CHAPTER TWENTY

Postscript

Is Convergence a Viable Agenda for Career Psychology?

Robert W. Lent
Michigan State University

Mark L. Savickas
Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine

Reflecting back on the career convergence project from the present vantage point is both instructive and, in some ways, melancholic. Gone is the immediate excitement generated by the convergence conference, the high energy of creative and sometimes conflicting viewpoints being unveiled in the moment, the sense of history in the making, the optimistic expectations for the "event." Yet as the novelty recedes, time and distance afford a more sober opportunity to consider the project's achievements, limitations, and future prospects. In this postscript, we will measure the convergence project against its original goals and reassert the value of promoting rapprochement among the career theories, despite the many obstacles that such an agenda implies.

CONVERGENCE: A QUIXOTIC VENTURE?

In some ways, the aims of the convergence project seemed quite modest. As noted at the outset of this book, they entailed examining converging themes among the major career theories, considering the maintenance of important and useful distinctive features and applications of each theory, and nurturing an agenda for future research on theory integration. These aims did not include fashioning a unified career theory by committee fiat, forging a conceptual hegemony, promoting

atheoretical eclecticism, or devaluing theoretical and empirical diversity in the search for knowledge about career behavior.

Despite its modest goals and explicit assumptions about the unique strengths of the diverse theoretical perspectives on career development, the convergence project proved quite controversial with many participants. Reactions among the five major career theorists, in particular, to the goal of seeking theoretical confluence seemed to range from somewhat optimistic (Super), to neutral (Bordin), to cautious (Dawis), to discouraging (Holland, Krumboltz). For instance, whereas Super argued that his work already embraces diverse conceptual positions, Krumboltz has asserted that a convergence of existing theories may be the last thing that is needed and that "theories are not designed by committees." Holland was somewhat more blunt, cautioning that the project's intent to promote theory integration was "ill-advised" and that one "cannot assemble theoretical constructs like Tinkertoy materials." Instead of pursuing a convergence agenda, Holland recommended that we renovate current theories, and Krumboltz counseled that we adopt different theories for different purposes.

While not precluding efforts at theoretical convergence, Dawis noted that "unified theory is the Holy Grail of science" and that such theories may prove to be a "will-o'-the-wisp." His four "iron laws" illustrated why all theoretical formulations, including integrative ones, are likely to enjoy an ephemeral existence, destined to be replaced or incorporated by next-generation models. Nevertheless, Dawis usefully made the distinction between unified theory and theory convergence, and suggested two general approaches to demonstrating or promoting convergence: (a) by showing how two or more systems overlap or are equivalent or (b) by building linkages among them.

Similarly, other project participants expressed caution or misgivings about the utility of convergence as a goal (e.g., Vondracek & Fouad, Subich & Taylor). Spokane noted that efforts at convergence are necessarily limited by the divergent assumptions that the theories make about particular facets of psychosocial functioning—for example, trait-and-factor and developmental approaches hold disparate views on the stability of behavior. He also emphasized the difference between a convergence of terms versus underlying philosophy, implying that the latter is considerably more difficult to achieve. Dollard and Miller's (1950) famous translation of psychodynamic concepts into learning theory terms is a good case in point: While a convergence in terminology is possible, it does not necessarily guarantee that the two positions will agree on fundamental issues, that the two sides mean the same things in their use of similar terms, or that more enlightening explanations (as opposed to new labels) for behavior will result.

Other authors were somewhat more sanguine about the goal of convergence, or were at least willing to consider vehicles for seeking convergence. Walsh and Chartrand, for example, suggested that the willingness to entertain theoretical convergence may be a "sign of a maturing field," though they asserted the need for care in the selection of potential unification constructs. Rounds and Hesketh

recommended a general strategy for examining convergence, namely, study of the latent structure of our major predictor and criterion variables, together with the variables that moderate their relationships. Savickas advocated approaching convergence by comparing how different theories view the same phenomenon and by empirically examining the relationships among them. Lent and Hackett described one model intended to account for the relationships among a variety of person and environmental variables that emanate from different theories.

KEY BUILDING BLOCKS FOR COMPREHENSIVE THEORY

Although the project produced no clear mandate for widescale convergence efforts, it did identify a variety of important and, in some cases, neglected elements that will need to be incorporated within truly comprehensive accounts of career behavior. On the person side of the ledger, Bordin argued for the inclusion of intrinsic motives and play as essential features of career development; Brown and Watkins, and Phillips each noted the need to attend to affective/emotional variables to a greater degree. Several sets of authors asserted the relevance of the Big Five personality dimensions to career choice, interest, and adjustment outcomes (e.g., Brown & Watkins; Walsh & Chartrand). Lent and Hackett discussed sociocognitive person mechanisms, such as self-efficacy and goals, that may enable the exercise of agency in career pursuits.

On the environment side, Fitzgerald and Betz offered a compelling plea, echoed by Harmon and others, for incorporating structural and cultural factors into career development theory and research to a much greater extent than is presently the case. These authors noted how environmental constraints limit the utility and relevance of current career theories for many segments of the population, and how a focus on structural and cultural variables may provide an "overlay to, or new perspective for, the consideration of career theories." This perspective seems to suggest that our major theories overrely on person constructs and assume that career paths may be freely chosen, without regard to contextual obstacles, if people bring their "rational" faculties to bear on their decision making (Phillips). One specific feature of the sociocultural environment, the family system, was cited by several authors as an important focal point for future study (Blustein; Bordin; Brown & Watkins); another was the concept of contextual affordance (Lent & Hackett; Spokane; Walsh & Chartrand).

Several sets of participants focused on the person-environment (P-E) interface as the basis for comprehensive theory. Rounds and Hesketh asserted, for example, that P-E transaction is a "unifying principle for career development theory," and Spokane identified the resolution of incongruence as a potential point of theory convergence. Blustein's embedded identity construct emphasizes the means by which people internalize environmental influences in seeking a stable, coherent

sense of self. The life span perspective was offered as a general framework for studying career development in context (Vondracek & Fouad), and general social cognitive theory was used to explicate processes by which the person, behavior, and context may jointly shape career outcomes (Lent & Hackett).

ARCHITECTURAL PLANS
FOR COMPREHENSIVE THEORY

In addition to suggesting a number of important building blocks for a more comprehensive understanding of career behavior, the project highlighted some overarching plans for putting these basic elements together. In many cases, these plans hint at our larger paradigms (Borgen, 1992), questioning our business-as-usual approach to developing, testing, and applying career theories.

Perhaps the most frequently occurring argument that emerged throughout the convergence project involved the need to broaden the purview of career behavior and remove the conceptual shackles that constrain us. Descriptions of this ailment and its potential remedies took a variety of forms. Fitzgerald and Betz, in particular, noted how the literature has taken a myopic view of career development, focusing the majority of its inquiry on a relatively small segment of the larger population—namely, white college students. Along with Harmon, they urged that we extend the scope of career theory and research, including within our efforts those who do not enjoy the luxury of having a "subjective career" in Savickas' terms, for example, the underclass. Similarly, Vondracek and Fouad emphasized the need to attend to the cross-cultural utility of current career models.

Another variant of this paradigm-expanding argument involved the need to employ multiple perspectives to guide our efforts, along with diverse research tools to implement them. Vondracek and Fouad, for example, recommended that career inquiry become more multidisciplinary, drawing on advances in developmental psychology and other areas. Other writers pointed to personality, social, organizational, and cognitive psychology as wellsprings for career psychology. Recent constructivist positions, an outgrowth of the cognitive movement, were seen as offering potentially profound implications for the way in which career scientists and practitioners view their domains (Lent & Hackett). The nature of schemata allow for the expression of behavioral consistency and plasticity across time and context, thereby setting a place at the table for both developmentalists and trait-and-factor adherents.

Constructivism, and motoric conceptions of cognition, emphasize the active, feed-forward mechanisms by which people make meaning of their experiences and help regulate their own behavior. Such conceptions view cognitive, affective, and behavioral pathways as integral partners in guiding human functioning, thereby challenging earlier approaches that assume a simple "cerebral supremacy," or one-way causal influence of cognition on emotion and behavior. These approaches also call into question theories that offer decontextualized accounts of behavior.

In her chapter, Phillips illustrated the limitations of classical decision-making models that are founded on the ideal of the "rational person." She noted that decisions are often affected by factors such as affect, cultural norms, information processing constraints, and biases that are not well accounted for by rational-prescriptive decisional approaches. The latter tend to view affect as a problem to be solved, one that stems from irrational or maladaptive thinking. In contrast, constructivist formulations acknowledge the functional utility of personal beliefs. Importantly, in the realm of career counseling, constructivist and humanistic streams have recently found a confluence in novel methods that take a narrative, storytelling view of career development impasses (Savickas). Such an approach engenders efforts to "edit" unsatisfying stories, rather than impose an invariant sequence of rational problem-solving activities.

Finally, a number of authors suggested that an expanded base of inquiry on career development will require that we take a more ecumenical approach to selecting research methods. Although no one advocated abandoning traditional quantitative methods, several participants championed the use of qualitative methodologies to illuminate particular facets of career development, such as the embedded self, that may prove refractory to quantitative techniques alone (e.g., Brown & Watkins). Others considered ways to make traditional and emerging methods more responsive to our knowledge needs. For instance, Walsh and Chartrand admonished career psychologists to attend to basic measurement issues, ensuring that research scales adequately reflect the constructs they are intended to assess. Vondracek and Fouad advocated longitudinal designs to better capture the dynamic flow of P-E interaction. Harmon encouraged the harvesting of computer-technologic advances, exploration of nonlinear relationships, and use of nonparametric methods. Some noted, or implied, the utility of causal modeling procedures (Lent & Hackett; Rounds & Hesketh).

If all of these recommendations for theory and research expansion did not produce a definitive set of architectural blueprints for a comprehensive career theory, at the very least they suggested important qualities about the neighborhood of such an edifice, as well as its foundation, building materials and methods, and would-be inhabitants—a multicultural, multiclass, dual-gendered collective, to be sure.

HEALING THE THEORY-PRACTICE RIFT

Convergence project participants addressed at length in their chapters one significant controversy that was aired at the conference, namely, the gulf that many perceive to exist between career development theory and research on the one hand, and career counseling practice, including social policy, on the other. That such gulfs exist in other applied psychological specialties, such as psychotherapy, is well known, though it is not much cause for consolation. The fact is, this issue became a major subtext of the convergence project, quickly creating the momentum for a

follow-up project exploring the convergence between career theory and practice (see the chapters by Savickas; Walsh & Chartrand).

In his chapter, Osipow noted that "career theories are not career counseling theories, and although career theories may have suggestions of value for career counseling practice, probably career counseling needs its own theory or theories." In the spirit of convergence and parsimony, theory-bridging efforts may prove valuable here. Indeed, there are inherent connections between career and personal development, and between career interventions and psychotherapy. Thus, rather than developing unique career counseling theories from scratch, it would be well to promote better efforts to link career practice with theories of change derived from personal counseling (cf. Rounds & Tinsley, 1984), as well as with more basic career, personality, learning, and development theories.

Such theory-bridging efforts will require the elaboration, modification, and the possible reforging of basic concepts and propositions within a more practice-friendly context. They will also require the cooperation of practitioners, scientists, and scientist-practitioners. The question raised throughout the project, Can practice ever inform theory?, sticks in academic psychology's collective craw. Of course it can and *should*; the problem may be that we too rarely ask it to.

Although practice-relevant theory and research might well form an integral part of the field's future mission, it is important that we not downplay the virtues of more basic research and theory. Kurt Lewin's observation that "there is nothing as practical as a good theory" has been invoked so often that perhaps it has lost its impact. The field's occasional tendency to dichotomize basic and applied science and to demand immediate relevance can be short sighted. For one thing, theorists live in the real world, too, and do not develop their ideas in a social void. For another, theorizing that may at first appear to be practice-distant tends to spin off practical applications. The contribution of theoretical physics to the development of nuclear technology is a case in point; there are many theory-into-practice examples to be found closer to home—for example, Holland's (1985) hexagonal interest model, Lofquist and Dawis' (1991) P-E correspondence counseling theory, and Super's career-development assessment and counseling model (Super, Osborne, Walsh, Brown, & Niles, 1992).

In sum, a reasonable argument might be made for supporting theorists to develop their models without the demand for instant consumption; some cakes simply take more time to bake than others. Such theories represent Savickas' notion of "practice at a distance." At the same time, a portion of the field's considerable energies can be devoted to elaborating practice and policy implications from existing theories, developing "bridging theories" that are specifically directed at practice issues, and launching research projects that test the applied implications of career theories. Part of the value of professional conferences, like the one included in this project, is that they provide the medium for a communal quest for future agendas. They may also, in their wake, facilitate the organization of programmatic research that addresses particular needs.

The point is that we need not try to eliminate the dialectic tension between theory and practice by forcing all theory to be immediately responsive to practical concerns or by abandoning basic theory; this tension can be healthy and heuristic. At the same time, however, we realize that our comments do not begin to address many practitioners' sense of alienation from the field's scientific base. Our field has clearly been slow to ponder innovative, structural methods that might unite scientists and practitioners in the common search for, and application of, knowledge. Clinical psychology has been struggling with this issue for some time; career psychology is just beginning to acknowledge it publicly. We can only hope that the career theory/practice project that follows this one will grapple openly and productively with the problems of scientist-practitioner dialogue and cooperation.

BACK TO TILTING AT WINDMILLS

The recent sensitivity to convergence and similarities among career theories (Borgen, 1991; Hackett, Lent, & Greenhaus, 1991; Krumboltz & Nichols, 1990; Osipow, 1990; Super, 1992) comes in the context of a broader dialogue about fragmentation versus unification in psychology's knowledge base. Arthur Staats (1991), one of the key figures in this dialogue, has argued that "psychology suffers from a crisis of disunity...[with] many unrelated methods, findings, problems, theoretical languages, schismatic issues, and philosophic positions" (p. 899). Let us briefly revisit Staats' thesis and its relevance to vocational psychology.

Essentially, Staats has argued that, in developing sciences like psychology, scientists tend to examine different phenomena, relying on diverse conceptual and methodological perspectives. The reward structure emphasizes identifying novel concepts and phenomena and generating competing theoretical accounts; it does not favor the search for commonality and interdependence. Staats contends that eventually this "chaos of disunity" is surmounted by movement toward a more unified state. This movement is marked by a change in goals "from preoccupation with the novel to inclusion of efforts to find interrelationships and to simplify and organize that which has already been found" (p. 900). As consensus emerges regarding underlying principles, language, and problems, competition in science begins to take on a different form. Rather than efforts to distinguish one's own work as unique, the prize involves being the first to solve complex problems.

Disunity in Career Psychology

Is career psychology a disunified science? If we apply Staats' criteria, perhaps it is. Are we as disunified as psychotherapy or certain other areas of psychology? Probably not. We currently have at least four dominant theories of career choice and development and a number of additional models that have proven heuristic to

varying degrees (Hackett & Lent, 1992; Osipow, 1990). We also have a research literature that has grown exponentially in the past 20 years (Borgen, 1991), though, unfortunately, a good portion of it has not been explicitly ground in theory (Hackett et al., 1991).

One might argue that the unbridled proliferation of inquiry is healthy—an indication that our subject matter is fertile and our conceptual lenses acute. Alternatively, one might acknowledge that, while it has produced a rich and expansive literature, our tendency toward knowledge production without a corresponding focus on knowledge unification has yielded considerable conceptual disarray. In essence, we possess many unconnected fragments of knowledge, making it difficult to synthesize what we know into a coherent whole. Needless to say, if this burgeoning complexity is difficult to organize, efforts to apply what we know to practice will necessarily meet with considerable frustration. Thus, scientific diversity sans unification or convergence efforts likely contributes dramatically to the rift between theory and practice noted earlier.

Holland and a few other writers in this volume eschewed the search for convergence, noting the many pitfalls of such a quest. Indeed, it is hard not to be swayed by Holland's conclusion that "theoretical restoration or renovation looks like a productive strategy with relatively few barriers, but integration looks like a strategy with many barriers." We agree with Holland on the virtues of renovating existing theories, especially those that have proven their mettle in research and practice. However, at the risk of swimming against the tide, we also see value in nurturing more efforts at theoretical integration. Simply put, it does not need to be an either-or proposition.

If convergence is such a good idea, then why did it receive such a lukewarm, if not cool, reception from so many participants in this project? Part of the reason may lie in the multitude of meanings that were ascribed to the term *convergence*. Some seemed to view convergence or integration as implying a movement toward one grand career theory-to-end-all-theories, akin to physicists' quest for a unified theory of the universe (Hawking, 1988). From such a perspective, diversity would be stifled, current "partial" theoretical positions would be reassembled by committee into a larger "Tinkertoy" structure, and one monolithic theory would dominate all inquiry. Other participants, ourselves included, saw convergence in far more modest terms—essentially, as an effort to explore points of commonality, to account for the relationships among seemingly diverse constructs, to promote more comprehensive theories, and, where possible, to reduce redundancy and promote parsimony.

Unification Agendas

If one accepts the latter agenda for convergence, then how can it be pursued? It is perhaps ironic that a variety of strategies may be employed in the quest for convergence, recalling the Zen assurance that there are many roads to the same end.

Staats (1991) advocated several "theory tasks," or types of unification, ranging from relatively circumscribed theory-bridging efforts to grand, unified theory strategies at the more ambitious end of the continuum. We will highlight three of Staats' tasks that represent a relatively modest level of unification activity and which, we believe, might lend themselves particularly well to current career inquiry. These tasks do not require that one subscribe to the vision of a single grand theory of career development that would absorb, render obsolete, and transcend all separate career theories.

The first task involves devising what Staats (1991) called "unifying theory analyses" that attempt to bring common concepts and principles together within a shared framework to "produce parsimony, relatedness, and unity" (p. 905). P-E fit conceptions may offer a good example of how and where such analyses can benefit career psychology. Holland (this volume) and Dawis (this volume) have both noted the similarity between their respective concepts of congruence and correspondence. Though conceptually similar, each version of P-E fit involves somewhat different central matching constructs (e.g., interests in Holland's model versus values and abilities in TWA). Since it is reasonable to assume that P-E fit is multiply determined—for instance, there are many dimensions upon which people and their environments may be compatible or incompatible, with some potentially compensating for others (cf. Gati, 1989)—unifying theory analyses could be undertaken that attempt to identify, organize, and incorporate the major variables that are assumed to define fit. At the same time, unifying research could be conducted that examines whether different methods of defining fit are complementary, redundant, or differentially useful. Surprisingly, incidents of this sort of research are somewhat rare in the career literature (e.g., Rounds, 1990).

A second, related strategy involves the construction of "theory bridges" that relate seemingly separate phenomena (Staats, 1991). Arguing that isolated concepts need to be "woven into a general fabric for expanding knowledge," Staats has cited a number of variables that are quite familiar to career researchers, such as interests, attitudes, values, and preferences:

> We have separate studies of phenomena under these labels. Are there any relationships among these phenomena? Could theory bridges of common underlying principles be constructed?... We will never achieve a related, meaningful, coherent, compact, and parsimonious field of knowledge if we do not relate and organize the phenomena studied. (pp. 905–906)

Career psychologists appear to be increasingly sensitive to the need to explore such potential links. For instance, Brown (1990) asked, "what are the relationships among values, needs, aptitudes, and interests as they operate in concert to influence occupational choice making?" (p. 346). Betz (1992) called for more work examining individual difference variables' theoretical linkages, structure, and dimensionality. Rounds and Hesketh (this volume) advocated study of the latent structure of the field's predictor and criterion variables. And Lent and Hackett (this volume)

described one bridging theory that attempts to account for the relations among a number of common career individual difference variables (e.g., interests, self-efficacy, ability, goals).

In constructing and researching theory bridges, it may be important to refrain from what Bandura (March 1, 1993, personal communication) described as "cafeteria theorizing," or what Holland (herein) has characterized as assembling theoretical constructs like "Tinkertoy materials." Bandura argued that "greater scientific progress is achieved by applying more aspects of a unified theory to career development than by stringing together constructs from divergent theories." The cafeteria approach may "spawn discordant eclecticism and needless redundancy," cautioned Bandura, rather than theoretical coherence and parsimony. Staats (1991) likewise counseled against "superficial eclectic combinations" that promote an "ephemeral peace" (p. 906) but do not fundamentally advance unification.

A third unification strategy described by Staats also seems quite relevant for current career psychology. This involves developing theories to reconcile general theoretical schisms or disparate philosophical positions, that is, broad disputes that transcend specific theories. For instance, in the career realm, developmentalists, trait-and-factor adherents, and social cognitivists hold differing views on the stability versus plasticity and globality versus situation-specificity of person attributes. Are these positions truly unbridgeable? Staats (1991) suggested that "theories are needed that show how the major findings of the schismatic positions can be related in a close, derivational way" and that such differences be viewed as "*problems* to be worked on toward a solution; they should not be accepted as foundations for mutual discreditation, for these sap the science's strength" (p. 906). Career psychology does not presently contain many examples of schism-melding unification efforts, though Vondracek, Lerner, and Schulenberg's (1986) attempt to bridge developmental and interactional positions is noteworthy.

We have tried to show in this book that there are many ways to approach theoretical convergence—and that the "big business" notion of a theory-conglomerate that would engulf and devour smaller theories actually offers a limited view of convergence. The common goal of the various unification strategies is not to restrain diversity or creativity, but rather to counterbalance "sheer production" with a

> strong investment in weaving the unrelated knowledge elements together into the fabric of organized science. Without that counterbalance...[of] unifying knowledge, the experimental productivity of the science simply makes it progressively more complex and disunified, less of a science, and less strong as a profession. (Staats, 1991, p. 910)

Activism Versus Letting Nature Take Its Course

In addition to the goals and methods of theoretical convergence, one area in which project participants disagreed was on whether convergence should be pursued actively and intentionally or whether a laissez-faire approach is best. Osipow (this volume) seemed to summarize the latter position well when he asked, "Should career theory be converged? The answer is an emphatic no." Osipow's stance places

faith in the emergence of "new and more powerful theories" from the "ashes and residue…of the failures of earlier theories." He suggests that convergence represents a naturally occurring process of theory renewal and that to pursue convergence as an explicit agenda may constrain theorists' creativity.

Osipow's position is thoughtful and persuasive, yet the patient, nonintervention-ist approach to convergence is not without its downsides. Staats (1991) interpreted the history of science as suggesting that "letting nature take its course with respect to unification guarantees that a very long-term process results" (p. 910). He argued that increasing fragmentation of our knowledge base is the price we pay for shunning theoretical rapprochement. We agree with Osipow in the sense that it would be counterproductive for the field to expect all of its theorists to focus on convergence. Indeed, career psychology is well served by a diversity of theoretical positions. Yet it would seem that this diversity could be complemented by having some theorists and researchers build structures to unify our diverse fragments of knowledge. Thus, both diversity *and* convergence have their place. As Staats (1991) has observed, "psychology has enormous power in its building materials, but that potential will only be realized by adding the architectural direction of [intentional and systematic] unification efforts" (p. 910).

CONCLUSION

Unified theory, as Dawis (this volume) has observed, may well be likened to the quest for the Holy Grail—elusive, ephemeral, perhaps unattainable. But where would literature be if the knights found in medieval and Renaissance writings went on strike and refused the challenge of the quest, complaining that the Holy Grail probably doesn't exist or, if it does, it's too much trouble to find? The point may be that we need the quest, the challenge, and the striving involved in theory conver-gence. As the work motivation literature tells us, goals have orienting and motivat-ing functions, sometimes enabling people to transcend the targets they work toward and to produce fortuitous outcomes. For instance, even though many viewed the goal of landing a person on the moon by the end of the 1960s as implausible, the goal nonetheless spurred important scientific and technological advances—and later proved to be achievable.

Unified science in the grand theory sense seems quixotic or Arthurian, in part, because it may appear to represent an end state, an advanced stage in which knowledge cannot be furthered. Yet we all know that science is a growth enterprise, and Dawis' four "iron laws" certainly mitigate against the framing of a finalized, universal theory that will explain all career-relevant phenomena. While unified science, the mythical end state, may ultimately be unattainable, unifying science—the process of seeking convergence among seemingly diverse theories and phenomena—somehow does not seem so farfetched. In this process, a multiplicity of convergence efforts is needed, not one single project or theory.

So what did this project achieve? Did it produce meaningful convergence, if only of opinion? Honestly, no. Its value may lie not in any immediate tangible product, but rather in its process—its ability to bring together a number of the field's foremost theorists and researchers who were willing to consider the merits of a convergence agenda. As Osipow (this volume) has observed, real theory developments, including theory convergence efforts, are generally pursued by individuals or small teams, far from the tumult of projects such as this one.

Nevertheless, the convergence project may have achieved a number of modest, though useful, intermediate objectives, such as (a) legitimizing the search for theoretical commonalities and relationships among our diverse phenomena of interest; (b) identifying several person, contextual, and P-E interaction mechanisms that could serve as a springboard for future inquiry on theory integration; (c) reaffirming the useful distinctions among the major career theories; (d) highlighting the theories' deficiencies and features needing renovation; and (e) recognizing a serious career theory-practice rift, leading to a new profession-wide project. Finally, we'd like to believe that the project helped set a valuable precedent in career psychology—that is, the coming together to identify and consider a communal response to pressing problems of scientific and practical import. This atmosphere of dialogue and debate may help nurture a sense of shared mission, a zeitgeist that promotes convergence as well as diversity.

REFERENCES

Betz, N. E. (1992). Career assessment: A review of critical issues. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (2d ed., pp. 453–484). New York: Wiley.

Borgen, F. H. (1991). Megatrends and milestones in vocational behavior: A 20-year counseling psychology retrospective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39,* 263–290.

Borgen, F. H. (1992). Expanding scientific paradigms in counseling psychology. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (2d ed., pp. 111–139). New York: Wiley.

Brown, D. (1990). Summary, comparison, and critique of the major theories. In D. Brown, L. Brooks, & Associates, *Career Choice and development* (2d ed., pp. 338–363). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dollard, J., & Miller, N. E. (1950). *Personality and psychotherapy.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gati, I. (1989). Person-environment fit research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35,* 181–193.

Hackett, G., & Lent, R. W. (1992). Theoretical advances and current inquiry in career psychology. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (2d ed., pp. 419–451). New York: Wiley.

Hackett, G., Lent, R. W., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1991). Advances in vocational theory and research: A 20-year retrospective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 38,* 3–38.

Hawking, S. W. (1988). *A brief history of time: From the big bang to black holes.* Toronto: Bantam.

Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (2d ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Krumboltz, J. D., & Nichols, C. W. (1990). Integrating the social learning theory of career decision making (pp. 159–192). In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.), *Career counseling: Contemporary topics in vocational psychology* (pp. 159–192). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lofquist, L. H., & Dawis, R. V. (1991). *Essentials of person-environment correspondence counseling.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Osipow, S. H. (1990). Convergence in theories of career choice and development: Review and prospect. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 36,* 122–131.

Rounds, J. B. (1990). The comparative and combined utility of work value and interest data in career counseling with adults. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37,* 32–45.

Rounds, J. B., & Tinsley, H. E. A. (1984). Diagnosis and treatment of vocational problems. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 137–177). New York: Wiley.

Staats, A. W. (1991). Unified positivism and unification psychology: Fad or new field? *American Psychologist, 46,* 899–912.

Super, D. E. (1992). Toward a comprehensive theory of career development. In D. Montross & C. Shinkman (Eds.), *Career development: Theory and practice* (pp. 35–64). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Super, D. E., Osborne, W. L., Walsh, D. J., Brown, S. D., & Niles, S. G. (1992). Developmental career assessment and counseling: The C-DAC Model. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 71,* 74–80.

Vondracek, F. W., Lerner, R. M., & Schulenberg, J. E. (1986). *Career development: A life-span developmental approach.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.