

Boundaryless Careers and Knowledge Creation

Sung-Choon Kang*

〈목 차〉

- | | |
|---|--|
| I. Introduction | III. The Antecedents of Boundaryless Careers |
| II. The Concept of Boundaryless Careers | IV. Managing Boundaryless Career |
| | V. Discussion |

ABSTRACT

In today's dynamic environment, it is not possible for the firm to develop all valuable knowledge internally. Valuable knowledge possessed by core employees also tends to decay over time. In this light, firms need to mix external and internal employment modes to continuously acquire and absorb new knowledge. This paper intends to clarify the construct and nature of boundaryless career as an important source of external knowledge. This paper suggests a "ground-up" framework of intellectual capital to facilitate knowledge inflows and knowledge creation from boundary career workers.

Key words: Boundaryless career, Knowledge creation, Intellectual capital

* Assistant professor, School of Business Seoul National University(sk229@snu.ac.kr)
The author acknowledges financial support from the Institute of Management Research, College of Business Administration, Seoul National University.

I. INTRODUCTION

Careers are generally defined as the evolving sequence of a person's work experience or roles over time (Robinson & Miner, 1996). Traditionally, careers were viewed as upward, linear progression across job positions clearly defined within single employment settings by accumulating firm-specific technical and professional competences (Deffillippi & Arthur, 1994; Sullivan, 1998). In this regard, the traditional concept of careers is characterized by linear or hierarchical career progress and organizational or bounded careers. Organizational careers have been considered dominant career patterns under traditional assumptions about the nature of organizations: stable organizational environments, hierarchical organizational structures, job-based organizations, the dominant large organizations, and lifetime employments (Arthur, 1994).

However, dynamic environments facing current organizations are calling those conventional organization models and correspondingly, the valence of organizational careers into questions. More specifically, the imperatives of organizational adaptation to dynamic environments accelerate the emergence of new forms of organizations such as: (1) from large *bureaucratic entities* who are based on vertical coordination and control to *network-form organizations* who emphasize horizontal, internal and external coordination (Miles & Snow, 1996): (2) from *job-based organizations* based on prescribed employees' skills and behaviors to *competency-or knowledge-based organizations* based on employees' knowledge and self-organizing capabilities (Lawler, 1994): (3) from *bounded organizations* who compete on firm-specific competencies accumulated through internal labor market and employment security to *learning or boundaryless organizations* who compete on flexibility and organizational capabilities for consistently absorbing novel knowledge (Mirvis & Hall, 1994). Under those new organization models a critical issue regarding career management moves from how organizations build employees' careers toward

how careers contribute to organizational dynamic capabilities and competitive advantages through supporting organizations' evolution, strategic positioning, learning, networking, alliance-building and the like (Arthur, 1994). The boundaryless career emerges as a new concept of careers, which emphasizes interorganizational mobility and flexibility, to respond to those new organization models.

Along with this, HR researchers have also acknowledged the complexity of managing human assets. For example, Lepak and Snell (1999)'s HR architecture model suggests that an organization may possess multiple employment groups with different human capital in term of strategic value and firm-specificity. According to the HR architecture framework, core employees with a wide variety of skills and broad discretion are willing to perform tasks that fall outside the range of the specified exchange so that they enhances a firm's capability to create new knowledge and to readily redeploy resources. But it is not possible for the firm to develop all valuable knowledge internally. Further, it is highly possible that hypercompetition makes valuable knowledge possessed by core employees decays over time. Thus, firms need to mix external and internal employment modes to continuously acquire and absorb new knowledge (Matusik & Hill, 1998). Boundaryless career would provide an important source of knowledge inflows for the firm.

In spite of increasing practical interest in and strategic value of boundary careers, however, the concept is still unambiguous to both academicians and practitioners. This paper intends to provide a framework of boundaryless careers by summarizing the theoretical discussions to date. For this, this paper first clarifies the construct and nature of boundaryless careers. Next, individual and organizational factors that make an individual pursue the boundaryless careers are examined. Third, this paper suggests a 'ground-up' framework of intellectual capital that helps to increase potential benefits of boundaryless careers for firms. This paper concludes by providing several

implications for further research.

II. The Concept of Boundaryless Careers

1. Defining Boundaryless Careers

Put simply, boundaryless careers refer to the opposite of organizational careers. More specifically, boundaryless careers include various forms of careers that unfold unconstrained by traditional organizational career principles such as clear boundaries around job activities, fixed sequences of such activities, or attachment to one organization (Arthur, 1994; Robinson & Miner, 1996). Current literature has suggested that boundaryless careers have several unique characteristics, which are not found in traditional organizational careers (Arthur, 1994; Defillippi & Arthur, 1994; Sullivan, 1999).

First, while organizational careers evolve through hierarchical advancements within the boundary of an employer, boundaryless careers evolve through moving across the boundaries of separate employers (*interorganizational mobility*). Second, while organizational careers are based on firm-specific human capital, boundaryless careers are equipped with transferable or employer-flexible rather than firm-specific know-how or human capital, and thus, draw validation or marketability from outside the present employer (*transferable competence*). Third, while traditional careers develop through hierarchical career paths designed and prescribed by employers, boundaryless careers are self-designed by employees themselves (*self-designed career planning*). Fourth, competence accumulation and employment opportunity on the boundary career search are sustained and accompanied by extra-organizational networks that are non-hierarchical and worker-enacted, whereas success of organizational careers is supported by intraorganizational networks (*extraorganizational networks*). Fifth,

whereas organizational career workers develop their identity as “organization man” (e.g., “I am a Xerox man”), boundaryless career workers develop employer-independent career identity (e.g., “I am a software engineer”) (*organization-independent identity*). Sixth, while organizational career workers exchange loyalty for job security, boundaryless career workers exchange performance for continuous learning and employability (*learning- and employability-based motivations*). Finally, boundaryless career workers pursue the balance between work and family life, subjective career development, and psychological success (*strong internal work value*). They are less motivated with traditional, tangible rewards such as pay, promotion, and status.

These natures of boundaryless career require new employment relationships in the organizations. Although boundaryless careers are a form of temporary employment that does not have explicit or implicit contracts for the long-term employment, they are different from traditional contractual employment in terms of motivations of temporary employment and level of skills and experience required (van Dyne & Ang, 1998; Marler, et al., 2002). In other words, most of contractual workers enter into temporary employment arrangements with employers on involuntary reasons – for example, oversupply labor market, downsizing, and outsourcing—and basically prefer getting a permanent job in an organization. But, boundaryless career workers voluntarily pursue temporary employer assignments because they increase their values and marketability by accumulating knowledge across employers or because they prefer balancing their work and non-work life by flexibly arranging work schedules. Thus, boundaryless career workers are mostly high-skilled and voluntary temporary workers, whereas traditional contingent workers are mostly low-skilled and involuntary temporary workers.

In sum, boundaryless careers cannot be explained by conventional organizational models, which are based on the distinctions between permanent core and periphery contract groups (according to the nature of human capital) or

between relational and transactional obligation groups (according to the nature of psychological contract) (Sullivan et al, 1998). Instead, boundaryless careers are related to the careers of so-called knowledge workers, who occupy a growing segment of workforce in learning- or competency-based organizations, and also who prefer employment contracts to offer employability (i.e., consistent competence accumulations or leaning) and autonomy rather than job security and paternalistic company programs (Sullivan et al., 1999).

2. Typology of Boundaryless Careers

Career scholars have argued that career patterns are represented on two principal dimensions - the types of human capital and personal identity. For example, Tolbert (1996) argue that both human asset specificity and the degree of codification of occupations may affect career patterns. Specifically, she argue that career patterns are primarily classified into internal or external in terms of human capital specificity and then, external career patterns, normally associated with boundaryless careers, takes two distinctive forms (occupational or secondary) according to the degree of codification of occupations - refer to the degree to which occupations are commonly identified with a clearly defined set of skills and knowledge, and with a distinctive set of tasks or problems to which these skills and knowledge applied. In her model, while occupational bounaryless careers are characterized by high rates of interfirm mobility and low rates of interoccupational mobility, second boundaryless careers are by high rates of both intefirm and interoccupational mobility. Following Tolbert's view, Boh, Slaughter, and Ang (2001), in a study of career histories of IT professionals, found that the IT occupation exhibited three unique career groups - internal, occupational, and secondary.

Similarly, Sullivan et al. (1998) argue that individual careers can be examined along the two continua of transferability of competencies and level

of internal work values. In their model, transferability of competencies is defined by how portable or organization-specific an individual's knowledge, skills, and abilities are, and internal work values is defined as the relatively stable goals (i.e., self-fulfillment vs. extrinsic outcomes) individuals attempt to achieve through their careers. They argue that those two dimensions may be combined to produce four basic forms of careers – specifically, traditional (nontransferable competence and extrinsic needs), provisional or temporary (transferable competence and extrinsic needs), self-directed (nontransferable competence and self-fulfillment needs), and self-directing or professional (transferable competence and self-fulfillment needs). Provisional and self-directing careers in their model correspond to secondary and occupational boundaryless careers in Tolbert's model, respectively.

Baker and Aldrich (1996), focusing on career dynamic progress, argue that career patterns are classified on three dimensions – number of employers, knowledge accumulation, and personal identity. In their model, the dimension of knowledge accumulation reflects the degree to which knowledge learned in one period of their careers is pertinent to their activities in a later period of their careers and the dimension of personal identity concerns the extent to which their work histories structure personal identity. They propose that 8 types of career patterns can be identified through combining those three dimensions and of those career patterns boundary careers are characterized by inter-employer mobility, consistent competence accumulation, and strong personal identity over career history.

In addition to the roles of human capital and personal identity, many researchers have also noted that extraorganizational networks are likely to be especially important to the development of boundaryless careers. Specifically, social networks may function as conduits for knowledge and job search so that individual extraorganizational networks facilitate interorganizational mobility and consequently boundaryless career development (Raider & Burt,

1996; Saxenian, 1996). Also, social networks may enforce collective norms and commitment among network contacts so that they may function as focal sources of identification for boundaryless career workers (Mirvis & Hall, 1996).

This review of prior literature suggests that, as Defillipi and Arthur (1996) argue, careers may contain three distinctive competencies – personal identity (know-why), human capital or knowledge (know-how), and social networks (know-whom). Boundaryless careers are characterized by employer-independent identity, transferable know-how (knowledge and human capital), and interfirm networks, whereas organizational careers are by organizational identification, firm-specific know-how, and intranetworks.

As mentioned above, most of prior studies implicitly assume that occupations are likely to function as primary career boundaries where boundaryless career workers develop personal identities, social networks, and transferable knowledge. Put differently, they view professional careers that evolve within consolidated occupational communities as typical boundaryless careers. Although several prior studies have suggested two alternative types of boundaryless careers – e.g., occupational vs. secondary (Tolbert, 1996) or self-directing vs. provisional (Sullivant et al., 1998), secondary and provisional careers may not be included into boundaryless careers. Rather, those careers are more closely related to traditional contractual careers because they tend to move across organizational boundary without strong personal identity.

Continuous learning is the hallmark of boundaryless careers. Boundaryless career workers are likely to consistently expand their knowledge through learning cycles of exploration-trial-mastery-exit across functional, organizations and even occupations (Mirvis, 1996; Weick, 1996). Accordingly, boundaryless careers may make occupational as well as organizational boundary permeable (Sullivan, 1999). With regard to the roles of occupational boundaries in the career development, boundaryless careers can be classified into two general

forms - *professional and entrepreneurial* (c.f., Defillippi & Arthur, 1994).

Professional boundaryless careers refer to careers transited across organizational boundary but within occupational boundary. Regarding career competencies, professional boundaryless careers embody personal identification with particular occupations, occupational skills and knowledge adaptable to various organizations and industries, and occupational community (e.g., professional associations)-based social networks. Entrepreneurial boundaryless careers evolve through transitions across both organizational and occupational boundary. Whereas occupational boundaryless careers make people build strong social connections to occupational clique networks, entrepreneurial boundaryless careers make people connected to social contacts across various organizations and occupational communities. Thus, they are likely to convey more entrepreneurial advantages (i.e., the ability to search and recognize new opportunities) embedded into network rich in structural holes for individuals and organizations than are occupational boundaryless careers. Entrepreneurial boundaryless careers also embody entrepreneurship-based identity (e.g., pioneers or challengers). Since entrepreneurial boundaryless careers accumulate knowledge over various occupational domains, they may be equipped with coordination capabilities to identify and combine new opportunities as well as particular occupational knowledge and skills. In this line, I expect that entrepreneurial boundaryless careers will provide coordination flexibility for the firm, while professional boundaryless careers will offer resource flexibility.

III. The Antecedents of Boundaryless Careers

The backgrounds of the growth of boundaryless career may be understood in the perspectives of supply and demand - i.e., individuals and organizations.

Specifically, the growth of boundaryless careers may be associated with the changes of individuals' career goals and organizations' competitive demands, both of which emphasize flexibility and learning.

1. Individual Factors

Much of current research suggests that the growth of boundaryless careers is primarily attributed to the change in individual career needs. First, as the strategic importance of dynamic organizational change and knowledge-intensive work makes organizational career ladders broken, the locus of career development responsibility to shift from organizations to individuals. Under this changing environment individuals increasingly have greater opportunity and rewards for discovering new career paths (Ellig & Tharchenkery, 1996; Zabusky & Barley, 1996). Thus, individuals are motivated to seek appropriate domains to apply their knowledge and to learn new things to increase their employability (Defillippi & Arthur, 1996). Second, as work and non-work roles overlap and shape jointly an individual's identity and sense of self, individuals increasingly seek flexible work to balance between work and non-work life (Arthur, 1994; Arthur & Rousseau, 1996). Boundaryless careers are considered efficient career patterns for achieve flexible work. That is, individuals' preference for flexible work is a critical driving force of boundaryless careers. Third, individuals increasingly value psychological success - which refers to the experience of achieving goals that are personally meaningful to the individual, rather than an organization - in their careers (Mirvis & Hall, 1994). This change of career goals motivates individuals to pursue boundaryless careers that can facilitate individual growth, learning, and achievement.

The strength of these new career needs may vary with individual characteristics (e.g., gender, race, age, education level, social and organizational status, and individual learning goals) and the stages of individual career

progress (Barker & Aldrich, 1996; Sullivan et al, 1998). Few empirical studies have yet been conducted on the impact of those individual differences on boundaryless careers. Also, while these changes of career needs reinforce individuals' motivations to seek boundaryless careers, all individuals with these new career needs will not win on boundaryless careers. In fact, prior studies have identified two key individual competencies necessary for success in boundaryless careers. First, boundaryless careers require individual adaptability or meta-skills. As noted earlier, boundaryless careers are based on transferable competences across various employment settings. Transferable competences in boundaryless careers do not merely mean their applicability in various settings. Instead, boundaryless careers may be supported by individual adaptability (including cognitive complexity and tolerance for ambiguity), which enables individuals to accommodate to new tasks and relationships, and to incorporate new roles and responsibilities into their personal identities (Defillippi & Arthur, 1996; Mirvis & Hall, 1996; Sullivan et al, 1998). Second, the nature of individual social networks is a requisite of successful boundaryless careers. Social networks are major conduits of information flow and referral (Burt, 1992). Nonredundant, external networks enable individuals to be informed of, and recommended for opportunities in other organizations, and thereby more efficiently to search and exploit boundaryless career opportunities (Raider & Burt, 1996). In contrast, individuals who reside in internal, clique-type networks are relatively uninformed about career opportunities outside the organizations and thus have limited abilities in searching and exploiting boundaryless career opportunities.

2. Organizational Factors

Boundaryless careers may play an important role in improving flexibility and learning capabilities of the organization. As discussed earlier, current

organizations move from bureaucratic and job-based forms toward network or boundaryless and knowledge-intensive forms. In those new organization forms, membership rules, department rules, and job responsibility rules become ambiguous (Robinson & Miner, 1996; Miles & Snow, 1997). These new organization forms also emphasize competence variation over competence retention and organizational learning on individual learning over individual learning on organizational learning (Robinson & Miner, 1996). Boundaryless careers are likely to embody a variety of external knowledge and be loosely connected to organizations' prior routines and often help organizations to form and coordinate strategic interfirm networks by providing information, control, and referral benefits (Bird, 1996; Weick, 1996; Raider & Burt, 1996; Robinson & Miner, 1996; Matusik & Hill, 1998). Thus, they may contribute to improving organizational capability (referred to dynamic capability) to learn, integrate, and reconfigure new knowledge. In fact, several empirical studies show that the use of boundaryless careers is expanded by and support these new forms of organizations – for example, project-based film industry (Jones, 1996), network-form information-technology firms (Miles & Snow, 1997), and team-based organizations (von Hippel et al., 1997). Industry or geographic concentration of interdependent firms and occupations may also facilitate the growth of boundaryless careers, as in the cases of Silicon Valley. Professionals in Silicon Valley mostly are connected to stable social or professional networks outside of the firm so that they may easily access new career opportunities in other firms and also have less switching cost because their networks are not changed with job changes (Saxenian, 1996). Those regional contexts enable professionals to advance their careers through inter-firm mobility, with personal identity attached to their community networks and continuous learning.

IV. Managing Boundaryless Career

Boundaryless careers may provide unique benefits for both individuals and organizations. Boundaryless careers may provide individuals with greater flexibility, more interesting work, greater job variety and autonomy, higher compensation, and the opportunity to avoid organizational politics while bringing one's career into better alignment with one's personal values (Valcour & Snell, 2002; von Hippel, 1997; Batt et al, 2001; Marler et al, 2002). They may also facilitate employment flexibility, organizational learning and dynamic capability, and knowledge creation (Bird, 1996; Weick, 1996; Raider & Burt, 1996; Robinson & Miner, 1996; Miles & Snow, 1997; Matusik & Hill, 1998; Valcour & Snell, 2002). However, boundaryless careers require new employment relationships and new principles for knowledge management, both of which are different from those applied for core and contract employee groups. Accordingly, managing boundaryless careers invoke important challenges for firms.

1. Employment Relations

Boundaryless career workers tend to keep transactional relationships with organizations. Transactional contracts are relatively disadvantageous in motivating individuals to display positive attitude, cooperation, and extra-role behavior, compared to relational contracts (Rousseau, 1990). Thus, boundaryless career workers may hesitate to transferring their tacit knowledge and thus not offer the expected benefits of organizational learning and knowledge creation. While boundaryless career workers tend to exhibit less affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior than regular core employees, they may go beyond what is required of them when they view their relationships with organizations positively (van Dyne & Ang, 1998). In fact, while boundaryless career workers develop personal identity attached to

occupational community, their professional commitment does not necessarily conflict with organizational commitment: rather, the two types of commitment may have a strong, positive association under organizational structures to provide more professional incentives and less organizational control for boundaryless career workers (Wallance, 1993). The dual commitment of boundaryless career workers would be achieved through balanced exchanges of performance and employability between firms and boundaryless career workers. Specifically, positive attitude of boundaryless career workers can be enforced when firms provide them with many training and learning experiences to increase their marketability and employability (Hall, 96). Also, high pay and stock options may be used to facilitate positive exchange relationships between them and organizations (Saenian, 1996; Sullivan et al, 1998).

2. Human Capital

Firms rely on boundaryless career workers to acquire external knowledge, which would complement their internal, core knowledge for knowledge creation and innovation. But the use of boundaryless career workers also tends to increase the risk of leakage of internal knowledge (Matusik & Hill, 1998). Regarding this issue, Matusik and Hill suggest that the risk of knowledge leakage may be avoided by developing firm-specific architectural knowledge (including soft culture and organizational metaphor to articulate individual knowledge into organizational knowledge). This implies that the benefits of boundaryless careers may be maximized when there is knowledge portioning between individuals and organizations - i.e., individuals' component knowledge and organizations' architectural knowledge.

3. Social Capital

Social capital plays an important role in sharing and combining knowledge distributed among different people (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In this light, firms need to develop and maintain efficient social relationship between internal (i.e., core employees) and external employees (e.g., boundaryless career workers) to facilitate knowledge inflows. The nature of social capital tends to influence the amount and quality of those knowledge inflows. For example, Kang, Morris, and Snell (2007) suggests that the cooperative archetype as tightly coupled social relationships supports efficient sharing and combination of fine-grained and in-depth knowledge, whereas the entrepreneurial archetype as loosely connected social relationships facilitates the flexibility required to share and exchange a broad range of knowledge.

When we accept the premise that different types of social capital contribute to creating knowledge in different ways, a fundamental question is which type of social is more valuable than the other. Part of the answer to this question has to do with the nature of partners' specialized knowledge that is complementary to a firm's core employees. For example, boundaryless career workers help a firm create value by performing similar activities differently or performing different activities than its core employees. These differences in value creation have a direct impact on the nature of information and knowledge exchange between boundaryless career workers and core employees. More specifically, when boundaryless career workers help refine a firm's existing knowledge stocks - which are accumulated by its core employees - by providing more efficient knowledge, there may be a structural separation of exploitation and exploration at external partners and core employees groups. Because core employees have component knowledge similar to external partners', they can evaluate and absorb external partners' knowledge relatively easily. It is important for the firm to search a broad range of external partners in

order to match its changing capabilities renewed by core employees, while preventing the dissemination of its valuable knowledge into the external environment. So relationships with these external partners should put weights on search efficiency and flexible rearrangements, which reflect the characteristics of an entrepreneurial archetype.

In contrast, when boundaryless career workers provide knowledge that is not available or adequate internally (i.e., when they are a source of new knowledge creation), the firm needs to exactly identify knowledge available from those external partners, enforce their collaboration and mutual investment, and effectively combine a diverse knowledge pool. A cooperative archetype as a tight coupling provides a relational mechanism to exchange and combine knowledge between these external partners and core employees, even without prior overlapped knowledge.

4. Organizational Capital

Organizational capital (e.g., structures, processes, and routines) that constitutes a firm's institutional knowledge and codified experience provides a built-in mechanism to transform or embody individual knowledge into organizational outputs (Subramaniam & Youndt, 2005). Just as different human capital structures should be aligned with different social capital, they should also be aligned with different types of organizational capital.

When boundaryless career workers provide complementary knowledge that helps gain full returns on current capabilities, an important issue is to ensure conformance of external partners to present standards, eliminate uncertainty, and increase predictability of individual behaviors at work. In this context, organizational capital focuses on reinforcing efficient coordination by establishing ingrained patterns of behavior and interdependence and a common frame of reference. 'Mechanistic organizational structure', 'standardized work

processes', and 'detail routines' characterize this type of organizational capital.

In contrast, when external partners tend to be valued for the novelty of their knowledge (vital for discovering new opportunities that depart from existing knowledge stocks), the organizational systems, structures, and processes that are excessively rigid and programmed may make them work against that goal. Instead, organizational capital needs to provide opportunities for individuals to experiment with both the way they work and the way they organize that work. By providing opportunities for individuals to more easily modify work processes, flexible or organic organizational capital ('organic organizational structure', 'flexible work processes', 'simple routines') may stimulate infusion of heterogeneous specialized knowledge from external partners to create innovative products (e.g., Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Hargdon & Sutton, 1997).

V. Discussion

Boundaryless career workers are important suppliers of new knowledge into the firm. Since they have human capital and motivation forces different from those of other employee groups such as core employees, traditional contingent or secondary workers, and external alliance partners, it is important how firms can best manage those differences. At the outset, therefore, I noted that the purpose of this paper was to identify unique characteristics of boundaryless careers and provide a framework of managing boundaryless careers. To accomplish this, this paper has clarified the construct and potential antecedents of boundaryless careers. This paper also has suggested a "ground-up" framework of intellectual capital to facilitate knowledge inflows and creation from boundaryless career workers.

First, the strategy involves a careful consideration of how best to develop and utilize the variety of capabilities and stocks of knowledge available from

boundaryless careers with the principles of employee relationships and human capital. Second, the social capital considerations are just as important. Social capital, both cooperative and entrepreneurial, varies in the types of information and knowledge exchanges they enable. Not surprisingly, the nature of partners' knowledge required for value creation also varies. Firms that explicitly recognize these differences, and use them to cultivate valuable relationships, are in a much stronger position to manage knowledge flows from boundaryless career workers. Third, organizational capital influences a firm's ability to integrate and transform individual knowledge into organizational outputs. A firm should also consider the difference in the characteristics of organizational capital that effectively coordinate a human capital pool between internal, core employees and boundaryless careers. By incorporating this principle of knowledge management, firms have and can continue to contribute to improving organizational learning, innovation, and strategic capabilities by combining their own core knowledge and new knowledge from boundaryless career workers.

In this paper I suggest that boundaryless careers can be classified into professional and entrepreneurial types, which would embody different types of human and social capital as well as personal identity. While this conceptual model of boundaryless careers needs to be evaluated on its empirical validity, it might cast several interesting research questions for future study. First, future research needs to explore how they support different types of organizational learning (e.g., exploitation or exploration) and innovations (incremental or radical). Also, managerial career backgrounds may affect their personal characteristics (e.g., cognitive structures, personality, and preference), which, in turn, affect strategy choice and implementation. (Gunz & Jalland, 1996). Thus, the impact of managers' boundaryless career experiences on strategic formation and implementation is another potential research question. Lastly, prior studies suggest that boundaryless careers may affect the development

of interfirm networks. This is an interesting issue for future study and its reverse causation (i.e., how do interfirm networks affect employees' career developments?) is another issue for future research.

REFERENCES

- Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (1996). *The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (1996). "A career lexicon for 21st century." *Academy of Management Executive*, 10: 28-39.
- Boh, W., Slaughter, S., & Ang, S. (2001). "Is information technology a "boundaryless" profession? A sequence analysis of the career histories of IT professionals from 1979-1998." *Academy of Management Proceedings*.
- Batt, R., Christopherson, S., Rightor, N., & Van Jaarsveld, D. (2001). *Net Working: Work Patterns and Workforce Policies for the New Media Industry*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Bird, A. (1994). "Careers as repositories of knowledge: A new perspective on boundaryless careers." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15: 325-344.
- Defillippi, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1994). "The boundaryless career: A competency-based perspective." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15: 307-324.
- Dyne, L. V., & Ang, S. (1998). "Organizational citizenship behavior of contingent workers in Singapore." *Academy of Management Journal*, 41: 692-703.
- Gunz, H. P., & Jalland, R. M. (1996). "Managerial careers and business strategies." *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 718-756.
- Jones, C. (1996). "Careers in project networks: The case of the film industry." In M. B. Arthur & D. M. Rousseau (eds.), *The Boundaryless Career* (pp. 58-75). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Lawler, E. E. (1994). "From job-based to competency-based organizations." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15: 3-15.
- Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (1999). "The human resource architecture: Toward a theory of human capital allocation and development." *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 31-48.
- Marler, J. H., Barringer, M. W., & Milkovich, G. T. (2002). "Boundaryless and traditional contingent employees: Worlds apart." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23: 425-453.
- Matusik, S. F., & Hill, C. W. L. (1998). "The utilization of contingent work, knowledge creation, and competitive advantage." *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 680-697.
- Miles, R. E., & Snow, C. C. (1996). "Twenty-first-century careers." In M. B. Arthur & D. M. Rousseau (eds.), *The Boundaryless Career* (pp. 97-115). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Miner, A. S., Robinson, D. F. (1994). "Organizational and population level learning as engines for career transitions." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15: 345-364.
- Mirvis, P. H., & Hall, D. T. (1994). "Psychological success and the boundaryless career." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15: 365-380.
- Pfeffer, J., & Baron, J. (1988). "Taking the workers back out: Recent trends in the structuring of employment." *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10: 257-303.
- Raider, H. J., & Burt, R. S. (1996). "Boundaryless careers and social capital". In M. B. Arthur & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era* (pp. 187-200). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Roehling, M. V., Cavanaugh, M. A., Moynihan, L. M., & Boswell, W. R. (2000). "The nature of the new employment relationship: A content analysis of the practitioner and academic literatures." *Human Resource*

Management, 39: 305-320.

- Rousseau, D. M. (1990). "New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11: 389-400.
- Saxenian, A. (1996). "Beyond boundaries: Open labor markets and learning in Silicon Valley." In M. B. Arthur & D. M. Rousseau (eds.), *The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era*. New York: Oxford University
- Sullivan, S. E. (1999). "The changing nature of careers: A review and research agenda." *Journal of Management*, 25: 457-484.
- 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.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). "Dynamic capabilities and strategic management." *Strategic Management Journal*, 18: 509-533.
- Valcour, P. M., & Snell, S. A. (2002). "The boundaryless career and workforce flexibility." Presented in the Academy of Management meeting, Denver, CO.
- Von Hippel, C., Mangum, S. L., Greenberger, D. B., Heneman, R. L., & Skoglund, J. D. (1997). "Temporary employment: Can organizations and employees both win?" *Academy of Management Executive*, 11: 93-104.
- Tolbert, P. S. (1996). "Occupations, organizations, and boundaryless careers." In M. B. Arthur & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era..* New York: Oxford University.
- Wallace, J. E. (1993). "Professional and organizational commitment: Compatible or incompatible?" *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42: 333-349.
- Wright, P. M., & Snell, S. A. (1998). "Toward a unifying framework for exploring fit and flexibility in strategic human resource management." *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 756-772.

무경계경력과 지식창조

강 성 춘*

요 약

오늘날의 역동적 경영환경하에서 한 기업이 기업활동에 필요한 모든 지식을 내부적으로 개발하는 것은 불가능하며, 조직내 핵심 인력이 보유한 가치 있는 지식은 시간이 지남에 따라 진부화되게 마련이다. 따라서 기업들이 지속적으로 새로운 지식을 확보하고 창조하기 위해서는 외부고용과 내부고용을 혼합한 고용형태를 유지할 필요가 있다. 본 논문은 최근 외부고용을 통한 지식 유입의 중요한 원천으로서 인식되고 있는 무경계경력의 개념과 성격을 명료화하는데 일차적인 목적이 있다. 아울러 본 논문은 무경계경력 노동자들로부터의 지식 유입을 통해 새로운 조직 지식을 창조하기 위해 필요한 조직역량으로서 지식자본의 틀을 제공하고자 한다.

* 서울대학교 경영대학 조교수