.572(**)	.271(**)	.471(**)	-.125	.500(**)	.178(**)
Goal orientation	.475(**)	.116	.454(**)	-.231(**)	.342(**)	.087
Openness to experience	.411(**)	.152(*)	.357(**)	-.014	.331(**)	.199(**)

- It is seen that the people who change their careers by being affected externally prefer “self-directed attitude” more. One of the interesting findings in the analyses is that the employees with this personality characteristics (career authentic) make their decisions on their own despite they can be affected from outside in their career decisions ($r=0.285$, $p<0.01$). According to the correlation analyses there is a negative relationship between “career authenticity” and “values-driven” career attitudes ($r = -0.070$, $p>0.05$). So, it can be said that the people who make their final decision on their own are not “values-driven”.

- The people with “proactive personality” give priority to both psychological and physical satisfactions in their career attitudes preferences. These people feel “psychological satisfaction” when they direct their works on their own and when they didn’t give any compromise from their values (self-directed $r=0,572$, $p<0,01$; values-driven $r=0,271$, $p<0,01$). At the same time, they feel “physical satisfaction” when they work at different projects having “boundaryless mindset” ($r=0,471$, $p<0,01$). But we can say that these people don’t prefer boundaryless mobility because there is a negative correlation between “organizational mobility” and “proactive personality” factors ($r= -0.125$, $p>0.05$).

- The “goal-oriented” people feel “psychological satisfaction” when they direct their careers on their own ($r=0.475$, $p<0.01$). Despite of the negative correlation between “goal orientation” and “organizational mobility” ($r=$

- 0.231, $p < 0.01$) it can be said that these people could be happy when they work at different projects and works.

- The people who are open to experience care both psychological and physical satisfaction in their career attitudes preferences. It can be said that these people feel “psychological

satisfaction” when they direct their careers on their own and when they don’t give any compromise from their values (self directed $r = 0.411$, $p < 0.01$; values-driven $r = 0.152$, $p < 0.05$). But although these people are happy and willing at working at different projects and they don’t prefer organizational mobility (boundaryless mindset $r = 0.357$, $p < 0.01$; organizational mobility $r = -0.014$, $p > 0.05$).

Personality characteristics can be divided into two groups based on psychological and physical satisfaction. So, it can be assumed that the people with “career authenticity” and “goal orientation” prefer “psychological satisfaction” while the people with “proactive personality” and “openness to experience” prefer “physical satisfaction”. According to the correlation results in Table 7’s last two columns; (the last two column is found by calculating the averages of career attitudes which constitute them; for example protean career is the average of self-directed and values-driven attitudes)

- The goal oriented employees prefer psychological satisfaction ($r = 0.352$, $p < 0.01$),

- The employees who have a proactive personality and who are open to experience prefer both psychological and physical satisfaction (proactive personality $r = 0.500$, $p < 0.01$; $r = 0.178$, $p < 0.01$, openness to experience $r = 0.331$, $p < 0.01$; $r = 0.199$, $p < 0.01$).

Proactive personality correlates highly with three measures. This seems to validate the ideas that those with protean and boundaryless career attitudes are in fact agentic in their career posture, not willing to wait for events to control them. In a similar vein, the strong positive relationship between goal orientation, openness to experience and three of the new career attitude measures indicates that those demonstrating these attitudes are interested in pursuing goals that are necessarily associated with certain outcomes and are may be more effective at facing ambiguous career situations.

Of interest is the fact that there isn't any relationship between personality characteristics and organizational mobility. This implies that a person may be very modern and proactive in their career without necessarily being markedly active in terms of mobility. This explains in part studies by others (Briscoe, & DeMuth, 2003, Gratton, Zaleska, & DeMenezes, 2002).

Section 3: In section 3 it is explored whether there is any relationship between the employees' demographic indicators and all other variables. For this purpose, hypotheses are developed related to each of the demographic indicators. In the case where more than half of the variables can be accepted, then the hypothesis can be accepted.

Hypothesis 1: "There is a difference between the age groups based on the employees' protean and boundaryless career attitudes and personality characteristics."

Table 8: Age Means and the Results of ANOVA Analysis

	Age					Sig.
	≤20	21-30 years	31-40 years	41-50 years	≥51	
Career authenticity	3.60	3.97	3.76	3.42	3.82	,003
Proactive personality	4.24	3.83	3.86	3.60	3.84	,026
Goal orientation	4.80	4.12	4.10	3.85	4.10	,006
Openness to experience	4.40	3.92	3.96	3.60	3.74	,014
Organizational mobility	3.20	2.90	2.53	2.51	2.65	,022
Boundaryless career	4.10	3.43	3.18	3.11	3.23	,002

As seen in Table 8;

- The career authentic people in ages of "21-30 years",
- The people with proactive personality in ages of "20 and under 20 years",
- The goal oriented people in ages of "20 and under 20 years",

- The people who are open to experience in ages of “20 and under 20 years” can make significant changes in their career attitudes preferences.

As seen in Table 1, %5 of employees is in ages of “20 and under 20 years” and %45 of employees is in ages of “21-30 years”. So if we do not take %5 of employees into account, then we can say that almost half of the employees prefer boundaryless career attitudes. Although the means are different, in order to determine whether this difference is statistically significant ANOVA analysis was done. By looking at the significant values, hypothesis 1 can not be rejected because there are differences between age groups based on their protean and boundaryless career attitudes preferences and their personality characteristics ($p=.003$, $p=.026$, $p=.006$, $p=.014$, $p=.022 < 0.05$).

Hypothesis 2: “There is a difference between women and men based on the employees’ protean and boundaryless career attitudes and personality characteristics.”

When looking at the means of the answers the woman and man employees gave in Table 9, there is not any significant difference based on their personality characteristics and career attitudes. But according to t-test results done in order to determine whether the mean differences are statistically significant, we can see that there is a significant difference between women and men based on the variable “openness to experience” ($p=0.014 < 0.05$). It means that men are more open to experience. When looking at the gender differences based on the career attitudes, we can say that men have more tendencies to behave self-directed in their career attitudes than women ($p=0.002 < 0.05$). Hypothesis 2 can be rejected because there are differences between women and men based on only two of the protean and boundaryless career attitudes and personality characteristics.

Table 9: Gender Means and the Result of T-test Analysis

	Gender		F-test	Sig.
	Woman	Man		
Openness to experience	3.77	3.96	,973	,014
Self directed	3.58	3.84	,461	,002

Hypothesis 3: “There is a difference between married, single and divorced employees based on the employees’ protean and boundaryless career attitudes and personality characteristics.”

As seen in Table 10, there is only significant difference between married, single and divorced employees based on the variable “career authenticity” ($p=0.000 < 0.05$). It means that single employees are more authentic in their careers than married and divorced employees. Hypothesis 3 can be rejected, because there is difference between married, single and divorced employees based on only one personality characteristic.

Table 10: Marital Status Means and the Results of ANOVA Analysis

	Marital Status			Sig.
	married	single	Divorced	
Career authenticity	3.65	4.10	3.72	,000
Boundaryless career	3.23	3.44	3.16	,014

Hypothesis 4: “There is a difference between employees who have children and who don’t have children based on the employees’ protean and boundaryless career attitudes and personality characteristics.”

As seen in Table 11, there are differences between the employees who have children and who don’t have children based on the variables “career authenticity”, “openness to experience” of personality characteristics and “boundaryless mindset”, “organizational mobility” of career attitudes ($p=0.000$; $p=0.006$; $p=0.033$; $p=0.040$; $p=0.005 < 0.05$). The employees who don’t have children are more authentic in their career, more open to experiences and they prefer more boundaryless career attitudes than the employees who have children. As a result, Hypothesis 4 can not be rejected.

Table 11: Children Means and the Results of T-test Analysis

	Children		F-test	Sig.
	Yes	No		
Career authenticity	3.58	4.04	,259	,000
Openness to experience	3.77	3.99	,356	,006
Boundaryless mindset	3.81	3.98	,424	,033
Organizational mobility	2.60	2.83	,447	,040
Boundaryless career	3.20	3.40	,767	,005

Hypothesis 5: “There is a difference between the employees with different education level based on the employees’ protean and boundaryless career attitudes and personality characteristics.”

As seen in Table 12, the employees with primary school diploma have the highest means in all personality characteristics. But, the employees with both primary school diploma and PhD diploma are in total %10 of all employees. For that reason, if we exclude these employees from our research, it can be said that the employees with a university diploma have the highest means in all personality characteristics. It means that these employees are more authentic in their career, more open to experiences, more goal oriented and more proactive in their personalities.

However, according to the ANOVA analysis done to determine whether these mean differences are statistically significant we can see that there is not any significant difference between the employees with different education levels based on the personality characteristics. When looking at the career attitudes, it can be said that there are significant differences between the employees with different education levels based on the variables “boundaryless mindset” and “organizational mobility” ($p=0.049$; $p=0.022 < 0.05$). This means that if excluding the employees with PhD and primary school diploma, the employees with a mater degree prefer more “boundaryless mindset” attitudes and the employees with a university diploma prefer more “organizational mobility” attitudes. As a result, Hypothesis 5 can be rejected, because there are differences between the employees with different education levels based on only two career attitudes.

Table 12: Education Level Means and the Results of ANOVA Analysis

	Education Level					Sig.
	Primary	High School	University	Master Degree	Ph. D.	
Boundaryless mindset	4.63	3.70	3.95	3.98	4.13	.049
Organizational mobility	1.00	2.49	2.81	2.74	3.00	.022

Hypothesis 6: “There is a difference between the employees with different organization tenure based on the employees’ protean and boundaryless career attitudes and personality characteristics.”

As seen in Table 13;

- The employees with less than 1 year organization tenure are more authentic in their career and more proactive in their personality,
- The employees with 1-5 years organization tenure are more goal oriented and more open to experiences.

According to ANOVA analysis done in order to determine whether these mean differences are statistically significant, it is seen that there is significant difference between the employees with different organization tenure based on only one personality characteristic, “career authenticity” ($p=0.000<0.05$). When looking at the career attitudes there are differences between the employees with different organization tenure based on only two career attitudes, “self-directed” and “organizational mobility” ($p=0.009$, $p=0,002$, $p=0,020$, $p=0,001 <0.05$). It means that the employees with 16 and more than 16 years organization tenure prefer more self-directed career attitudes and the employees with less than 1 year organization tenure prefer more organizational mobility. As a result, Hypothesis 6 can be rejected.

Table 13: Organization Tenure Means and the Results of ANOVA Analysis

	Organization Tenure					Sig.
	< 1 year	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	≥ 16 years	
Career authenticity	4.28	3.99	3.75	3.50	3.51	.000
Self directed	3.73	3.85	3.48	3.55	3.87	.009
Organizational mobility	2.94	2.91	2.50	2.46	2.46	.002
Protean career	3.41	3.62	3.38	3.35	3.66	.020
Boundaryless career	3.40	3.46	3.12	3.08	3.19	.001

Hypothesis 7: “There is a difference between the employees with different job tenure based on the employees’ protean and boundaryless career attitudes and personality characteristics.”

As seen in Table 14, the employees with less than 1 year job tenure have the highest means in all personality characteristics. But, because these employees are only %5,7 of all employees we exclude these employees from our research. So;

- The employees with 1-5 years job tenure are more authentic in their career, more goal oriented and more open to experiences,
- The employees with 16 and more than 16 years job tenure are more proactive in their personalities.

According to ANOVA analysis results done in order to determine whether these mean differences are statistically significant it is seen that there are differences between the employees with different job tenure based on the variables, “career authenticity”, “boundaryless mindset” and “organizational mobility” ($p=0.000$; $p=0,038$; $p=0,002 < 0.05$). It means that the employees with 1-5 years job tenure are more authentic in their careers and prefer more boundaryless career attitudes than other employees. As a result Hypothesis 7 can be rejected.

Table 14: Job Tenure Means and the Results of ANOVA Analysis

	Job Tenure					Sig.
	< 1 year	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	≥ 16 years	
Career authenticity	4.33	4.10	3.87	3.73	3.54	.000
Boundaryless mindset	4.10	4.08	3.87	3.71	3.85	.038
Organizational mobility	3.17	3.00	2.80	2.44	2.55	.002
Boundaryless career	3.64	3.54	3.33	3.07	3.20	.000

Hypothesis 8: “There is a difference between the employees with different job status based on the employees’ protean and boundaryless career attitudes and personality characteristics.”

As seen in Table 15, the high level managers have the highest means in all personality characteristics. But, because they are only %3,2 of all employees, we exclude these employees from our research. In this regard;

- Middle level managers are more authentic in their careers and more proactive in their personalities,
- Staffs and the others are more goal oriented
- Specialists are more open to experiences.

According to ANOVA analysis results done to determine whether these mean differences are statistically significant it is seen that there are significant differences between the employees with different job status based on only two variables, “career authenticity” and “organizational mobility” ($p=0.004$; $p=0,001 < 0.05$). It means that middle level managers are more authentic in their careers and the others prefer more organizational mobility than other employees. As a result Hypothesis 8 can be rejected.

Table 15: Job Status Means and the Results of ANOVA Analysis

	Job Status						Sig.
	High Level Managers	Middle Level Managers	Specialists	Asis. Specialists	Staff	Other	
Career authenticity	4.16	3.88	3.86	3.31	3.94	3.55	.004
Organizational mobility	3.26	2.70	2.84	2.17	2.48	2.94	.001
Boundaryless career	3.78	3.31	3.40	2.98	3.13	3.26	.000

Hypothesis 9: “There is a difference between the employees with different job turnover based on the employees’ protean and boundaryless career attitudes and personality characteristics.”

Table 16: Job Turnover Means and the Results of ANOVA Analysis

	Job Turnover				Sig.
	1 job	2 jobs	3 jobs	≥ 4 jobs	
Self directed	3,76	3,61	3,78	4,00	,036

The variable “job turnover” shows how many jobs the employees have changed. While looking at the means in Table 16 we can say that there is not any difference between the employees with different job turnover in their personality characteristics and career attitude preferences. It means that the means are almost same. According to ANOVA analysis results done to determine whether the mean differences are significant, it can be seen that there is a significant difference in self-directed career attitude ($p=0,036 < 0.05$). So, it means that the employees who have changed their jobs four times or more than four times prefer self-directed career attitude more than other employees. As a result Hypothesis 9 can be rejected.

8. Conclusions

Among the traditional attitudes of traditional human resources managers there were to select the employees according to their experiences, to define the right steps, to wait the development of the employees’ weaknesses, and to promote the employees by helping their learning. But nowadays, human

resources managers tend to look at the employees' capabilities not at their own experiences; to define the right results not the right steps; to focus on the employees' strengths not weaknesses; and to help the employees find the appropriate step not the next one for their developments. These show us that the works of human resources managers have been getting hard because the employees do the works only if they add any value to them. For this reason, managers should create value related to the jobs for the employees' more effective working.

While developing a relationship between boundaryless career and value-creation both the employees and managers have important responsibilities. Firstly, the employee should make plans about his or her own working life, and set goals about his or her vocation. The responsibility to define career path belongs firstly to the individual and the individual has to take this responsibility. For this reason the individual has to examine itself, and define its own goal clearly. This means that he/she should ask himself/herself;

“Who am I; what are my personality characteristics; are my capabilities, skills and knowledge appropriate with my job; do I want to develop myself, to promote, to work at different projects or exciting jobs? Or am I happy at my current position; do I want to advance in this company with little effort until the end of my working life?”

During the study, human resources managers explained that the employees are willing to advance in their careers and they often repeat these demands by visiting the managers. “Career planning”, one of the responsibilities of human resources departments, is often a secondary subject to take into account. One of its reasons is that career planning is highly related with the company's foundation year, its place in the industry, its improvement level in market, and its human resources politics.

Human resources manager in Imperial Tobacco said *“we are a company for only three years. We will begin performance evaluation works this year. As our production and sales volume increase, our need for new employees will increase consequently; as a result we have to restructure our human resources politics.”* The human resources manager in Indesit said similar statements.

The most significant difference about “career planning” between foreign invested and domestic companies is that the managers in foreign invested companies have the opportunity to live “global career” in parent country or subsidiary country based on their own preferences. In two foreign invested companies given in the study there is such an opportunity to have global career, and the managers can enter to “career pool” to be evaluated if there is any empty position.

The starting point of the study is to present a guideline to HR managers in order to show them which subjects (personality, career attitudes, and demographic indicators) they should take into account mostly in planning the employees’ careers. But the research results show that there is not any significant difference between the employees in these given companies based on their career attitudes. This result is unpredictable, because it was assumed that the employees should have behaved more consciously in defining their career paths. It is more interesting that the research results show similarities with other studies done in different countries.

When evaluating our country based on its development and welfare level, both the employees’ education levels and expectations in their career have increased significantly for recent years. However, the results show that the employees are still unconscious about their career attitudes. Undoubtedly its reasons are the economic crisis in the country and difficulties in finding a job. These unfavorable troubles naturally affect the human resources politics. The companies try to produce more with fewer employees. For this reason, the human resources managers in both foreign invested and domestic companies can not execute their jobs sufficiently related to employees’ job satisfaction, career planning, and value creation. But, we think that this study will be a guideline for human resources managers in planning their employees’ careers.

Briscoe et al. (2006) constructed and developed four new scales to measure protean and boundaryless career attitudes, and asked as a limitation of their research; “what are the outcomes of being protean or boundaryless?” So, by taking this question into account we related the career attitudes with personality characteristics because it was assumed that the individuals with certain protean or boundaryless career attitudes will exhibit such vocational behaviors according to their certain personality characteristics. For example,

if the individuals who are proactive or open to experiences prefer boundaryless career attitudes (boundaryless mindset or organizational mobility) they will behave in such a way what their personalities require. It can be thought that this explanation will contribute a new perspective to the literature, and help human resources managers to plan the employees' careers by relating the career attitudes with personality characteristics and demographic indicators.

References

- Arthur, M. B. (1994). The Boundaryless career: a new perspective for organizational inquiry. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*, 295-306.
- Arthur, M. B., Hall, D. T., & Lawrence, B. S. (1989). *The handbook of career theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (1996). The boundaryless career as a new employment principle. In Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (Eds.), *Boundaryless Career* (pp.132-149). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Briscoe, J. P., Hall D. T., & DeMuth R. L. (2006). Protean and boundaryless career: An empirical exploration. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*, 30-47.
- Collin, A. (1998). New challenges in the study career. *Personnel Review, 27*(5), 412-425.
- Counsell, D. (1999). Careers in Ethiopia: An exploration of careerists' perceptions and strategies. *Career Development International, 4*(1), 46- 52.
- Dowd, K. O., & Kaplan, D. M. (2005). The career life of academics: Boundaried or boundaryless. *Human Relations, 58* (6), 699-721.
- Eby, L. T., Butts, M., & Lockwood, A. (2003). Predictors of success in the era of the boundaryless career. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(6), 689-708.
- Goffee, R., & Scase, R. (1992). Organizational change and the corporate career: The restructuring of manager's job aspirations. *Human Relations, 45*(4), 363-385.
- Gunz, P. H., Evans, M. G., & Jalland, R. M. (2000). Career Boundaries in a "boundaryless word". In Arthur, M. B, Goffee, R., & Morris, T. (Eds.), *Career Frontiers, New Conceptions of Working Lives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gürüz, D., & Gürel, E. (2006). *Yönetim ve organizasyon*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

- Hall, D. T., & Moss, J. E. (1998). The new protean career contract: Helping organizations and employees adopt. *Organizational Dynamics, Winter*, 22-37.
- Marler, J. H., Barringer, W. M., & Milkovich, G. T. (2002). Boundaryless and traditional contingent employees: Worlds apart. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 425-453.
- Murrell, A. J., Frieze, I. H., & Olson, J. E. (2002). Mobility strategies and career outcomes: A longitudinal study of MBAs. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49*, 324-335.
- Pringle, J., & Mallon, M. (2003). Challenges for the boundaryless career odyssey. *Human Resource Management, 14(5)*, 839-853.
- Sabuncuoğlu, Z. (2000). *İnsan kaynakları yönetimi*. Bursa: Ezgi Kitapevi.
- Soysal, A. (2007). Örgütlerde kariyer planlama ve geliştirme. In Şimşek, M. M., Çelik, A., & Akatay, A. (Eds.), *Kariyer yönetimi insan kaynakları yönetimi uygulamaları* (pp.95). Ankara: Gazi Kitapevi.
- Sullivan, S. E. (1999). The changing nature of careers: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 25(3)*, 457-484.
- Sullivan, S. E., & Arthur, M. B. (2006). The evolution of the boundaryless career concept: Examining physical and psychological mobility. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*, 19-29.
- Werther, W. B., & Davis, K. (1996). *Human resource and personel management*. North America: McGraw-Hill.