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Abstract

The science and professional practices of vocational psychology and career development are brought into question via a critical polemic informed by the work of Foucault, with a particular focus on the application of theory and techniques of objective assessment and psychometrics. It is asserted that the scientific and professional discourse and constructs of traditional approaches to career development have been reified. The context of this discourse is discussed with respect to the risk that career development scientists and practitioners have become unwitting or complicit instruments of a broader economic and political discourse. Their alignment with the client is ultimately questioned.
A Critical Reflection on Career Development

Attempts by vocational psychology to come to grips with the post-industrial era have been recognised by a number of authors (Savickas, 2000). Apart from a few notable and stimulating works (e.g., Irving & Malik, 2005; O'Doherty & Roberts, 2000; Richardson, 2000; Woodd, 2000), researchers and practitioners of vocational psychology and career development have produced scant publications that reflexively turn on the torch of critical self-inspection. In the vein of critical psychology, which sets out to challenge traditional assumptions and practices of psychology (e.g., Austin & Prilleltensky, 2001; Baydala, 2001; House, 1999; Larner, 2001), this paper presents a polemic that raises doubts regarding the intentions of traditional career development practice with respect to their allegiance to the client and calls for an alternative perspective for practice in which tacit assumptions underpinning power are made explicit. It asserts that vocational psychology and career counselling are powerful social institutions that have the capacity to influence the lives of individuals, and are also concomitantly influenced by broader global forces that impact upon them.

Traditional Career Development Practices

The science of vocational psychology was born with the publication of Frank Parsons’ (1909) book, Choosing a Vocation. Since the publication of this seminal work, the central tenets have remained popular amongst researchers and practitioners of vocational guidance. Despite almost a century passing since their emergence, Parsons’ ideas would not seem out of place in a contemporary text on vocational assessment—this is either quaint or concerning.

The theoretical and practical approaches to career development and planning have developed within the context of western industrialised society, which has emphasised empirical science founded upon the mechanical, formist, and organicist root metaphors
(Collin & Young, 1986; Lyddon, 1989). Herr et al. (2004, p. 49) echoed the terminology of scientist-practitioner applied to psychologists in relating to career counsellors as ‘applied behavioural scientists’. They emphasised the increasing sophistication of career counsellors as eclectic purveyors of proven, evidence-based techniques. Despite the emphasis on evidence-based practice, Baydala (2001) convincingly argued that the research outcomes produced for the validation of psychological interventions were suspect with respect to the construction of variables and procedures. Furthermore, Fouad’s (1994) major review questioned whether the scientist-practitioner model was actually being implemented with respect to evaluating the effectiveness of interventions.

From its earliest beginnings, vocational psychology has been deeply committed to logical-positive science. Savickas (1993, p. 206) eloquently described career counselling’s contribution to the scientism of vocational psychology:

While scientists were objectifying the world, counsellors objectified interests, values, and abilities with inventories, and used these inventories to guide people to where they fit in organizations. Thus, career development professionals participated fully in the societal move to increase domination of the subjective by the objective.

The psychological science and scientific practice of vocational psychology has endeavoured to generate sophisticated systems of classification and measurement. One of its notable achievements has been the comprehensive classification of occupations (Gore & Hitch, 2005). Vocational psychology is replete with scientific forms and its flagship of objective measurement is the standardised, nomothetic psychometric instrument, otherwise known as a psychological test. Psychometric assessment in vocational psychology and career development practice has particularly focused upon the ‘big three’: interests, needs/values, abilities (Swanson & D'Achiardi, 2005, p. 353).
The number and variety of psychometric tests related to vocational interests is so extensive that it has been a challenge to comprehensively organize them into some coherent whole (Osipow, 1987). Furthermore, Anastasi (1988) boldly wrote that ‘nearly every type of available test may be useful in occupational decisions’ (p. 450). The omnipresence of psychometric testing is demonstrated by its application in human resource development. For example, approximately one million Self-Directed Searches are administered annually by a recruitment service of the United States armed forces (Herr et al., 2004); this is but one organisation in one nation. The proliferation of psychometric testing is being driven not only by individual practitioners of traditional models of career development, but additionally by human resources consulting firms whose interests are with their own profits and the corporate success of their client-organisations (Melamed & Jackson, 1995).

Psychometric methods have been derived mainly from trait-and-factor theories which may be collectively reformulated as the person-environment fit paradigm (Rounds & Tracey, 1990). The trait-and-factor and person-environment fit theories have been prolific in their contribution to the science of vocational psychology and the practice of career development. This theoretical school underpins the ‘traditional approach’ to career development.

Reification: Diagnosing the Ordinary

Although the traditional approach to career development has been vigorously upheld as a source of viable forms of theory and practice (Rounds & Tracey, 1990; Swanson, 1996), recent reviews indicate that there has been international diversity in models of practice and a movement toward alternative perspectives (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2004) and qualitative methods (McMahon & Patton, 2002). With respect to the practice of psychometric testing, a review of middle-income nations also revealed potential for its over-use in career development services (Watts & Fretwell, 2004).
Traditional theories and practices of vocational psychology have been brought into question through postmodern thought and its adherents’ concomitant scepticism of authority and predictability of career and the world-of-work (e.g., O'Doherty & Roberts, 2000; Richardson, 2000), and this has not been a recent phenomenon (e.g., Borow, 1974; Roberts, 1977). Within the sphere of career development, this scepticism is exemplified in the rejection of models of vocational assessment, which, under the aegis of applied science, assert their capacity to ‘measure’ and ‘predict’ a person’s career through psychometrics and objective techniques (Bradley, 1994).

It should be noted, however, that the traditional approach is not the only paradigm in question. Rounds and Tracey (1990) quite rightly indicate, in their defence of this approach, that other forms of career development practice rely heavily upon similar assumptions and methods (Isaacson & Brown, 1993). Moreover, the epistemological bases for alternative paradigms, inspired by postmodern thinking that there is no verifiable truth ‘out there’, but instead there is a viable truth that is pragmatic for the client (e.g., constructivist psychology), have also been criticised (Erwin, 1999). In addition, some adherents of the postmodern revolution may unwittingly cling to modernist assumptions (O'Doherty & Roberts, 2000).

The knowledge generated by and practices of the traditional approach and psychometric instruments per se are not the only sources of contention. An additional argument lies with the professional discourse that a career development practitioner can ‘objectify’ and ‘manage’ the career of an individual with all the trappings of science and technology. Although career ‘self-management’ is a laudable client-centred perspective, the discipline has paid scant attention to it (King, 2004). This critical argument is informed by the polemics of House (1999) and Smail (1999) who cogently demonstrate the presence of a self-serving ideology within the field of psychotherapy and counselling. House was not anti-therapy; his argument was with the institutionalization of psychotherapy and its creation of a
power discourse for the purpose of sustaining itself, and the failure of the professions to critically self-reflect.

Following Parsons’ (1909) notion of reasoning the fit between oneself and an occupation, the trait-and-factor approach posits five assumptions for theory and practice (Isaacson & Brown, 1993):

1. Vocational development is largely a cognitive process in which individuals use reasoning to arrive at decisions.
2. Occupational choice is a single event.
3. There is a single right goal for everyone making decisions about work.
4. A single type of person works in each job.
5. There is an occupational choice available to each individual (p. 23).

Isaacson and Brown (1993) point out that these assumptions are worthy of rejection if taken literally. Despite their legitimate caveat, these assumptions were the foundation of a corpus of professional practice, which, until the relatively recent advent of postmodern thinking, enjoyed predominance without serious dissent. Furthermore, they arise from an ideology of career that assumes: (a) career is a purely individual endeavour, (b) a person is defined by their career, and (c) formal work is the highway to self-actualisation (Richardson, 2000). Consideration of these assumptions would indicate their potential for irrelevance in the contemporary world of work (Storey, 2000) and the seemingly chaotic nature of career development (Bloch, 2005; Pryor & Bright, 2003), in which career ‘choice’ is irrelevant amongst the contingencies of socioeconomic class and concomitant limitations upon career opportunities (Gottfredson, 1981; Roberts, 1977).

The tide against the traditional paradigm was moving strongly in the 1980s and 1990s. Super (1992), for example, recollected the ‘fall’ of trait-and-factor as being partially energised by neo-Freudian and Rogerian psychologies of the 1950s ‘gnawing at the
foundations of testing’ (p. 57). Savickas (1992; 1993) also portended a shift toward subjectivity in the career assessment process because of the paradigmatic challenge to traditional empirical methods and counsellors’ interest in engaging in the phenomenal life of their clients. Furthermore, Kidd (1988) exhorted practitioners to eschew notions that vocational assessment was something done to clients by some expert, and advanced the position that assessment is neither labelling nor simply testing.

The trait-and-factor position has been repudiated and often sarcastically described as the ‘test-em and tell-em’ approach (Herr et al., 2004; Prediger, 1974; Rounds & Tracey, 1990). This unfortunate term sounds out the scepticism and caution held by scholars and practitioners who do not necessarily prescribe to the traditional methods of vocational assessment that over-emphasise objectivity and psychometric tests, and moreover, their application in the context of counselling (Bradley, 1994; Herr, 1988; Isaacson & Brown, 1993; Kidd, 1988; Tinsley & Bradley, 1988). Groth-Marnat (1997), for example, highlighted that psychometric tests were at risk of being used merely as technological, clerical devices without appreciation of the unique phenomenology and context of the individual being tested. Sharf (1997) suggested that the over-emphasis on vocational testing in trait-and-factor counselling may be related to the inexperience of counsellors or the deceptive simplicity of the theory and practices.

The Lens of Foucault

The work of Michel Foucault has provided a useful foundation upon which to critically examine human services and has featured in a special edition of the British Journal of Guidance and Counselling (e.g. Besley & Edwards, 2005). From Foucault’s perspective, power, discourse and knowledge are inseparable (McHoul & Grace, 1993). Foucault (1980) argued that ‘truth’ is constructed through power and that the power is administered through
the production of truth. Taken from this radical position, discourse can be seen to bring phenomena-for-observation into being. In other words, the subject of a science is constructed by the very discourse of that science. In his archaeology of the human sciences, Foucault (1971/1973) adumbrates his theory that human sciences are inextricably embedded within the confines of discourse:

Having become a dense and consistent historical reality, language forms the locus of tradition, of the unspoken habits of thought, of what lies hidden in a people's mind; it accumulates an ineluctable memory which does not even know itself as a memory. Expressing their thoughts in words of which they are not the masters, enclosing them in verbal forms whose historical dimensions they are unaware, men believe that their speech is their servant and do not realize that they are submitting themselves to its demands. The grammatical arrangements of a language are the a priori of what can be expressed in it (p. 297).

Foucault used medicine, psychiatry and clinical psychology as examples of how a professional, scientific discourse produces its subjects, that is, disease and mental illness, in their journeys toward scientific status.

The central thesis of Foucault’s (1971/1973; 1973/1994) argument transfers to the professional and scientific discourses of vocational psychology, and in particular, the “test-em and tell-em” approach to psychometrics and their purported capacity to measure. To measure! To measure what? To measure what they have brought into being – constructs of vocational identity, traits, factors, types. This argument applies to the arena of career and work in which ‘diagnostic formulations’ are made upon a client’s presenting problems in the person-environment approach to career development (Holland, 1985, pp. 138-139; Holland, Magoon, & Spokane, 1981). Rounds and Tinsley’s (1984) review of the diagnostics of career problems contained an allusion to the need for nosological system for the purposes of
securing insurance claims and they further claimed that research into career-intervention
efficacy would be delimited by the lack of a nosological system.

If Rounds and Tinsley’s (1984) recommendations were to be accepted, then consider
that in the parallel discourse of psychiatry and clinical psychology, ordinary problems of
career choice or job dissatisfaction can be given a psychiatric diagnosis under the category of
additional conditions that may be a focus of clinical attention: ‘V62.2 Occupational Problem’,
or an alternative selection of diagnoses including ‘313.82 Identity Problem’, or ‘V62.89
Phase of Life Problem’ (American Psychiatric Association, 2000, p. 741-742). The very act
of starting a new career is a criterion for the diagnosis of Phase of Life Problem! These
diagnostic terms are patently questionable, or, alternatively, they are representative of a
scientific and professional tradition that aims to control, through discourse, even the most
ordinary aspects of life.

From a Foucauldian perspective, it is instructive to consider Gregory’s (1996, pp. 34-
35) recollection of Thorndike’s classical positivist axiom that “whatever exists at all exists in
some amount” and Gregory’s own assertion that “tests measure individual differences in
traits or characteristics that exist in some vague sense of the word”; and moreover, his
affirmation of the existence of traits in writing “all people are assumed to possess the trait or
characteristic being measured, albeit in different amounts” [italics added]. What exists, and
what all people are assumed to possess, is nothing but the trait that the psychometrist reifies
through his/her measurement system. These samples of text highlight the shift of thinking
from the notion of measuring a theoretical construct to the measurement of a real thing in the
world. Herein lies the power of the practitioner who uses psychometrics for the purposes of
career development—that is, to hold the social position to observe and then to name, to
confer identity upon the expressions, concerns, thoughts, beliefs, and hopes of the client
(O’Doherty & Roberts, 2000).
Taken from the perspective of the critical view that users of psychometrics and their tests reflexively bring what they want to measure into reality, a portion of Gregory’s (1996) text ironically dismisses the logical positivist assumption that traits actually exist in the world, by writing ‘there is a lesson here for test consumers: The fact that a test exists and purports to measure a certain characteristic is no guarantee of truth in advertising’ (p. 36). If only that text was applied as a mandatory consumer warning on the front cover of every psychometric test.

In his study of prisons and society, Foucault (1977) explicates the role of the professional examination of a person and the use of documentation techniques as an expression of power to control and correct training for society’s needs. In this argument, techniques of documentation refer to psychometric tests. When a client, who has been tested, states ‘I am an ABC type therefore I should work in XYZ environments’, the vocational assessment interview and the psychometric test have transcended to a new domain of influence: the coding and typing have been reified; brought into reality by the client’s own commission; the cycle of observation is complete through the testing and reporting—the client has been labelled. Consider, for example, the language used in this excerpt from an article on a career counselling intervention: ‘working through the process of career selection may force these people to crystallize their self-concepts’ (Taylor, 1986, p. 203) [italics added]. Two points are noteworthy; firstly, the notion of forcing individuals, and secondly, the clear objectification and classification of ‘these people’. After the point of labelling, clients can then be properly directed toward their most suitable occupational goals. Some clients may rightly dissent; however, what of those clients who acquiesce to the power of the objective, scientific, expert, highly-qualified, credentialed, government-registered, counsellor who, after all, has the best interests of the client in mind? This critical question juxtaposes the literature on the clients’ influential ascription of expertise to counsellors (e.g. Paradise, Conway, &
Zweig, 1986) and the power dynamics of counselling and educational guidance (House, 1999; Usher & Edwards, 2005).

Dawis and Lofquist (1984) recommend that both actuarial-prediction (based upon psychometric data) and the clinical-prediction (based upon the interview process) proffered by the psychologist serve the client equally well; however, lend more credence to the psychometrics in recommending that psychologists should advise their clients to preferentially heed the actuarial-prediction, presumably because of its scientific visage. This surreptitiously diminishes the importance of the counselling relationship and the considerable process to establish a working relationship and collect bio-data. Dawis and Lofquist absolve the counsellor from responsibility by reiterating that the career decision remains the responsibility of the client and that this decision should be based upon the ‘best data available’ (p. 101). Reiterating that the client must live his or her own life and take responsibility is not an unreasonable position. However, given the scientific rationale surrounding the actuarial process, it is disingenuous to subtly blame the client for a failure of the technology to deliver its purported service.

Directing the Traffic

Despite the criticism of the “test-em and tell-em” approach, the value of career development services for getting on in life and career cannot be vitiated. There is significant (empirical) evidence pointing to the benefits of career development experiences for individuals (e.g., Swanson, 1995); so much evidence that in recent years the socioeconomic value of career development has moved under the gaze of international agencies such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the World Bank. Both of these global organisations have recognised career development for its value to the individual, as a private good, and its value to national economies, as a public good (OECD,
2004; Watts & Fretwell, 2004). In addition, this international public policy literature juxtaposes a body of literature indicating the value of career development for social justice (e.g., Blustein, McWhirter, & Perry, 2005; Irving & Malik, 2005).

Notwithstanding the potential benefits of public policy and social justice initiatives for individuals, some scrutiny is warranted. Having seen that traditional models of career development use the power to ‘fix’ persons’ identities, career development’s place in the knowledge economy and its favour with the OECD and the World Bank should be carefully considered in context of the ethical question: Who is the client? This suspicious attitude echoes Saul’s (1997) critique of the encroachment of corporations upon the sovereignty of States and moreover, the sovereignty of individuals caught up in the maelstrom of globalisation. Furthermore, this critical attitude reflects a circumspect view that global economic forces are impinging upon education, not for the sake of the individual, but for corporate success founded upon necessary labour supply (Law, 2000; Richardson, 2000). Is it possible that the profession of career development, in its breathless rush toward scientific status and to receive the accolades bestowed by the OECD for its contribution to the knowledge economy, will become a servant of corporate power distinct from its original role of serving the good of the client individual?

Sampson (1987) implicated psychology’s role in contributing to the social construction of the person and the perpetuation of systems of power in society. Richer (1992) provocatively claimed that psychology is the police and that humanist and psychodynamic counselling are the secret police. To which department of the constabulary does the ‘test-em and tell-em’ model of career development practice belong, in its role of shunting objectively tested and labelled workers into appropriate occupations and work environments for the public good and the national economy? The traffic police perhaps?
Summary

Although sceptical, this argument posits the assertion that the practitioner is an inherent component of the career development experience, profoundly involved in the construction of the individual client’s life through dialogue, and a component that must be vigilant in unpacking the assumptions of power and identity brought into the guidance environment. The assertions presented in this section echo Foucault’s (1977) view of professionals as potential agents of the State, or at least powerful institutions, who, by virtue of the corporate sanction, become legitimised as the controllers of individuality. Furthermore, it highlights a cautionary note that practitioners of vocational psychology need to understand the dynamics of the individual client and their context (Collin, 1997; Collin & Young, 1986, 2000), and be fully aware of the power that they wield within the economies in which individuals exist (Maranda & Comeau, 2000).

As with institutionalised psychotherapy (House, 1999; Smail, 1999), the theories, discursive practices, and counselling actions of career development practitioners need to be brought into question. Furthermore, the counsellor’s knowledge of him or herself in the relationship is crucial. This is not simply a call to adherence with professional ethics. This pertains to a claim from Edwards and Payne (1997) that counsellors should be critically self-aware and self-confess their power in the relationship, and be fully conversant with the theories and discourses they are practising. Narrative therapy, for example, inherently deconstructs the client-counsellor power dynamics and gives voice to the person (Besley, 2002).

The practices of career development need to be reviewed with the aim of empowering the client through their lived reality of the world and their context; rather than an imposed reality constructed by the self-serving ideals of positivist psychological science and its practitioners with their attended self-serving biases (House, 1999). This assertion is
subsumed by the call for a revision of the scientist-practitioner model toward a critical-practitioner model of practice (Larner, 2001). How then do the discipline of vocational psychology and the practice of career development steer their way through this treacherous field laden with critical questions pertaining to their epistemological assumptions and their significant social and economic power?

The root metaphor of contextualism (Collin, 1997; Collin & Young, 1986; Lyddon, 1989) requires the individual client and the counsellor to be considered as part of a recursively dynamic interacting system surrounded by higher order influences (Patton & McMahon, 1999), and in this dynamic the counsellor should not be privileged as the expert dispenser of truth (House, 1999). Furthermore, Patton and McMahon (2006) proffer constructivism as a promising intellectual and pragmatic vehicle to carry vocational psychology and career development further through this chaotic world-of-work, and, moreover, uphold the person-in-context, as opposed to subjugating the individual through the discursive practices of the vocational scientist-practitioner. What is needed therefore, is an approach to career development that is reflexively and critically aware of its own discursive practices, integrates the narratives and discursive engagement of practitioner-in-context and client-in-context, and one which seeks to open new vistas for the client that transcend the hackneyed diagnostic process according to the so-called big three: interests, needs/values, and abilities.
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