Navigating the World of Work
Thomas Kochan, John Paul Ferguson, Helen Hsi, and Ryan Hammond[1]
September, 2010

The purpose of this note is to introduce you to today's world of work and to outline the skills, strategies, and actions you will need to contribute to and to prosper in it. You will be some of the best-prepared young people in the world. You bring to work a world-class scientific, mathematical, and technical education, and you will now complement that with knowledge of the economic and social context of work and organizations. This is exactly the mix of technical and behavioral skills that employers look for in new recruits.

With the advantages of your education come high expectations and considerable responsibilities. You will be expected to hit the ground running–to use your talents to improve the welfare of the organizations that employ you, the people you work with, the people whom you will eventually supervise and manage, and the communities and societies in which you will live. In short, as graduates of MIT, you are expected to be a *leader* in the economies and societies of the future.

Realizing your potential requires an understanding of the changing nature of work. In contrast to most management writing, which looks at work from the top down (focusing on the management of the workforce), here we explore things from the point of view you will have when you start working—from the bottom up!

Work: Past and Present

Do we work to live or live to work? Karl Marx asked this famous question when he attacked capitalism for exploiting workers. He predicted that, ultimately, workers would throw off their chains and take control of the means of production and of their work lives. He was only half right. Workers rarely chose to revolt *en masse*, but they have consistently sought greater control over how, when, and under what conditions they would work. As worker educational levels grew over time and *professions* developed, more and more influence over how work is carried out devolved to the individuals and groups carrying it out.

How has work changed over time? Did your grandparents approach work the same way as your parents did? Is your generation somehow different, wanting perhaps a more meaningful balance between your work and personal life? Will the job and career opportunities open to you meet your expectations and aspirations for what you want to accomplish in life? And, as a future manager or employer, what will be your responsibilities for providing others what the Secretary General of the International Labor

---

[1] Prepared for use in 15.668 People and Organizations. Adapted, abridged, and updated from Thomas Kochan and Maureen Scully, "Workforce Management," Module 7, in Debora Ancona, et al, *Managing the Future,* Thomson Publishers, 2003.

Organization (ILO) calls "decent work?" What can you do to shape your and others' work experiences, to meet the needs and hopes you have for your careers?

The earliest forms of work were done in a hunter-gatherer society. Work was an instrumental task, done to ensure personal and family survival. Later, work began to be linked to different classes. Ancient Greeks, for example, viewed work as drudgery and relegated it to lower classes. Christian theologians like Thomas Aquinas changed this view considerably, seeing work as instrumental to a healthy soul. Martin Luther and John Calvin went a step further and taught that work was a virtue in itself and necessary for a full and complete life. The concept of the "Protestant Ethic" that Max Weber described grew from this; work was seen as a means of serving God. The modern idea of the "work ethic" is a direct descendant of this concept. Confucius viewed relationships at work as part of the balance needed in society: workers should respect those in authority and those in authority should treat workers fairly. This principle foreshadowed the development of what later philosophers like Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau called a "social contract" that applied to a variety of relationships in society. Others later applied this concept to relations at work (Osterman, Kochan, Locke, and Piore, 2001).

The industrial revolution changed work in many ways, but in particular it separated work and family activities and created a stronger division of labor among family members and between workers and managers. Unlike the agrarian life, in which work and family activities occurred in the same place and to which all hands contributed, industrial work took place in large factories and offices, largely staffed by male "breadwinners" with a wife at home taking care of family and community responsibilities. Henry Ford perfected mass production with the automobile assembly line, breaking work down into very narrowly defined tasks and ensuring that work was done in standardized ways, so that workers would be as interchangeable as the parts they were assembling. Large-scale industry meant that most work occurred in hierarchical organizations with separate roles for managers, who directed and controlled the work, and employees, who performed the work.

For almost as long as there have been managers and employees, there have been disputes over wages, working conditions and other aspects of the employment relationship. As economic organizations developed, so too developed procedures and organizations to resolve those disputes. The medieval and early modern periods had guilds, protective organizations formed around particular crafts and skills. After the industrial revolution, craft and industrial unions were formed to give workers a collective voice and power in dealing with large, powerful employers. Eventually, the ILO (which was established in 1919) and its governing body of employers, workers, and government representatives agreed that the right to a collective voice and representation was one of the fundamental human rights at work.

All these aspects of work and employment are still part of our lives today. Work continues to be instrumental to meeting basic survival, security, and economic needs; work continues to be a moral force in society and a source of personal dignity; work and employment relationships are linked to family life, especially as more women participate

in the paid labor force; labor is still a cost of production that needs to be used efficiently; and both cooperation and conflict shape modern employment relationships. These multiple features are what make work so fascinating, and such an important and dynamic part of our lives.

Most of the workforce in developing countries still labors in what we call the informal sector—in the fields, on the streets, and sometimes in small businesses, trying to provide basic necessities for themselves and their families without the benefits of much education, formal employment relationships, or legal protection. Modern studies of work too often overlook this reality, but consumers and corporations are reminded whenever abuses of child labor, unsafe or unhealthy working environments, or failures to meet other minimum labor standards are brought to light. This class will focus on work and organizations in a country like the United States, but a fundamental component for understanding today's economy is appreciate how the operations of people and organizations in developed countries are tied to those in developing ones. As managers, as contractors, and as consumers, it is important to ask about the conditions under which the products and services being purchased have been produced. In recent years several corporations have been held accountable for enforcing codes of conduct throughout their global supply chains, including those at the bottom that might work in the informal sector under the harshest conditions. Yet the task of meeting minimal working standards throughout the world is barely begun.

Work in a Knowledge-Based Economy

For those in the formal sector of all economies, today's defining feature of work is that it is more *knowledge- and technology-driven* than ever before (Cutcher-Gershenfeld et al, 1998). Today no business can afford to pay workers for just their physical efforts. No employer can totally supervise how all work is carried out. No manager has all the information, technical expertise, or practical know-how to find ways to continuously improve work or to invent new products or ways of getting work done. And no worker can succeed through technical knowledge alone. The nature of knowledge-based work is collaborative requiring skills in communication, leadership, corrdination, and teamwork. Additionally, knowledge-based work lends itself to more decentralized and network-based forms of work organization. Being successful and satisfied at work in these environments relies on the ability to build and draw on social networks through which flow the ideas, information, and personal bonds that are critical to making work pleasant and satisfying for employees and consumers.

Suppose that, as new graduates, you are well prepared to enter the labor force, carrying a strong technical or disciplinary set of skills, a good knowledge of how to work in and lead teams, of how to communicate orally and in writing, and of how to analyze the culture, politics, and structure of your organization. Will the organizations that hire you be prepared to make full use of your skills and motivation? What can you do to make sure the expectations you bring to the workplace are met?

The "Old" Versus "New" Employment Relationships

Mobility. Empowerment. Teams. Cross-training. Virtual offices. Telecommuting. Re-engineering. Restructuring. Delayering. Outsourcing. Contingency. If the buzzwords don't sound familiar, they should: They are changing your life. The last decade, perhaps more than any other time since the advent of mass production, has witnessed a profound redefinition of the way we work (Patterson, 1994).

You may have heard all these buzzwords before. They dominated the business-press discussion of work in the mid-1990s. Then, as the dot-com boom accelerated, new terms were added: talent wars, knowledge workers, signing bonuses, confidentiality and non-compete agreements, and stock options. In the wake of the burst dot-com bubble and the corporate accounting and related financial scandals, still more words have entered public discussions: transparency, conflicts of interest, trust and confidence (or lack thereof), globalization, voice, and governance. But how do you make sense of all these charged words?

For employees, most of these words suggest good news, promising a world of work with increased flexibility, opportunity, a wider variety of places and types of organizational settings to choose from, and a more entrepreneurial environment than the ones open to prior generations. But there are also the lurking threats of downsizing, longer hours, and greater stress and insecurity. Do the ups and downs of the economy mean that organizations have little or no control over how they manage their workforces? Are both managers and workers doomed to be victims of short-sighted fads that create as many problems as they solve? Or can managers establish a set of principles for building organizations and employment practices that will withstand the ups and downs? Let us see if we can answer these questions by assessing how the employment relationship is changing and ways that you as an employee might gain greater control over your destiny and contribute to the performance of your work unit and organization.

From the end of World War II through the 1970s, American workers and firms enjoyed a sustained period of shared prosperity. Real wages and personal income rose in tandem with increases in productivity. Employee loyalty (especially for white-collar, managerial, and professional employees) and long tenure generally were rewarded with employment security and rising incomes. Many employees worked in "internal labor markets" that featured long-term employment, advancement up a company job ladder, well-defined jobs linked in a progression that defined a career, and individual compensation based on merit, seniority, or some combination thereof. Thus wages (and other components of compensation) rose with experience and tenure, presumably because employee productivity also rose gradually with experience and because organizations invested in and trained their labor forces to use new technologies. This system was called an "internal" labor market because generally neither employees nor managers went back to the "open" market to apply or hire for openings above the entry level, but instead counted on the promotion of trained, talented people from within. These features worked together as a system because collectively they made sense and reinforced one another. They were the consistent pieces of a firm's overall human resource strategy (Osterman, 1988).

From 1980 onward, however, productivity and wages stopped moving in tandem, especially for men. Productivity growth slowed in the 1970s, recovered in the 1980s and then accelerated in the 1990s, but real wages (wages adjusted for price increases) stagnated or fell for all employees except those at the very top of the occupational and income distribution (senior executives and the highly educated and mobile professionals) and income inequality greatly increased. Earnings grew for all levels of employees during the tight labor market of the late 1990s, yet inequality still widened as the very rich captured most of the gains from growth. One of the few bright spots in the labor market, however, was that women's wages advanced faster than men's, thereby reducing the male-female wage gap. Restructuring continued to produce many white-collar and managerial layoffs, but the layoffs were counterbalanced by the new jobs being created. Labor shortages created abundant opportunities for well-educated, skilled professionals. More jobs were also created in the lower half of the income distribution, but many of these failed to provide "living" wages or benefits. The phenomenon of the "working poor"—people employed in full-time jobs that do not pay a living wage—jarred with the image of prosperous American employment from preceding decades. A popular book, *Nickeled and Dimed* (Ehrenreich, 2001), chronicled the human challenges faced by individuals unable to support themselves or their families by working in low-level service jobs. Real-wage stagnation largely returned after the 2001 recession and extended to skilled, professional occupations.

Staffing practices have also changed dramatically in recent years. In the 1990s, large companies long known for lifelong careers and promises of employment security began to lay off employees. For example, IBM, once 406,000 employees strong, cut some 170,000 employees from 1986 to 1994 and then steadily rebuilt itself and its workforce as a full-service information systems company. By 2002 it once again had over 300,000 employees and an extended array of contractors doing work it deemed to be outside the company's core competencies, including much of its routine human resource and information systems service work. In recent years, household names like Xerox, AT&T, Dell, Boeing, Cisco Systems, Lucent, Intel, and others all announced large-scale layoffs as part of restructuring processes, despite earning profits at the time. Each firm was also hiring new employees at the same time it was displacing others. During this time, the U.S. economy was seen world-wide for its ability to create new jobs at a high rate, outstripping the job losses experienced in these organizational downswings and restructuring. Today more jobs are filled by turning to the external market than by promoting from within, especially in firms facing changing technologies and rapidly changing product markets. Peter Cappelli (1998) describes the new employment relationship as "market mediated."

The increase in anxiety over job security caused by this new approach to staffing is happening around the globe. European workers have experienced a decade of unemployment averaging between six and nine percent. New markets have opened in some countries, like Mexico, Brazil, China, and India, which produce new jobs in new industries but are accompanied by the elimination of jobs in industries once protected by import restrictions or state subsidies. Japan was long considered the paragon of lifetime employment, but this institution is being reconsidered in the wake of prolonged economic stagnation. Unemployment beca,e a persistent problem in Japan for the first time since it recovered from

World War II. The deep financial crises that hit Thailand, Indonesia, South Korea, and then Brazil, Argentina, and other developing countries in 1997 and 1998 forced a number of multinational firms to close facilities or scale back investment plans and forced many local firms to likewise abandon long-standing employment-security practices.

The old employment relationship was sometimes criticized as too paternalistic. Perhaps the new employment relationship over-corrects this tendency. Many employees are now expected to shoulder the responsibility for their own employment. The phrase "lifetime employment" (provided by the employer) has been replaced by the phrase "lifetime employability" (traits that are supposed to be polished continuously by the employee). It is an open question whether employers will provide the training and "life-long learning" needed to help employees stay current, continue to learn new skills, and remain employable. New arrangements that bolster the new employment relationship are still evolving.

Today the United States is going through one of the most severe economic downturns since the Great Depression. Since September of 2008 the economy has been shedding jobs at a rate of over 500,000 jobs a month. National unemployment has climbed to over 9%. Two high-profile American industries historically intertwined with MIT, automobiles and finance, have been particularly adversely affected. The stress on the economy has brought to the forefront of public discussion the importance of work and the structure of employment relations in people's lives. It is probable that the recession has come to affect you personally, either as a job-seeker or as friends or family of those who have been impacted. The current circumstances set in relief the many challenges and difficult choices faced everyday by workers and employers across the country as they try to navigate the new employment relationship. It begs the question whether the emerging set of employment arrangements is robust and acceptable through both relatively prosperous and difficult times.

This crisis has also brought increased scrutiny on employment-related public policy while at the same time a significant change of control has taken place in both the White House and Congress. Questions regarding income inequality and the role of government in the economy are being debated with new vigor. Will the economy overcome the sluggish rate of job growth on its own or require more aggressive actions to replace the 10 million jobs lost needed to get unemployment back down to its pre-recession levels? Bills such as the Employee Free Choice Act (EFCA) are pointed at significantly reshaping the rules by which unions and employers interact. Significant reforms to the employer-based health care system in the United States are again being attempted. Recent cases before the Supreme Court have reexamined discrimination and affirmative action laws. This all adds to the increased uncertainty regarding the current structure of the world of work. It also demonstrates the possibility of change to the institutions and policies that govern the world of work. To take a knowledgeable stance on public policy issues requires a deep understanding of both how we got here and the benefits and drawbacks of different approaches to addressing these problems. It is possible that the decisions made in Washington and the state capitols while you are taking the class will come to impact important aspects of your job years down the road.

Advancement: Climbing the Ladder versus Learning Lateral Skills

When employees were expected to spend their careers advancing within a company they worked their way up multiple rungs on internal job ladders. The "flattening" of job ladders has resulted in fewer or very different advancement opportunities for those employees who remain with an employer. Lateral advancement or advancement up the levels of a skill set relevant to jobs within one's unit (often called pay-for-skills plans) are common substitutes. The expectation of a promotion every few years has changed radically. Thus the flattening of the organization may be greeted with ambivalence. On the one hand, employees may enjoy greater decision-making authority because there are fewer managers in supervisory roles. On the other hand, there are fewer opportunities for promotion, ironically just at a time when employees are shouldering more of the responsibilities that used to signal readiness for promotion. The challenge to managers in flattened organizations is to provide opportunities for learning and ways to reward employees without the visible status and financial signals that accompanied moving up the old hierarchy. The employee's challenge is to learn skills in allied jobs within their work unit so as to increase their availability for new and interesting task assignments. These new arrangements also require considerable cooperation among employees. Yet Scully and Preuss (1994) quote one example of how such cooperation can have problems of its own: "I have to be willing to share information about how I do my job to train you so you can replace me."

Organizational charts typically contain boxes with distinct job titles and show the reporting links among jobs. But the new division of labor in organizations may defy a two-dimensional chart. Networked work arrangements also blur organizational and managerial responsibilities, so that one often has two (or more) "bosses" who share responsibility for things like conducting performance appraisals and recommending salary increases or promotions. A wise employee working in these environments learns to "manage" his or her managers by making sure these duties don't fall between the cracks. Individuals working in these settings can rightly expect and should be ready to insist that the reward system is adjusted to ensure that these broader skills and capabilities are appropriately valued. Organizations are often slow to do this unless employees raise the issue. Finally, staying productive in these settings requires periodic refresher training and education in one's home discipline or function, to ensure that basic knowledge and skills are kept current.

Past and Future Models of Employee Voice and Representation

A majority of workers in America and around the world express a desire to have a voice in how they work and in determining their wages, hours, and working conditions. Surveys show that in the U.S. a majority of workers would join a union if they had the opportunity to do so and that a substantial majority want and expect management to cooperate with unions or professional organizations that might represent them. Yet union representation is one of the most hotly contested features of employment relationships. American managers in particular have a long history of resisting unions using both legal and illegal tactics.

In the United States, unions declined from their peak of representing about 35 percent of the private-sector labor force in the mid-1950s to representing about 7.5 percent of private-sector workers (14 percent of all private- and public-sector workers) in 2009. This trend, while less dramatic in magnitude, is visible in most other highly industrialized countries around the world. Britain, Japan, Australia, and even some of the European countries with strong labor and social-democratic traditions, such as Sweden, experienced significant declines in union membership in the past two decades.

Given both the decline in traditional unions and the evidence that most workers want voice and representation at work, the question arises: what, if any, forms of voice and representation will be available to the next generation of workers? Will unions rebound in response to the anxieties many workers experience, or will new organizations with new strategies arise to provide workers with a voice on their jobs and the assistance needed to move across firms as job opportunities come and go? These questions are difficult to answer. However, history teaches us that no democratic country has existed for long periods of time without some significant independent force advocating and representing employee interests. Perhaps new organizational forms will emerge to represent employees that are better matched to current organizations and the contemporary workforce. Some are already emerging, such as an organization called Working Today (www.workingtoday.org)http://www.workingtoday.org/ that provides health benefits and social-networking opportunities for highly mobile media workers in New York City.

Flexibility: What Kind, What Is Changing, and For Whom?

The growing demand for flexible work arrangements is often traced to women's entrance into the paid workforce (the contribution of women's unpaid work at home to national productivity is a separate issue). In 1950, 32 percent of women were in the labor force, compared to about 60 percent today. Yet several features of employment are changing under the umbrella of "flexibility," and some have more to do with changes in the law or the international economy than with women *per se*. Some kinds of flexibility will pose greater challenges to workplaces and managers than others.

Flexible Space. Telecommuting allows employees to work at home, at distant sites, or on the road. Usually these employees are linked electronically to the main site by computer and are expected to be available at certain regular hours or to report to work in person at specified times. They may do the same job, and even work longer hours, just in a different place. Systems for ensuring their accountability are evolving. They range from those based on strict monitoring to those based on high trust.

One corporate approach to reducing costs is to weaken employees' link to one physical space and establish a "virtual office." The number of square feet maintained per employee is an indicator receiving greater attention and may be decreasing. A virtual office is like a hotel, where employees check in at fixed times when a certain cubicle is theirs and a "concierge" helps put the right files into cubicles for that day's occupant. Flexible space will have to fit with other elements of the new employment system; for

example, employees will need to work effectively as teams over electronic links and learn when face-to-face contact needs to be scheduled.

Flexible Time and Allocation of Tasks. Flexibility in work hours often takes the form of "flex time," where employees have some choice in their start and end times. The basic nature of the job is often unchanged. Part-time work and job sharing involve different partitioning of work. Part-time work may involve a schedule that is reduced on a weekly basis (e.g., five half days or three full days) or an annual basis (seasonal employment). Job sharing involves two employees sharing the responsibilities that were typically associated with one job description and devising ways to communicate across their roles. Job sharing requires particularly good communication and teamwork among the sharers and their supervisors. It has been slow to develop among professionals, even though it is appears to be of growing interest to many people with small children. Several organizations have recently begun to promote job sharing for young professionals.

Flexible Career Paths. Career paths in the "old" employment relationship were more linear. They were implicitly designed for the "organization man," i.e., a male breadwinner who would work full time in the labor force from when he graduated school until he retired. His continuous involvement was assumed possible because he was supported by a wife at home taking care of family and community responsibilities. Of course, this view of the "ideal" worker (Williams, 2000) no longer fits today's diverse workforce or families.

New models of careers are needed but have been slow to develop. Some firms offer part-time or reduced-hour options for parents who need time to care for children or elders. This requires changing compensation criteria, the rules governing promotions, and most importantly the assumptions and norms about what constitutes a "good" worker. Should long hours still be seen as a signal of high productivity and dedication, or are more actual performance or project-based indicators called for? Can part-time employees be given challenging assignments and become eligible for promotions without creating a sense of inequity among those who remain full-time? Can the workplace culture be modified to allay the fear that using these options will hinder one's career or forever put one behind one's peers? The evidence consistently shows that these are constraining factors that result in under-utilization of the flexible career policies that organizations offer (Bailyn et al., 2001). Yet despite the overall pattern, countless examples exist where managers and employees have worked out solutions and created a workplace culture that supports the use of flexible hours and career opportunities. The key to these success stories is that the parties have worked out local solutions to how to redesign work to achieve what Lotte Bailyn and colleagues call the "dual agenda," namely designing work for both high performance and work-family integration (Rappaport et al, 2002).

Flexible Workforce Size and Firm Boundaries. The so-called "virtual corporation" is one where multiple activities are spun off to subcontractors, an arrangement that allows firms both to adapt to changing market conditions and to create tenuous employment relationships. These relationships have prompted people to ask normative questions about severing the bond between employer and employee:

In computerese, a virtual disk exists only in the computer's memory; when the computer is turned off, the virtual disk is obliterated. By analogy, I suppose, people who work for the new virtual corporations can be called virtual employees. What happens to these people when the power is turned off and their virtual employer disappears? Do they vanish along with the electrons? Are they put together again somewhere when some chief executive loads another virtual corporation into memory? (Patterson, 1994)

In recent years, more firms have turned to temporary workers to cope with variations in markets and demand for work. Manpower, Inc., which not only provides temporary workers to large firms but also carefully screens and sometimes trains them, became one of the largest employers in the United States, with some 600,000 workers on its rolls by the turn of the century. Many other temporary-help firms or employee-leasing firms have joined Manpower in supplying skilled professionals such as graphic artists, web designers, and other high-technology specialists. Working in these temporary assignments and managing temporary or contract employees is clearly a double-edged sword, as Barley and Kunda (2006) discuss in the reading that follows this note.

Such are the pieces of work being transformed under the heading of "flexibility." As we have seen, much that we once took for granted about the employment relationship seems no longer to hold, and what will replace it is not yet clear. What are some of the alternatives?

Global Comparisons

If we look at how different nations have related the management of work to other aspects of the organization, we often realize that there are more choices for doing so than just looking at the United States would suggest. Faced with the same international and technological pressures, for example, Japan and Germany have created different institutional arrangements, which embed different historical choices and shape their approaches to similar challenges. Both countries have emphasized and maintained longer-term employment relationships. Japanese and German firms have for example retained greater number of employees and had them work shorter hours (an example of one kind of flexibility discussed above), had top managers and executives take pay reductions, moved work back inside the firm from outside contractors and, at a societal level, required substantial severance or early-retirement payments to those laid off.

One of the questions raised above was whether employers will provide ongoing training for employees, particularly if they will not have a long-term relationship with those employees. Ideas for alternative approaches to training may come from countries such as Germany, which has an elaborate apprentice system that provides the highly skilled technicians that new technologies demand. These work-related practices fit into an organizational setting that expects firms to weigh employee and community responsibilities in addition to maximizing shareholder value. It is interesting that, as of this writing, the appropriate weight to give shareholder value vis-à-vis other "stakeholder" interests is a matter

of debate in all three countries. Japan and Germany are both under pressure to give greater weight to shareholders and to loosen some of their traditions or laws that protect employees or give them a voice in corporate governance. In the U.S. the corporate scandals of recent years have re-energized a debate over whether corporations give too much weight to maximizing shareholder value at the expense of employee and broader societal interests. How this debate is resolved will affect how workforce management fits into future managers' portfolio of responsibilities and will help shape the organizations of the future.

Keeping one Foot in the External Labor Market

The old advice to never put all your eggs in one basket applies to anyone entering today's labor markets and organizations. A key principle in modern negotiations theory is to always know what is your "best alternative" to your current situation. Following this principle requires efforts to keep one's professional and personal networks current in order to be aware of and have access to career opportunities that become available on the external labor market. Labor market research has consistently shown that most people find their best jobs through individuals and networks of friends and colleagues who know their skills and potential, and that jobs acquired in this fashion often end up being good matches for both employees and employers. So keeping one's networks current may be good for all who share an interest in promoting productive and rewarding work, careers, and organizations.

Summary

This introductory reading was designed to introduce you to the types of work settings you are likely to walk into as you begin your career and to help you to think analytically about what is changing and what your options are for shaping your career as it unfolds. In conclusion, here are some things to keep in mind.

- What do I want in my first job? How realistic are my expectations? Are they well matched to the expectations of employers and the requirements of the job?

- Will the job allow me to balance my work responsibilities with my non-work interests and my personal or family responsibilities?

- Will the job allow me to apply and develop both my technical/functional knowledge and my behavioral/organizational skills?

- How does my job fit into the overall mission, strategies, and future directions of the organization? Are there future career opportunities inside the organization? What are my best alternative job opportunities and how do I ensure I have outside alternatives? (See next question!)

- What do I need to do to keep my external networks current so that I can compare future opportunities in my current organization with those in the external labor market?

- Thinking ahead, what institutions do we need to support the parts of the economy that we think are strong and yet to support the goals and expectations of ourselves as employees?

- And, thinking way ahead, what do I want to tell my grandchildren about what I did at work and how it mattered?

REFERENCES

Bailyn, Lotte. 1993. "Patterned Chaos in Human Resource Management." *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 34, #2 (Winter 1993), pp. 77–83.

Barley, Stephen and Gideon Kunda, "Contracting: A New Form of Professional Practice, *Academy of Management Perspectives*, vol 20, no. 1 2006, 45-66.
Bridges, William. 1994. "The End of the Job." *Fortune* (September 19, 1994), p. 64.
Business Week, "The New World of Work." (October 17, 1994), p. 76.

Cutcher Gershenfeld, Joel, et al. 1998. *Knowledge Driven Work Systems*. New York: Oxford University Press,

Osterman, Paul. 1988. *Employment Futures: Reorganization, Dislocation, and Public Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Osterman, Paul, Thomas A. Kochan, Richard Locke, and Michael Piore, *Working in America: A Blueprint for the New Labor Market*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Patterson, Jack. 1994. "Welcome to the Company that Isn't There." *Business Week*, October 17, p.86.

Rappoport, Rona, Lotte Bailyn, Joyce K. Fletcher and Betty H. Pruitt. (2002) *Beyond Work Family Balance: Advancing Gender Equity and Workplace Performance*. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass.

Scully, Maureen, and Gil Preuss. 1994. "The Dual Character of Trust During Workplace Transformation." *Proceedings of the Industrial Relations Research Association*. Madison, WI: Industrial Relations Research Association.

Williams, Joan. (2000). *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to do about It*. New York: Oxford University Press.

15.668 People and Organizations
Fall 2010