ARTICLE

Mary Sue Richardson, (1993, October). Work in People's Lives: A Location for
    Counseling Psychologists, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40, 425-433.

COMMENTS

Mark L. Savickas, (1994, January). Vocational Psychology in the Postmodern
    Era: Comment on Richardson (1993), Journal of Counseling Psychology,
    41, 105-107.

Howard E. A. Tinsley, (1994, January). Construct Your Reality and Show Us Its
    Benefits: Comment on Richardson (1993), Journal of Counseling
    Psychology, 41, 108-111.

Mary Sue Richardson, (1994, January). Pros and Cons of a New Location:
    Reply to Savickas (1994) and Tinsley (1994). Journal of Counseling
    Psychology, 41, 112-114.

Work in People's Lives:
A Location for Counseling Psychologists

Mary Sue Richardson

The career development–vocational psychology literature has been marked by 2 persistent problems: a slow response to new developments in basic areas of psychology, such as developmental psychology, and a lack of representation of populations other than White and middle-class groups as research participants or as foci of theoretical explanation. After a brief discussion of 2 factors that may have contributed to these problems, a rationale for a new location for this field is developed. The new location focuses on the study of work in people's lives from the perspective of social constructionism and from the perspective of counseling psychologists as applied psychologists.

The purpose of this article is to suggest some new directions for the field of vocational psychology or career development, terms I use synonymously here. The first thought that might come to mind is to question the need for new directions. Is there anything in the current state of affairs in this field that calls for a new direction? A perusal of a number of recent reviews seems to indicate that vocational psychology–career development is healthy, robust, and in good shape (Borgen, 1991; Hackett, Lent, & Greenhaus, 1991; Osipow, 1991). Moreover, the degree of convergence in this literature has been considered a mark of the maturity of the field and suggestive of the veridicality of the knowledge base (Osipow, 1990). I suggest that, in contrast to this positive and sanguine perspective, there are some very serious problems with this literature. Also, I share some preliminary thoughts regarding the etiology of these problems and suggest a perspective that I hope will enable the development of solutions to the problems identified.

Problems

The first problem to concern me is the quality of the relation between the career development literature and the major disciplinary roots in the field of psychology (specifically, the relation of career literature to developmental psychology). As indicated by the recent excellent and comprehensive review by Gelso and Fassinger (1992), the career literature in counseling psychology is indebted to personality psychology and, especially, developmental psychology, and many of the basic tenets of developmental psychology have been incorporated into career development theories and research efforts. Few would dispute that Donald Super has been a major

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mary Sue Richardson, New York University, Department of Applied Psychology, 239 Greene Street, East Building, 4th Floor, New York, New York 10003.

figure in this regard. Super can be credited with bringing into the field of vocational psychology and career development, throughout its history, a developmental orientation to an understanding of career choice and related processes. Also, he has been instrumental in enlarging the scope of this developmental inquiry to include multiple roles across the life span (Super, 1957, 1969, 1980). One also can point to those who have contributed models incorporating new and innovative theoretical perspectives into career theory (e.g., Betz & Hackett, 1986, on self-efficacy theory; Vondracek, Lerner, & Schulenberg, 1986, on a life-span developmental framework for career development; and Gottfredson, 1981, on the influence of the social context in constricting expectations and choices).

Despite these accomplishments, there is acknowledgment throughout the literature that too big a gap exists between the emergence of new advances in developmental psychology and their incorporation into the career development literature, that the theories and models of vocational psychology and career development are too static in light of what is now known about the interactional and transactional processes of development over the life span, and that these theories are limited on the basis of their formal adequacy (Betz, 1991; Betz, Fitzgerald, & Hill, 1989; Gelso & Fassinger, 1992; Hackett et al., 1991; Harmon, 1991). Furthermore, this line of criticism has appeared consistently throughout the history of vocational psychology (Beilin, 1955, 1963; Gottfredson, 1983; Vondracek, Lerner, & Schulenberg, 1983).

Is this state of affairs simply what is to be expected of an applied field? Is it inevitable that new developments in the disciplinary sources of an applied field take time to filter through and into its literature? Perhaps. A less positive reading of this situation is that the field is resistant to new ideas, that it is guilty of the disciplinary ethnocentrism recently described by George Howard (1992), and that it represents not only a necessary and understandable time gap but a more active and resistant attitude toward the incorporation of new and challenging ideas and perspectives. This less positive reading is more unsettling and demands attention. It is persuasive, in part, simply because it cannot easily be ignored. It requires a more active questioning of the potential ethnocentrism in this field, analysis of the sources of resistance to

new ideas, and encouragement of efforts for change. One needs to question why more career development theorists and vocational psychologists are not at the forefront of incorporating new ideas and approaches into the study of career behavior and what might be done to facilitate the infusion of innovative and challenging ideas and approaches.

The second and more serious problem is the fact that the theoretical and research literature in vocational psychology–career development is notably oriented toward the White middle class. (It should be noted that the career development literature is not alone in its inattention to the diversity of racial, ethnic, and class populations. A recent examination of a number of American Psychological Association journals, including the *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, revealed a general inattention to and disregard for these issues [Graham, 1992].) Twenty years ago, the literature was also very androcentric, with little or no acknowledgment of women's career development. Certainly that has changed to date, with an impressive research literature and a number of useful and important theoretical models of career development relevant and responsive to gender differences (Astin, 1984; Farmer, 1985; Hackett & Betz, 1981; Larwood & Gutek, 1987). The same progress cannot be cited with respect to racial and ethnic minorities. Although there has been some attention to these populations, as exemplified in the work of Arbona (1990), Cheatham (1990), June and Pringle (1977), Leong (1985), and Smith (1983), a subtext of recent major reviews acknowledges that racial and ethnic minorities are underrepresented and that, if anything, theoretical and research attention to these populations decreased during the 1980s (Betz, 1991; Betz et al., 1989; Gelso & Fassinger, 1992; Hackett et al., 1991; Harmon, 1991; London & Greller, 1991). Despite such consistent criticism, one is not left with the impression that this gap in representation is considered particularly problematic or critical. Moreover, there is almost no acknowledgment that poor and lower class populations, regardless of race or ethnicity, are almost totally absent from this literature.

In contrast to complacency, I believe that career development theorists should be shocked and dismayed by the inattention to race, ethnicity, and class, both as professionals and as scientists. According to George Howard's (1992) study of the values of counseling psychologists—members of a specialization with a historical commitment to vocational psychology—a central value in this specialty is the importance of enhancing awareness of oppression. Yet, the absence in the career development literature of racial and ethnic minorities and of the poor and lower classes, all of whom can be characterized as oppressed groups, is a clear sign that these groups have been marginalized, that professional efforts to understand and facilitate career development have been focused on White, middle-class populations, and that what is known is, for the most part, at best irrelevant to oppressed groups and at worst directly participatory in the implicit racism and classism of the social structure.

Furthermore, the absence of racial, ethnic, poor, and lower class populations in the career development literature seriously undermines any claims this literature might make to scientific validity. The small amount of knowledge about

these underrepresented groups is highly suspect for its blindness to the social structural context of race, ethnicity, and class. This social structural context, which involves hierarchies of power as well as ethnic or cultural diversity (Omi & Winant, 1986), is deeply implicated in the career development process of all groups, not only the so-called diverse groups. Interlocking hierarchies of gender, race, and class privilege and oppression structure and permeate people's lives and careers in a multitude of ways. Until these considerations are more fully incorporated into the theoretical and research literature, little will be known about these diverse groups, and there will be major blind spots in what is known about the White, middle-class experience. Linda Gottfredson's (1981) model of the circumscription of occupational choice based on gender and class is one example of a theoretical model that begins to open up an avenue of inquiry for the study of both oppression and privilege.

Problem Contexts

Although I am not a historian, I do have two ideas about why these problems exist and persist that may be helpful to share. The first idea involves the role of vocational psychology in the history of counseling psychology. In the 1950s, it was important for counseling psychology, as a new specialty, to establish an identity and to build the basis of a professional and scientific literature (Gelso & Fretz, 1992; Whiteley, 1984). Literature in vocational psychology and career development provided important building blocks in the history of the professionalization of counseling psychology. Since that time, the field of vocational psychology–career development has matured, as has the broader specialty of counseling psychology. Although interest in the individual and his or her work remains a significant element in the professional identity of many counseling psychologists, it is no longer, or not necessarily, the defining or central attribute in the identity of counseling psychologists (Fitzgerald & Osipow, 1988; Watkins, 1988). Counseling psychologists have made significant contributions across a range of areas, as indicated by the recent series of articles published in the *Journal of Counseling Psychology* (Dawis, 1992; Gelso & Fassinger, 1992; Hill & Corbett, 1993; Howard, 1992; Strong, Welsh, Corcoran, & Hoyt, 1992). It is possible that the initial concern of counseling psychologists to build a professional literature on which to base a claim to professional status and recognition, in a context in which counseling psychology was not generally recognized as necessarily legitimate or of equal status with other specialties, led to a premature rigidity or calcification of the literature in career development. This historical situation, which now has been outgrown, may have kept counseling psychologists involved in vocational psychology and career development too closely tied to the content of the early career literature rather than to the pioneering spirit that originally led to the emergence of the field.

In addition to concerns regarding professional identity and recognition that may have led to ethnocentrism in the theoretical and research literature in career development, I also believe that the field has been enslaved by its dominant epistemology: the legacy of logical positivism and empiricism,

with the associated beliefs that the goal of good theory and research is to provide a mirror of reality, that knowledge is independent of the knower, and that objectivity in science is an unquestioned ideal (Gergen, 1985; Howard, 1992). This epistemology and its related conceptions of science support an accretion of knowledge mentality, a greater respect for answers than for questions, and what seems to me to be a predilection to adhere to established theory rather than to explore new developments, new perspectives, new questions, and new populations. At this point, however, I turn to some ideas regarding solutions to the problems identified.

A Location for the Study of Work in People's Lives

My original plan was to develop a framework for the study of work in people's lives that would be superior to what is now available. As I started to think about this, I realized that the idea of a framework is characteristic of the kind of thinking that results in the types of problems that concern me. A framework connotes a kind of scaffold or structure for organizing knowledge, questions, and so forth. It provides a sense of organization and of perimeters and boundaries comforting to those who have been traditionally trained as researchers, scientists, and psychologists. It is useful for organizing "knowledge out there" and implies an independence or disconnection between the knower and the known. In contrast to such a framework and in hopes of encouraging a different kind of thinking that will be instrumental in resolving the problems identified in the first part of this article, I propose in this section a location for the study of work in people's lives. By location I mean a point of view, a perspective of the knower in relation to what is to be known. A location quite frankly roots knowledge in a subjective reality. What can be known from any particular location is admittedly affected by the location of the knower. The location I have in mind is threefold. I propose that counseling psychologists (a) focus on work in people's lives rather than on careers, (b) adopt a social constructionist epistemological stance in regard to work, and (c) view work in people's lives from their perspective as applied psychologists. Each of these points is considered in turn.

Work in People's Lives

There have been two major transitions in this century regarding ideas about work. I am referring to ideas in the emerging professional literature in counseling psychology and vocational psychology, as well as to ideas in the minds of the general population. First, there was the transition from the idea of getting a job to the idea of choosing a vocation, a transition critically influenced by Frank Parsons and the vocational guidance movement in the early part of this century. Work in the occupational structure came to be seen as more than just a job. Early vocational theorists realized that some jobs might suit a person more than other jobs. Thus, it was necessary for vocational guidance to assist people in finding the right job or vocation. The second major transition did not occur until the middle of the century, when as a result of the influence of the pioneering work of Donald Super (1957), notions derived from developmental psychology were built into ideas about work in the occupational structure. This entailed consideration of the sequence of jobs and positions over time and gave birth to the study of careers as they emerged and developed over the life span in the occupational structure (Osipow, 1987). No longer was the focus simply on the point of choice, which had begun to be considered not just a job or occupational choice but a decision that was part of an emerging career developmental process. Increasing attention was and is now paid to the various processes related to careers as they develop over time (Chartrand & Camp, 1991).

At this point, I suggest a third transition, from the study of careers predominantly located in the occupational structure to a focus on the study of work in people's lives in which work is considered to be a central human activity that is not tied to or solely located in the occupational structure. My reasons for suggesting this transition are fourfold. First, the concept of career that implies some sort of developmental progression over time is inherently biased in favor of middle-class populations that have access to occupational opportunities that enable progressive movement over time (Warnath, 1975). Although a number of writers in this field have taken great pains to dispute the middle-class bias and to assert that anyone who works (that is, in an occupation) has a career (Arthur, Hall, & Lawrence, 1989; Greenhaus, 1989), I do not find these refutations persuasive. Too many people are excluded by a focus on career with its inherent middle-class connotations. If the middle-class tilt in this field is to be corrected, work must be considered as a basic human function among populations for whom work has a multiplicity of meanings, including but not restricted to a career meaning.

Second, a focus on careers ties the field too closely to phenomena in the occupational structure and both ignores and marginalizes work done outside this structure. Most prominent in this regard is the gendered nature of work in the occupational structure and in personal and familial domains. Most of the theory and research regarding women's career development has acknowledged the importance of considering familial factors in any attempt to understand women's career development (Astin, 1984; Fitzgerald & Crites, 1980; Gallos, 1989; Larwood & Gutek, 1987), and theorists such as Super (1980) have expanded the conceptual umbrella of career to include a life career across and through multiple role enactments in various life domains. However, there has not been, for the most part, a clearly articulated interest or focus on work in people's lives across all of the domains in which this work might be enacted. An expanded consideration of life roles, or even life careers, that continues to presume that occupational roles and work are synonymous ignores work done outside the occupational structure. To consider family roles as nonwork roles, even if one is paying attention to the relation of family roles to work roles in the occupational structure (Loscocco & Roschelle, 1991), is to perpetuate a bias in favor of the primacy of work accomplished in the occupational structure, with work in other role domains or environments considered potentially explanatory or contextual.

In contrast to this bias or tilt, I propose that the focus be placed on work in people's lives across life role contexts in line with the thinking of others such as Abel and Nelson (1990), Gerstel and Gross (1987), Goldsmith (1989), Grossman and Chester (1990), Kline and Cowan (1989), and Voydanoff (1989). Refusal to endorse a male-biased definition of work, with its social devaluation of women's work as embedded in the concept of career, or to participate in the mythology of the separate worlds of work and family so eloquently described by Kanter (1977) has the potential for greatly enhancing the understanding of men's and women's work experiences in both occupational and nonoccupational domains (Marshall, 1989). Carol Gilligan (1990) was able to identify a pattern of moral reasoning in women that had been obscured by a focus on the study of moral reasoning in men, which resulted in the delineation of two developmental lines of moral reasoning applicable to both men and women. Similarly, those interested in the study of work in people's lives may be able to identify a richer and more complex understanding of the nature of work relevant to both genders if a broader and more basic focus on work across all life domains is adopted.

An example of a line of research and theory relevant here is the literature that is developing on caring work both within and outside of the occupational structure. This literature is exemplified by Fisher and Tronto's (1990) feminist theory of caring and by studies on topics such as family care of the elderly (Abel, 1990), the care for those who are mentally retarded and reside in institutions (Lundgren & Browner, 1990), the care of other people's children by family day-care providers (Nelson, 1990), the care of their own children by women employed to care for other people's children (Dill, 1980), and the effect of gender on caring work in nursing (Ekstrom, 1992). This line of research inquiry promises to enable an enriched understanding of caring work, the effect of context on such work, and the struggles of individuals, both female and male, to perform, cope with, and integrate caring work with other work and roles in their lives. Might not such lines of research and theory contribute to healing some of the false splits in people's lives produced by a society that typically ignores caring work, especially work accomplished in family and personal roles? Finally, might not the study of caring work across contexts begin to elucidate ignored but important dimensions of work in the occupational structure (e.g., the function and value of building, maintaining, and enhancing relationships in organizational structures)?

A third reason for preferring to focus on work in people's lives is that the emphasis is more clearly placed on the individual in the multiple contexts of his or her life. A career in the occupational structure is essentially a product of people interacting with their employment context (Arthur et al., 1989). If inquiry is limited to work in jobs and occupations, what might be known about people in the multiple and interacting contexts or environments of their lives is severely truncated. Although the centrality of the study of career may be cogent for industrial psychologists (who are, in fact, most concerned about the interacting nature of individuals and occupational structures), it is more appropriate for counseling psychologists (who have a more holistic interest in the developmental patterns of individual lives) to consider people and their work across the full range of life contexts.

Finally, I prefer the study of work in people's lives as opposed to career because of the values that inhere in the concept of work as compared with the values embedded in the concept of career. Work has long been understood to be a central and critical feature of human functioning. Although it can have many different meanings (MOW International Research Team, 1987; Weiss & Kahn, 1960), Hall (1986) provided a basic definition of work as "the effort or activity of an individual performed for the purpose of providing goods or services of values to others; it is also considered to be work by the individual so involved" (p. 13). This definition was further elaborated by Gerstel and Gross (1987), who expanded the notion of goods and services to include the social relations produced by work. These definitions explicitly recognize that work has a social value. It is done not just for individual success and satisfaction, to express achievement strivings, to earn a living, or to further ambitions and self-assertions. On some level, it is also, and most important, a contribution to society. The concept of work links individuals to a larger social good; it brings the individual into relation to others. (Although some work may be antisocial in nature [e.g., various criminal activities], the concept of work brings into focus the nature of the relation of such work to the social order. In this case, however, there is a negative relation to the general social order.) The concept of work makes explicit that people exist in a larger community and for others as well as for themselves. The concept of career is embedded in an ethos of self-centered individualism and in an ethnocentric conception of the self (Cushman, 1990; Hermans, Kempen, & van Loon, 1992; Sampson, 1988) that may contribute to undermining the social fabric of society and culture.

A Social Constructionist Epistemological Perspective

A second location for the study of work in people's lives is in an explicitly social constructionist epistemology. Originally stimulated by philosophers such as Rorty (1979) and transported into psychology by others (Bruner, 1986; Gergen, 1985; Hare-Mustin & Maracek, 1988; Howard, 1985; Koch, 1959; Manicas & Secord, 1983; Unger, 1983, 1989), social constructionism has radically altered conceptions of science. No longer is it possible to endorse a naive realism depicting "a world out there," with the task of science to mirror and represent this world. Rather, current philosophers of science have demonstrated convincingly that the "worlds out there" are constructed as opposed to naively apprehended. What people see before them is affected by who they are and what they value, as well as by their biases, theoretical predilections, and social locations (Flax, 1987; Morawski, 1990). Thus, what is known is, in part, a product of the knower. Rather than a belief in a single reality, there are multiple realities and multiple truths, each of which can make claims to being less false than others while giving up the futile quest to be true for all (Bordo, 1990). Although some would argue that the logical end point of social construc-

tionism is a collapse into total relativism, this is not at all necessary or desirable. Giving up claims to a single truth does not negate the attempt to approximate what is true for some people and might even be true for most people.

This social constructionist view, of course, profoundly affects conceptions of science. It enables a critical analysis of the ways in which a knowledge base is a product of social constructions and, conversely, of the ways in which the realities of others located differently in the social structure are not incorporated in this knowledge base. For example, with respect to current career development theory, what I would now consider a subcategory within a broader field of the study of work in people's lives, consider the convergence that has been noted in support of the importance of personal agency in career development (Borgen, 1991). As opposed to considering this a fact or a truth about the reality of career development, it is more appropriate within this epistemology to view this finding as one that has been at least partially constructed by and for those for whom personal agency in pursuing occupational pursuits is a possibility (i.e., mainly White, male, and middle-class populations). Whether personal agency best captures the central motivational dynamic in other socially located groups is not known.

It is a short step from social constructionism to a postmodern multiplicity of seemingly conflicting and clashing socially constructed perspectives and realities. One begins to wonder whether separate theories are needed for individuals located in each diverse social location. The multiplicity of locations is staggering. For example, the category of gender breaks down in this analysis (Spelman, 1988). I referred earlier to the importance of looking at work from what is essentially a perspective derived from women's lives (i.e., a perspective in which work is not contained solely or predominantly in occupational environments). But women's perspective is not univocal. One is never only a woman. Gender is always closely entwined with class, race, ethnicity, and other identities. The idea of a unitary self has been replaced by that of a saturated self with many potentially conflicting voices (Gergen, 1991). These considerations lead to what seems like an overwhelming plurality of specific social locations and the experience of the impossibility of ever knowing anything at all. I refer here to the anxiety engendered by what seems to be a collapse of comforting, if limited, bodies of generalizable knowledge into a confusing relativism and multiplicity of parts about which little is known or can be known.

If one can tolerate and overcome this angst, it is possible to envision a project designed to discover, record, study, and analyze a multitude of stories about work in people's lives. These stories would be shaped by people's respective social locations, and the goal would be to examine both commonalities and differences in the stories. A general theory is not impossible; rather, such a theory must be locally and situationally generated and tested carefully for generalizability across diverse social locations (Bordo, 1990; Fraser & Nicholson, 1990). What I propose here is a process that is more inductive than is typical in this field. In my opinion, however, such a project promises the genesis of new concepts, constructs, and theories and, ulti-mately, improved understanding and practice. Once attention is shifted away from the concern engendered by the collapse of knowledge, it is an exciting task to discover, identify, and shape multiple knowledges. Endorsement of a social constructionist epistemology opens up a multitude of avenues of productive and exciting inquiry. This epistemology is, I believe, far more conducive than the traditional canons of empiricism or positivism to the exploration of work in people's lives from diverse social locations, including race, class, gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation.

Implicit in a social constructionist stance is a receptivity to diverse methodologies, even ones that seem contradictory, including traditional empirical methods and newer and more innovative qualitative approaches (Bruner, 1990; Hoshmand, 1989; Howard, 1991). Although traditional empirical methods and a social constructionist epistemology may seem (and, indeed, are) antithetical, contradictions and conflict are part of this view of science. No single method has hegemony in a world of multiple realities. What is necessary is a constant self-criticism, regardless of method, with respect to what reality or whose story is being left out of any particular account and an ongoing struggle to identify standards and criteria for knowledge (Morawski, 1990).

It might be helpful here to provide some examples of lines of research inquiry that could be pursued given this epistemological stance. The examples that come to my mind, of course, reflect my particular interests, concerns, and values. Someone else with a different set of interests, concerns, and values would produce a very different set of examples. The point is that a major asset of this epistemological stance is that it opens up a multiplicity of lines of inquiry reflecting the diversity of potential perspectives among researchers. Thus, I offer these examples as illustrative rather than exemplary and in hopes of validating rather than constraining the perspectives of potential researchers who may read this article.

One line of inquiry long a tradition among vocational psychologists is career decision making. This inquiry could be broadened to encompass the investigation of how and why people from diverse social locations make life decisions regarding work (across domains) and family across the life cycle. (This reframing is similar to Super's [1980] reframing of the scope of career developmental theory. What is different here is the explicit recognition of work in nonoccupational domains and the epistemological stance.) In this reframing of a traditional question, the interview-based research of Gerson (1985) on the occupational and family decisions of a socioeconomically (although, unfortunately, not racially) diverse sample of women in their early 30s illustrates this epistemological approach. Her sample included mothers, childless women, homemakers, and employed women and focused on examining how and why their lives, in relation to family and occupational commitments, had either implemented or deviated from the life courses anticipated at an earlier age. This discovery-oriented approach, which focused on the perspective of the study participants in telling their life stories and emphasized within-gender variations, revealed a dynamic process of growth and development over time

shaped by individuals with their history and characteristics in response to the opportunities and constraints encountered in their immediate social environments. A very different set of opportunities and constraints would be discovered in the study of the lives of a socioeconomically diverse group of Black women, for whom patterns of oppression that differentially affect middle- and lower-class women would be a factor (Claude, 1986; Collins, 1990; Pinkney, 1984; Rapp, 1982). These are the kinds of studies that need to be conducted for both men and women in diverse social locations across the life cycle to begin to generate the necessary knowledge and important questions regarding work in people's lives.

Furthermore, this kind of research, although more qualitative in nature, is well within the spirit of current life span developmental theory. For example, current approaches (Gottlieb, 1983; Lerner, 1989) stress the influence of context on development, the importance of change, and the underlying plasticity of development, what has been called a probabilistic epigenetic model or developmental contextualism that enables the identification of divergent trajectories in people's lives. Qualitative approaches to the study of work in people's lives also are synchronous with current interactionist approaches in developmental psychology (Bornstein & Bruner, 1989) and could provide the kind of basic research foundations that would enable the development of new theoretical models, reconceptualization of traditional variables and identification of variables not yet considered, and the design of more strategically targeted quantitative studies either across or within groups. For example, following through on Gelso and Fassinger's (1992) recommendation of Bronfenbrenner's process–person–context framework for the study of human development, basic discovery-oriented research would enable the selection of those elements of process, person, and context to include in a research design. Along these lines, Stewart (1990) noted that qualitative and discovery-oriented studies have begun to highlight the centrality of the experience of relationships in women's occupational work lives.

Similarly, recommendations to use structural equation modeling to study interactions (Fassinger, 1987) would be facilitated by basic research that might help to select the most critical interactions to study either across or within groups, keeping in mind Bronfenbrenner's (1988) recommendations to embed studies on interactions in person–process–content models. For example, the design of a study such as Metz's (1992) investigation of the interaction of work and marital satisfaction using structural equation modeling would have been enhanced by the availability of a body of grounded research (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) on this topic (i.e., grounded in the study of people's lives in diverse social locations). He found significant negative effects of job satisfaction on the marital satisfaction of relatively affluent, well-educated men and women in dual-career families with young children and a positive effect of marital satisfaction on job satisfaction only for men. Rather than questioning, after the fact, the extent to which sample characteristics might have affected the results, would it not be better to be able to select a sample (or samples) to study based on prior research that

suggested where or among whom the most critical or theoretically relevant interactions might occur?

I also believe that those who propose to study work in people's lives are well positioned to open up for inquiry an area of investigation that, perhaps not unsurprisingly, has been little studied by psychologists: the interacting effects of power and powerlessness (Griscom, 1992) and of oppression and privilege on the development of work-related aspirations, choices, and patterns. Three lines of inquiry come to mind: the study of sexual harassment experiences as they interact with women's work lives in schools and jobs, the study of the interaction of homophobic contexts with the occupational work lives of lesbian women and gay men, and the study of difference and racism in the work life development of African-American, Hispanic or Latino, Asian, and other underrepresented groups. Clearly, these are broad areas of inquiry that could be pursued in both qualitative and quantitative ways and would not only enable a greater understanding of oppressive contexts but promise to elucidate contrasting patterns of privilege.

Goals of an Applied Psychology

The third point of location for counseling psychologists interested in a field focusing on work in people's lives is as applied psychologists committed to facilitating the development and enhancing the well-being of individuals who are clients as well as subjects or objects of inquiry. Applied psychologists do not have the luxury to be interested only in pure science or simply in the generation of knowledge. For applied psychologists, a central criterion of knowledge is its usefulness to practitioners who work to improve lives. Although some might bridle at what seems like an overly practical or pragmatic approach to knowledge, the question of truth claims and criteria for knowledge is central in a postmodern world open to multiple realities and multiple truths. If the dangers of solipsism and relativism are to be avoided, a thoughtful consideration of criteria is paramount. In my opinion, the usefulness of knowledge—usefulness considered in its broadest and most generic sense—is paramount in guiding such an inquiry.

Thus, I envision those of us who are interested in the study of work in people's lives positioned eagerly at the boundaries of core disciplinary and interdisciplinary sources, incorporating the best of both new and old ideas with a particular concern for using and generating knowledge that will be useful. I hope that both the maturity of counseling psychology as a professional specialty and the endorsement of a more open and less constraining epistemological stance will facilitate more open and fluid channels of communication between counseling psychologists involved in the field of work in people's lives and colleagues in related fields.

I also believe it is important for applied psychologists in this field to endorse goals related to both development and well-being. Although one of the major contributions of career development psychologists has been to elucidate and foster developmental understandings of a career process, considerations related to development and well-being are synergistic. Moreover, both sets of concerns are likely to char-

acterize the nature of the issues of clients in diverse settings. Perhaps in the effort to promote developmental understanding and avoid a mental health or psychopathological orientation, counseling psychologists have given insufficient attention to issues of health and well-being. Attention to both of these dimensions will orient counseling psychologists to a broader range of issues, concerns, and theoretical vantage points in relation to the people they study and the clients with whom they work.

Finally, I believe that developmental considerations need to be shifted from a focus on career to a more central focus on the individual (Bem, 1988; Maddi, 1982; McAdams, 1988). In other words, I believe that there is a need to move beyond career development to a broader emphasis on fostering the development of individuals considered as whole persons in relation to the work in their lives. I no longer believe it is tenable to separate the study of career from the multiple and interacting strands and trajectories of development that make up the texture of lives over the life span. Work is embedded in family and personal lives, as well as in paid employment. In any one case, this work may contribute to or impede development or well-being. A privileging of any one of the developmental strands relating to work in a person's life would necessarily distort and limit an understanding of that person.

References

Abel, E. K. (1990). Family care of the frail elderly. In E. K. Abel & M. K. Nelson (Eds.), *Circles of care: Work and identity in women's lives* (pp. 65–91). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Abel, E. K., & Nelson, M. K. (Eds.). (1990). *Circles of care: Work and identity in women's lives.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Arbona, C. (1990). Career counseling research and Hispanics: A review of the literature. *The Counseling Psychologist, 18,* 300–323.

Arthur, M. B., Hall, D. T., & Lawrence, B. S. (1989). Generating new directions in career theory: The case for a transdisciplinary approach. In M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of career theory.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Astin, H. S. (1984). The meaning of work in women's lives: A sociopsychological model of career choice and work behavior. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12,* 117–126.

Beilin, H. (1955). The application of general developmental principles to the vocational area. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 2,* 53–57.

Beilin, H. (1963). Symposium: New research in vocational development (discussion). *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 41,* 780–782.

Bem, D. G. (1988). Putting persons back into context. In N. Bolger, A. Caspi, G. Downey, & M. Moorehouse (Eds.), *Persons in context: Developmental processes* (pp. 203–216). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Betz, N. (1991). Twenty years of vocational research: Looking back and ahead. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39,* 305–310.

Betz, N. E., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Hill, R. E. (1989). Trait-factor theories: Traditional cornerstone of career theory. In M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of career theory* (pp. 26–40). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Betz, N. E., & Hackett, G. (1986). Applications of self-efficacy to understanding career choice behavior. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4,* 279–289.

Bordo, S. (1990). Feminism, postmodernism, and gender-scepticism. In L. J. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/postmodernism* (pp. 133–156). London: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.

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

Bornstein, M. H., & Bruner, J. S. (1989). *Interaction in human development.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1988). Interacting systems in human development. Research paradigms: Present and future. In N. Bolger, A. Caspi, G. Bowney, & M. Moorehouse (Eds.), *Persons in context: Developmental processes* (pp. 25–49). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1990). *Acts of meaning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chartrand, J. J., & Camp, C. C. (1991). Advances in the measurement of career development constructs: A 20-year review. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39,* 1–39.

Cheatham, H. E. (1990). Africentricity and career development of African Americans. *Career Development Quarterly, 38,* 334–346.

Claude, J. (1986). Poverty patterns for Black men and women. *Black Scholar, 17,* 20–23.

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Cushman, P. (1990). Why the self is empty: Toward a historically situated psychology. *American Psychologist, 45,* 599–611.

Dawis, R. V. (1992). The individual differences tradition in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39,* 7–19.

Dill, B. T. (1980). "The means to put my children through": Child-rearing goals and strategies among Black female domestic servants. In L. F. Rodgers-Ross (Eds.), *The Black woman* (pp. 107–123). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Ekstrom, D. (1992). *Gender and perceived nurse caring in nurse-patient dyads.* Unpublished manuscript, New York University.

Farmer, H. S. (1985). Model of career and achievement motivation for women and men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36,* 363–390.

Fassinger, R. E. (1987). Use of structural equation modeling in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34,* 425–436.

Fisher, B., & Tronto, J. (1990). Toward a feminist theory of caring. In E. K. Abel & M. K. Nelson (Eds.), *Circles of care: Work and identity in women's lives* (pp. 35–62). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Fitzgerald, L. F., & Crites, J. O. (1980). Toward a career psychology of women: What do we know? What do we need to know? *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27,* 44–62.

Fitzgerald, L. F., & Osipow, S. H. (1988). We have seen the future, but is it us? The vocational aspirations of graduate students in counseling psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 19,* 575–583.

Flax, J. (1987). Postmodernism and gender relations in feminist theory. *SIGNS, 12,* 621–643.

Fraser, N., & Nicholson, L. J. (1990). Social criticism without philosophy: An encounter between feminism and postmodernism. In L. J. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/postmodernism* (pp. 19–38). London: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.

Gallos, J. V. (1989). Exploring women's development: Implications

for career theory, practice, and research. In M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of career theory* (pp. 110–132). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Gelso, C., & Fassinger, R. E. (1992). Personality, development, and counseling psychology: Depth, ambivalence, and actualization. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39,* 275–298.

Gelso, C. J., & Fretz, B. R. (1992). *Counseling psychology.* San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist, 40,* 255–265.

Gergen, K. J. (1991). *The saturated self: Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life.* New York: Basic Books.

Gerson, K. (1985). *Hard choices: How women decide about work, career, and motherhood.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gerstel, N., & Gross, H. E. (Eds.). (1987). *Families and work.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1990). Remapping the moral domain: New images of the self in relationship. In C. Zanardi (Ed.), *Essential papers on the psychology of women* (pp. 480–496). New York: New York University Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Goldsmith, E. B. (Ed.). (1989). *Work and family: Theory, research, and applications.* London: Newbury Park.

Gottfredson, L. S. (1981). Circumscription and compromise: A developmental theory of occupational aspirations [Monograph]. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28,* 545–579.

Gottfredson, L. S. (1983). Creating and criticizing theory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 23,* 203–212.

Gottlieb, G. (1983). The psychobiological approach to developmental issues. In M. M. Heath & J. J. Campos (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Infancy and biological bases* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 1–26). New York: Wiley.

Graham, S. (1992). "Most of the subjects were White and middle class." *American Psychologist, 47,* 629–639.

Greenhaus, J. H. (1989). The intersection of work and family roles: Individual, interpersonal, and organizational issues. In E. B. Goldsmith (Ed.), *Work and family: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 23–44). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Griscom, J. L. (1992). Women and power: Definition, dualism, and difference. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16,* 389–414.

Grossman, H. Y., & Chester, N. L. (Eds.). (1990). *The experience and meaning of work in women's lives.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hackett, G., & Betz, N. E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18,* 326–336.

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

Hall, R. (1986). *Dimensions of work.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hare-Mustin, R. T., & Maracek, J. (1988). The meaning of difference: Gender theory, postmodernism, and psychology. *American Psychologist, 43,* 355–464.

Harmon, L. W. (1991). Twenty years of the *Journal of Vocational Behavior. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39,* 297–304.

Hermans, H. J. M., Kempen, H. J. G., & van Loon, R. J. P. (1992). The dialogical self: Beyond individualism and rationalism. *American Psychologist, 47,* 23–33.

Hill, C., & Corbett, M. (1993). The history of counseling process research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40,* 3–24.

Hoshmand, L. T. (1989). Alternate research paradigms: A review and teaching proposal. *The Counseling Psychologist, 17,* 3–79.

Howard, G. S. (1985). The role of values in the science of psychology. *American Psychologist, 40* 255–265.

Howard, G. S. (1991). Culture tales: Narrative approach to thinking, cross-cultural psychology, and psychotherapy. *American Psychologist, 46,* 187–197.

Howard, G. S. (1992). Behold our creation! What counseling psychology has become and might yet become. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39,* 419–442.

June, A. N., & Pringle, G. D. (1977). The concept of race in the career development theories of Roe, Super, and Holland. *Journal of Non-White Concerns, 6,* 17–24.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kline, M., & Cowan, P. S. (1989). Re-thinking the connections between "work" and "family" and well-being: A model for investigating employment and family work contexts. In E. B. Goldsmith (Ed.), *Work and family: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 61–90). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Koch, S. (1959). *Psychology: A study of a science* (Vol. 3). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Larwood, L., & Gutek, B. A. (1987). Working toward a theory of women's career development. In B. A. Gutek & L. Larwood (Eds.), *Women's career development* (pp. 170–183). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Leong, F. J. L. (1985). Career development of Asian Americans. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26,* 539–596.

Lerner, R. M. (1989). Developmental contextualism and the life-span view of person-context interaction. In M. H. Bornstein & J. S. Bruner (Eds.), *Interaction in human development* (pp. 217–243). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

London, M., & Greller, M. M. (1991). Demographic trends and vocational behavior: A twenty year retrospective and agenda for the 1990s. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 38,* 125–164.

Loscocco, K. A., & Roschelle, A. R. (1991). Influences on the quality of work and nonwork life: Two decades in review. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39,* 182–225.

Lundgren, R. I., & Browner, C. H. (1990). Caring for the institutionally mentally retarded: Work culture and work-based social support. In E. K. Abel & M. K. Nelson (Eds.), *Circles of care: Work and identity in women's lives* (pp. 150–172). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Maddi, S. P. (1982, April). *Personology for the 1980's.* Paper presented at the Michigan State University Henry A. Murray Lectures in Personality, East Lansing.

Manicas, P. T., & Secord, P. F. (1983). Implications for psychology of the new philosophy of science. *American Psychologist, 38,* 399–413.

Marshall, J. (1989). Re-visioning career concepts: A feminist invitation. In M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of career theory* (pp. 275–291). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

McAdams, D. (1988). *Power, intimacy and the life story.* New York: Guilford Press.

Metz, B. (1992). Toward an understanding of the reciprocal relationships between work and family (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53,* 722A.

Morawski, J. G. (1990). Toward the unimagined: Feminism and epistemology in psychology. In R. T. Hare-Mustin & J. Maracek (Eds.), *Making a difference: Psychology and the construction of gender* (pp. 150–183). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

MOW International Research Team. (1987). *The meaning of working.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Nelson, M. K. (1990). Mothering others' children: The experiences of family day care providers. In E. K. Abel & M. K. Nelson (Eds.), *Circles of care: Work and identity in women's lives* (pp. 210–232).

Albany: State University of New York Press.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1986). *Racial formation in the United States.* London: Routledge Chapman & Hall.

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

Osipow, S. H. (1987). Counseling psychology: Theory, research, and practice in career counseling. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Portes (Eds.), *Annual review of psychology* (Vol. 381, pp. 257–278). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Osipow, S. H. (1991). Observations about career psychology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39,* 291–296.

Pinkney, A. (1984). *The myth of Black progress.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Rapp, R. (1982). Family and class in contemporary America: Notes toward an understanding of ideology. In B. Thorne & M. Yalom (Eds.), *Rethinking the family* (pp. 168–187). New York: Longman.

Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sampson, E. E. (1988). The debate on individualism: Indigenous psychologies of the individual and their role in personal and social functioning. *American Psychologist, 43,* 15–22.

Smith, E. J. (1983). Issues in racial minorities' career behavior. In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.), *Handbook of vocational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 161–222). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Spelman, E. B. (1988). *Inessential woman: Problems of exclusion in feminist thought.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Stewart, A. J. (1990). Discovering the meaning of work. In H. Y. Grossman & N. L. Chester (Eds.), *The experience and meaning of work in women's lives* (pp. 261–272). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Strong, S. R., Welsh, J. A., Corcoran, J. L., & Hoyt, W. T. (1992). Social psychology and counseling psychology: The history, products, and promise of an interface. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39,* 139–157.

Super, D. E. (1957). *The psychology of career.* New York: Harper.

Super, D. E. (1969). Vocational development theory: Persons, positions, and processes. *The Counseling Psychologist, 1*(1), 2–9.

Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16,* 282–298.

Unger, R. K. (1983). Through the looking glass: No wonderland yet! (The reciprocal relationship between methodology and models of reality). *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 8,* 9–32.

Unger, R. K. (1989). Sex, gender, and epistemology. In M. Crawford & M. Gentry (Eds.), *Gender and thought: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 17–35). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Vondracek, F. W., Lerner, R. M., & Schulenberg, J. E. (1983). The concept of development in vocational theory and intervention. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 23,* 179–202.

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

Voydanoff, P. (1989). Work and family: A review and expanded conceptualization. In E. B. Goldsmith (Ed.), *Work and family: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 1–22). London: Newbury Park.

Warnath, C. F. (1975). Vocational theories: Direction to nowhere. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 53,* 422–428.

Watkins, C. E. (1988). Contemporary issues in counseling psychology: A selected review. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 19,* 441–448.

Weiss, R. S., & Kahn, R. L. (1960). Definitions of work and occupation. *Social Problems, 8,* 142–151.

Whiteley, J. M. (1984). A historical perspective on the development of counseling psychology as a profession. In L. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 3–55). New York: Wiley.

COMMENTS

Vocational Psychology in the Postmodern Era: Comment on Richardson (1993)

Mark L. Savickas

M. S. Richardson (1993) has proposed that vocational psychology be repositioned to a new theoretical location from which to produce knowledge about work in people's lives. This article underscores the importance of Richardson's proposal and comments on three features of the new location that she maps out for vocational psychology: defining work as a social activity of everyday life, using multiple realities constructed by perspectivity, and legitimizing knowledge by its usefulness in practice.

Richardson (1993) has persuasively argued that vocational psychology should be repositioned to remain relevant to contemporary society. Her article reflects the new sociohistorical conditions that have developed in conjunction with the new information technologies, a global economy, and the multicultural movement. As the new millenium draws near, Americans are facing a restructuring that will transform them into a postindustrial society. Academicians, working first in art, architecture, and philosophy and now in the humanities and sciences, are grappling to produce new ideas that fit this postindustrial era. Collectively, the efforts of these academicians are referred to as postmodern thought (Lather, 1991). Postmodern thought rejects the 20th century's concept of the grand narrative, which proclaimed that progress and emancipation could be achieved through reason and scientific research (Gergen, 1991). Realizing that a singular truth rarely emerges out of confrontations with reality, postmodern thinkers now explore local sites and local knowledges to produce instructive accounts of the multiple realities that arise from the different perspectives of a problem (Harding, 1991). Postmodern scholars envision new worlds empowered by a decentering from "them to us" and "self to context" (Kvale, 1992). Decentering affords multiple perspectives on knowledge, and, more important to this article, it provides a new vantage point from which to view the scientific enterprise.

Postmodern social scientists such as Richardson now stand at a new vantage point from which they can re-view modern life roles enacted in the theaters of work, home, and community. Positioned at Richardson's location one sees the insufficiency of modern science. In contending that meaning resides in the external world, 20th-century science shunned subjectivity and adhered to the philosophy of logical positivism with its objective methods for the dis-

covery of singular truth. Now, postmodernism proposes that meaning is made in the linguistic exchange between subjects and is not to be discovered only in the physical world. It is a daunting challenge to make postmodern thought useful to vocational psychology, and that is what Richardson (1993) seeks to do.

Three Comments

Richardson (1993) proposed that counseling psychologists enrich modern vocational psychology by incorporating two mandates from postmodernism: Decenter from self to context, and emphasize practical intelligence for the everyday activities of ordinary life (Kvale, 1992). She used these two ideas to suggest new directions for vocational psychology, especially those that realistically address problems attributable to the oppressive triad of poverty, racism, and sexism. I support her proposal and want to comment on three features of the new location that Richardson mapped out for vocational psychology: defining work as a social activity of everyday life, using multiple realities constructed by perspectivity, and legitimizing knowledge by its usefulness in practice.

From a Psychology of Careers to a Social Analysis of Work

The core message sent by Richardson (1993) from her new location is that vocational psychology needs to make a transition. Like Parsons (1909) and Super (1953) before her, Richardson challenged vocational psychology to refocus. Although she may disagree, I think that Richardson's call to refocus resembles the call of Parsons more than it does that of Super. The basic science of vocational psychology and the applied science of career counseling were born with the publication of Parsons's (1909) *Choosing a Vocation*, a book that describes methods for vocational guidance. Parsons did not invent the matching model for vocational guidance nor the field of vocational psychology. This credit may go to an individual such as Richards

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mark L. Savickas, Behavioral Sciences Department, College of Medicine, Northeastern Ohio University, 4209 State Route 44, P.O. Box 95, Rootstown, Ohio 44272-0095.

(1881), who more than 25 years earlier than Parsons proposed a science of *vocophy* that included matching as a central method for assisting individuals to choose jobs. However, Richards still used matching methods in accord with 19th-century romanticism. Parsons became known as the founder of vocational psychology because he made vocational guidance into a science and legitimatized it for the 20th century by proclaiming true reasoning as the modern method for matching people to positions. His methods for objectifying occupations and individuals, and then rationally matching the two, were wildly effective during the 20th century because they fit the spirit of modernity. The matching methods of objectivism probably have been brought to their pinnacle by the work of Holland (1985).

The major transition in vocational guidance during the era of modern science occurred at midcentury when Super (1953) asserted that psychologists must refocus their attention from the study of occupations to the study of careers. Super made objectivism work better by placing the individual, not the occupation, at the center of vocational psychology. Super revised the subject matter of vocational psychology; however, he did not introduce a new philosophy of science for vocational psychology as Parsons (1909) did or as Richardson (1993) aspires.

Richardson's (1993) call for a second major transition in vocational psychology comes at a time when counseling psychologists do not know whether the concept of career has a future. The bureaucratic form of large hierarchical organizations provided the structure for which careerism was a value. Today, the bureaucracies of industrial society are deteriorating. People can no longer build their lives around stable companies in which they develop their careers. Richardson acknowledged the demise of the concept of career when she proposed that counseling psychologists demote the study of career to the status of a subspecialty within the study of work. Her view of the study of work calls for a new pragmatism that is centered on the development of an individual's values in the real world. Richardson suggested that we use the insights of a new philosophical stance to implement her goal of moving from the psychology of career to the social analysis of work.

From Objective Truth to Perspective Reality

The philosophical stance of perspectivism instructs researchers to give primacy to the "perspective of the knower in relation to what is to be known" (Richardson, 1993, p. 427). Richardson coherently and convincingly applied the philosophical stance of perspectivism to vocational psychology in proposing that counseling psychologists focus on the study of work in people's lives instead of on the careers of middle-class individuals. Embedded in this seemingly straightforward proposal regarding subject matter is something more fundamental. Implementing Richardson's proposal would redirect research from an empirical testing of theory that generates abstract, universal principles toward an examination of knowledge produced from multiple realities in diverse communities of knowers, a knowledge that is also considered for its usefulness.

Thus, her proposal changes what is considered to be knowledge in vocational psychology. Accordingly, Richardson's proposal will be criticized not so much for changing the topic from career to work but for changing the research stance from objectivity to perspectivity.

If experience from other disciplines applies, then two major criticisms will be leveled at her proposal to change the research stance: charges of radical relativism and solipsism. Richardson (1993) addressed these anticipated criticisms too briefly, and they deserve more comment. In responding to a charge of radical relativism, I argue that knowledge is not private but relational, because meaning occurs between people. A theory of knowledge situated in perspectivist, social constructivism is by definition a relational theory of knowledge, but it is not necessarily a relativistic theory of knowledge (Grosz, 1988; Luke, 1992). Perspectivity does not mean that everyone's standpoint produces knowledge of equal usefulness. There can be epistemological relativity (i.e., all views are socially produced) without a degeneration into moral relativity when there is an acknowledgement that all views are not equally valid (Bhaskar, 1989). In matters that require action, an interpretive community must make commitments to what works best. Richardson suggested that usefulness of knowledge should guide inquiry. In so doing, she avoids solipsism and conforms to another tenet of postmodernism, which is that knowledge is legitimized by its usefulness in action, not validated in relation to theory.

I think that Richardson (1993) could also have advanced her proposal by stating in more detail how she views the relation of perspectivity to objectivity within the discipline of vocational psychology during the next decade. My view is that perspectivity cannot replace objectivity, at least for now. This would result in giving privilege to experience at the expense of theory, and local knowledges at the expense of universal principles. In the short term, perspectivity can make unique contributions by being used with objectivity, and, at the same time, perspectivity can enrich objectivity.

To date, perspectivity has primarily enriched objectivity by its questioning of the modern pretense that value-free objectivity can exist. Harding (1991) referred to the value-free stance toward science as weak objectivity. Perspectivity advises scientists to stop pretending that they control bias and to start articulating and questioning their biases as they conduct research and produce knowledge. This strong objectivity can rationally distinguish between more partial truth and less distorted truth. The concept of strong objectivity requires that vocational psychologists stop acting as if they do not have a point of view and announce their presence in their research. This means stating in the research report by whom and for whom the study was produced and how the findings are true and useful.

Richardson (1993) provided a coherent example of strong objectivity for vocational psychology in her contrast of the values that are inherent in career versus those that are inherent in work. She questioned counseling psychologists' view of work by showing its androcentricism. The discipline's bias in its definition of work is forever bereft of innocence by Richardson's social analysis. Out of the rubble

of her deconstructed definition of work, Richardson inscribed the concept of "caring work" and suggested that counseling psychologists constitute new meanings for work, starting from definitions that re-present work as service to other people and that emphasize the social relations produced by work. Richardson's social analysis of occupational work provides an outstanding exemplar of how postmodern thought can enrich vocational psychology. At a personal level, her analysis of the social meanings of work instructed me in the postmodern claim that language masters us and sharply challenged me to reconsider my own definition of work (Savickas, 1991).

From General Principles to Useful Practices

Richardson's (1993) proposal for vocational psychology has momentous implications for how vocational psychologists conduct research. Modern science produces knowledge with objectivist methods that emphasize measurement reliability, theoretical validity, statistical significance, and broad generalizability. In contrast, Richardson showed that knowledge about vocational behavior can be produced by constructivist methods that emphasize triangulation on multiple data sources, hermeneutics, applicability to practice, and relevance to workplace justice. In moving to the new location explored by Richardson, researchers will continue to achieve rigor by asking the modern question, Is it true? In addition, researchers will pursue relevance, critical perspectivity, and strong objectivity by asking the postmodern questions, How is it true? Is it useful? and Could it be otherwise?

The search for socially constituted and maintained knowledge shifts research from the generality of testing theoretical principles to the particularity of examining locally situated practices that are useful in specific circumstances. Accordingly, the postmodern approach to research transforms vocational psychologists from detached testers of theory into participant observers who extract knowledge from instructive accounts provided by individual workers, accounts that describe the ordinary activities of everyday life. This type of research is starting to produce vocational psychology reports that address the practical intelligence needed to deal with the tasks of vocational development, the best practices in effective organizations, and the important events in career intervention. Indirectly, these reports deconstruct definitions of work and the dichotomy between personal counseling and career counseling as well as reveal problems inherent within, or problemitize, critical concepts in modern vocational psychology, such as an essentialized self, decontextualized vocational identity, rational decision making, personal agency, and career maturity.

Conclusion

In summary, Richardson (1993) suggested how counseling psychologists can reposition vocational psychology to produce socially situated, local knowledges about work rather than produce abstract principles about individual careers. She hopes to move vocational psychology away from the periphery to the center of social analysis. In articulating her vision for how to move to a new location, Richardson also implied how to heal the rift between knowledge production in vocational psychology and knowledge use in career counseling. We are indebted to Richardson for being the first to systematically and compassionately describe a meaningful location for vocational psychology in the postmodern world.

References

Bhaskar, R. (1989). *Reclaiming reality: A critical introduction to modern philosophy.* London: Verso.

Gergen, K. (1991). *The saturated self: Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life.* New York: Basic Books.

Grosz, E. (1988). The in(ter)vention of feminist knowledges. In B. Caine, E. Grosz, & M. deLapervanche (Eds.), *Crossing boundaries* (pp. 92–104). Winchester, MA: Allen & Unwin.

Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge?: Thinking from women's lives.* Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.

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

Kvale, S. (1992). Postmodern psychology: A contradiction in terms? In S. Kvale (Ed.), *Psychology and postmodernism* (pp. 31–57). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern.* London: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.

Luke, C. (1992). Feminist politics in radical pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), *Feminism and critical pedagogy* (pp. 25–53). London: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.

Parsons, F. (1909). *Choosing a vocation.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Richards, L. (1881). *Vocophy.* Malboro, MA: Pratt.

Richardson, M. S. (1993). Work in people's lives: A location for counseling psychologists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40,* 425–433.

Savickas, M. (1991). The meaning of work and love: Career issues and interventions. *Career Development Quarterly, 39,* 315–324.

Super, D. (1953). A theory of vocational development. *American Psychologist, 8,* 185–190.

Construct Your Reality and Show Us Its Benefits: Comment on Richardson (1993)

Howard E. A. Tinsley

M. S. Richardson (1993) has argued that counseling psychologists are resistant to new ideas, resulting in the field's premature rigidity in career development theory, orientation toward White, middle-class individuals, and delay in the incorporation of advances in developmental psychology into its theory and research. I argue that career psychologists suffer less from an adherence to established theories than from the lack of systematic, theory-based research programs. The most effective way to improve theory and research in vocational psychology is to identify new theoretical insights that merit attention and to teach scholars new methods of investigation. Also, people focus on that which they find interesting, and vocational psychology will make significant progress in issues that are relevant to minorities and working-class individuals when people who have intrinsic interests in issues facing these populations have been educated as psychologists.

Richardson (1993) has expressed shock and dismay that counseling psychologists' efforts have marginalized racial and ethnic minorities, the lower classes, and the poor. She has declared that the literature of counseling psychology is guilty of "premature rigidity or calcification" (p. 426) and is "at best irrelevant to oppressed groups and at worst directly participatory in the implicit racism and classism of the social structure" (p. 426), that counseling psychology has been "enslaved by its dominant epistemology" (p. 426), and that the field's racism and classism has "undermine[d] any claims . . . to scientific validity" (p. 426).

The stridency with which Richardson (1993) writes is inspiring. My therapist has labored heroically to ameliorate my lack of emotional expressiveness, attempting to teach me a new vocabulary (e.g., mild irritation is "pain"), but I am a slow learner. An ability to express grandiloquent sentiments with a straight face would come in handy now, for the turmoil of the 1960s taught that efforts to engage in a reasoned intellectual analysis of the issues are futile when the mob is chanting "burn, baby, burn" or "hell, no, we won't go." In the face of Richardson's flamboyant polemic, I am terrified (note the expression of emotion) that a dispassionate intellectual response will result in the politically correct dismissal, "He just doesn't get it."

I think Richardson (1993) and I share many primary goals for vocational psychology, but we disagree on the receptivity of vocational psychology to new models and approaches and on the strategies that will most effectively accomplish those goals.

Theoretical Rigidity

Richardson (1993) argued that counseling psychologists are resistant to new ideas because of status concerns and

an adherence to logical positivism. This has resulted in a premature rigidity in career development theory and created a gap between the emergence of new advances in developmental psychology and their incorporation into vocational psychology.

It is well known that it takes years for new theories, ideas, and points of view to be assimilated. Important developments that have yet to be incorporated into vocational psychology theory and research have occurred in many areas, including social, cognitive, and personality psychology. Chaos theory, I believe, has great potential for improving counseling psychologists' understanding of vocational behavior, but integration of its principles into vocational psychology is certainly more than a decade away.

Cultural lag is inescapable, impervious to exhortations that it should be eliminated; but progress is obvious when viewed from a longer perspective. The nine 20-year retrospectives on vocational psychology published in the *Journal of Vocational Behavior* in 1991 reveal a dynamic field characterized by the emergence of new theoretical positions, better research, and more varied and sophisticated interventions. Each author in that series identified both impressive advances and important problems needing attention. The most effective way to shorten the lag Richardson (1993) criticized is to identify specific advances that merit attention and to suggest applications of these developments in vocational psychology. Hackett and Betz's (1981) work with self-efficacy theory illustrated this approach. I am optimistic that the openness of vocational psychology to new models and approaches will be instrumental in the successful confrontation of the important problems that face counseling psychologists.

Richardson (1993) argued that vocational psychology is theoretically rigid, but I believe it is too trendy, losing interest in theories long before their usefulness has been exhausted. Little work has been done to investigate Tiedeman and O'Hara's (1964) and Harren's (1979) developmental models of the decision-making process. Super's (1963) theory regarding the implementation of the vocational self-concept in career choice has not benefited from a systematic program of research. The dynamic

aspects of the Theory of Work Adjustment involving worker–environment coresponsiveness (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984) have not been investigated. These theories have been around for 30 to 40 years, and some have stimulated much research; yet each postulates important relations that have yet to benefit from empirical scrutiny. Counseling psychology suffers because important theories are too quickly forgotten in the rush to the latest trend or the newest theory.

A related problem is that most research in vocational psychology lacks a theoretical justification, and systematic, theory-based research programs are almost nonexistent. Counseling psychologists suffer less from a premature adherence to established theories than from a failure to be guided by and to systematically investigate the available theories.

Sexism, Racism, and Classism

Richardson (1993) argued that counseling psychologists' resistance to new ideas results in a continuing focus of career development theory and research on White, middle-class individuals. Theories are often criticized for failing to deal with environmental and demographic variables in a meaningful way. Theorists are not indifferent to these issues, but most do not know how to conceptualize the effects of these factors in a meaningful way. D. Tinsley and Faunce's (1980) investigation of the enabling, facilitating, and precipitating factors that influence women's career development revealed that environmental and demographic factors constrain vocational behavior. Unfettered personal agency is not possible for anyone, not even for White male and middle-class populations. Their findings provided a basis for distinguishing among the factors that influence career development, but much of vocational psychologists' research continues to focus on factors that have relatively less influence on vocational behavior. Vocational psychologists need to give more attention to the effects of enabling conditions on vocational behavior.

There is more research on the work experiences of working-class individuals than is apparent to many readers. The work experiences of lower economic level, working-class individuals (e.g., bank tellers, nurses, dock workers, and steel mill workers) frequently are examined when researchers investigate such issues as realistic job previews, work commitment, job commitment, job satisfaction, intention to change jobs, turnover, willingness to relocate, stress, and burnout.

Research that examines sex and economic class is often ignored or given superficial scrutiny. For example, early research on the Theory of Work Adjustment investigated the possibility of sex differences in the needs that are gratified by occupations, and much of the research stimulated by this theory continues to investigate the possibility of there being sex differences. The evidence has revealed no sex differences. The Theory of Work Adjustment also stimulated investigations of hundreds of occupations at all economic levels, including higher level occupations that are female-dominant (e.g., elementary school teacher and case worker), mixed-gender occupations, and lower economic level occupations (e.g., beauty operator, general office clerk, service station attendant, nurse aide, orderly, waiter, waitress, punch press operator, sewing machine operator, and taxi driver). Nevertheless, there is a tendency to dismiss general models that have applicability to both sexes and all economic class levels as limited in applicability to White, middle-class men.

Richardson (1993) criticized counseling psychology as if it were the only discipline concerned with vocational behavior, which illustrates the fragmentation I noted in an earlier review (H. Tinsley & Heesacker, 1984). Counseling psychologists, sociologists, and industrial organizational, or management psychologists all contribute to the literature on vocational behavior, and each group seems to be largely unaware of the efforts of the others. Issues involving gender and race differences have been treated more extensively in the sociology literature. The influx of women and minority groups into the labor force has been studied more extensively in management and sociology journals. Investigations of how and why people from diverse social locations make life decisions regarding work (across domains) and family (across the life cycle) appear most frequently in journals devoted to leisure, health (wellness), and community psychology. Scholars from many disciplines are concerned with the important issues cited by Richardson, and vocational psychologists need to become more broadly conversant with this multidisciplinary body of research and theory.

Work in People's Lives

Richardson (1993) criticized counseling psychology's limited focus on work activities "located in the occupational structure" (p. 427), and she called for an expanded focus on the role of work "as a basic human function . . . [that] has a multiplicity of meanings" (p. 427). I believe that the shift to a focus on work in people's lives has been under way for 20 years. The place of work in people's lives is being addressed in research on topics such as job involvement, career commitment, quality of life, leisure identity, family identity, retirement, and reciprocal work and nonwork relations. For example, H. Tinsley and Tinsley (1989) argued that work activities such as homemakers' should be investigated just like other kinds of work activities. D. Tinsley and Schwendener-Holt (1992) noted that work continues to be an important part of people's lives during retirement. Retirement involves not the cessation of work but a shifting of the emphases given to the many kinds of work activities in which an individual is engaged. I believe that the focus of vocational psychology should not be limited to work per se but should include the individual's psychological experiencing of work. This thesis underlies H. Tinsley and Tinsley's (1988) theories and research (H. Tinsley, Hinson, Tinsley, & Holt,

1993) on the effects of the individual's phenomenological experiencing of leisure and work.

Solutions

Richardson (1993) challenged vocational psychologists to address the problems she identified by adopting the social constructionist position that knowledge must be judged within the context of the knower's phenomenological perspective. She argued that the social constructionist stance requires a "receptivity to diverse methodologies" (p. 429) and a move toward "newer and more innovative qualitative approaches" (p. 429). I think the openness she called for already exists. I have served on the editorial boards of the leading journals in counseling psychology for more than 15 years, and I have experienced the editors under whom I have served and the board members with whom I have served to be receptive to both new theories and innovative research. I have discerned in them no fear of multiple truths that lead to "the impossibility of ever knowing anything at all" (p. 429); I have seen no longing desire for the "comforting, if limited, bodies of generalizable knowledge" (p. 429). I do not recall ever reading a review that criticized an article because a qualitative methodology was used. However, I have seen reviews that criticized the use of qualitative methodology in a crude and primitive manner, which leads to patently biased results. Instead of a lack of openness, there is a lack of people who are skillfully using these methodologies.

I suggest two principles that must be incorporated into a realistic plan to accomplish the goals Richardson, and I, endorse for vocational psychology. First, scholars, like most people, do what they know how to do. Efforts to lament the inadequacies of scholars' work may lessen their complacency, but, like negative reinforcement, these criticisms often provide little indication of the desired behavior. Efforts to explain new theoretical insights and to teach new methods of investigation are more helpful than are general criticisms that point out that what researchers are doing is not good enough.

Second, scholars, when allowed some degree of autonomy, focus on that which is intrinsically interesting to them. Vocational psychology will begin to make significant progress in investigating issues of relevance to minorities and working-class individuals when a significant number of persons with intrinsic interests in, and insights into, these issues have been educated as psychologists. The lack of information about the career development of women was not remedied by researchers writing essays about the need to study women. Instead, the problem was addressed after a large number of talented women who were intrinsically interested in the career development of women entered the discipline. The same process will lead to the issues of concern to minority and working-class individuals being addressed. Much as I would like to, I do not have the insights of scholars such as Cross (1971), Guthrie (1976), Helms (1992), or Parham (1989). The only way for the discipline to develop a more complex, multifaceted understanding of work in people's lives is for it to educate a diverse array of counseling psychologists and

to socialize them in the importance of contributing to the theories and research of the discipline.

In summary, I disagree with Richardson's (1993) views regarding counseling psychology's theoretical stagnation and rigidity. I urge a more multifaceted consideration of the multiple roles that individuals fulfill and the relations among experiences they have in those roles. I agree with Richardson that a simple focus on work as gainful employment is unnecessarily limiting, and I believe that efforts to develop an expanded emphasis on work in people's lives are beginning. Efforts to publish meritorious research and to develop testable theories are more efficacious than are essays urging counseling psychologists to challenge the status quo. The challenge to Richardson and others who share her views (and I, for the most part, include myself) is to develop new theoretical models and research approaches and show counseling psychologists what can be done with them that could not have been done before.

References

Cross, W. E. (1971). The Negro to Black conversion experience: Toward the psychology of Black liberation. *Black World, 20,* 13–27.

Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist, L. H. (1984). *A psychological theory of work adjustment.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Guthrie, R. V. (1976). *Even the rat was white.* New York: Harper & Row.

Hackett, G., & Betz, N. E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18,* 326–336.

Harren, V. H. (1979). A model of career decision making for college students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14,* 119–133.

Helms, J. E. (1992). Why is there no study of cultural equivalence in standardized cognitive ability testing? *American Psychologist, 47,* 1083–1101.

Parham, T. A. (1989). Cycles of psychological nigrescence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 17*(2), 187–226.

Richardson, M. S. (1993). Work in people's lives: A location for counseling psychologists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40,* 425–433.

Super, D. E. (1963). Toward making self-concept theory operational. In D. E. Super, R. Starishevsky, N. Matlin, & J. P. Jordaan (Eds.), *Career development: Self-concept theory* (pp. 17–32). New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Tiedeman, D. V., & O'Hara, R. P. (1964). *Career development: Choice and adjustment.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Tinsley, D. J., & Faunce, P. S. (1980). Enabling, facilitating, and precipitating factors associated with women's career orientation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 17,* 183–194.

Tinsley, D. J., & Schwendener-Holt, M. J. (1992). Retirement and leisure. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 627–662). New York: Wiley.

Tinsley, H. E. A., & Heesacker, M. (1984). Vocational behavior and career development, 1983: A review. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 25,* 139–190.

Tinsley, H. E. A., Hinson, J. A., Tinsley, D. J., & Holt, M. S. (1993). Attributes of leisure and work experiences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40,* 447–455.

Tinsley, H. E. A., & Tinsley, D. J. (1988). An expanded context for the study of career decision making, development, and maturity. In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.), *Career decision making* (pp. 213–264). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tinsley, H. E. A., & Tinsley, D. J. (1989). Reinforcers of the occupation of homemaker: An analysis of the need gratifying prop- erties of the homemaker occupation across the stages of the home- maker life cycle. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36,* 189–195.

Pros and Cons of a New Location: Reply to Savickas (1994) and Tinsley (1994)

Mary Sue Richardson

The comments by M. L. Savickas and H. E. A. Tinsley in response to my article, "Work in People's Lives: A Location for Counseling Psychologists" (M. S. Richardson, 1993), are useful in elaborating the originally proposed ideas and in raising a number of critical issues and concerns. In this reply, I respond briefly to major points raised by each of these authors. It is hoped that the comments and reply will contribute to a constructive and productive dialogue regarding the issues raised.

I would like to thank Mark Savickas and Howard Tinsley for their extremely thoughtful and intelligent responses to my article on work in people's lives. Their articles are stimulating and enriching contributions to the ideas I formulated, and I appreciate the opportunity to respond to their comments and criticisms.

Turning first to Savickas (1994), I believe that his remarks provide a fuller and more elaborated description of the postmodern context of my article. Although I am never quite sure what is meant by the term *postmodern*, it certainly does encompass the flux in, and questioning of, established truths and ideas that he expresses so eloquently. Although I am less familiar with the term *perspectivity*, and would have liked more discussion of its origins, I find it to be a particularly valuable addition to the lexicon and helpful in enabling a better understanding of what I have been calling social constructionism and location. It succinctly captures the idea that each person has a specific perspective when viewing reality from her or his social location. In contrast to perspective, location seems somewhat depersonalized. The notion of perspectivity helps to frame my article as a product of my social location, which has led me to develop a perspective that I hope will be useful or persuasive to others, but which is not being proffered as a singular truth about reality. In a world of multiple realities, there is room for many perspectives.

Along these same lines, Savickas's (1994) comments that he does not think I mean for perspectivity to replace objectivity are accurate. There is room for both multiple realities and diverse epistemologies. His description of strong versus weak objectivity is helpful in elucidating a fundamental premise that is difficult to keep in mind. It seems inevitable that an argument for a new perspective for vocational psychology is, to some extent, embedded in, and saturated with, a critique of the field as it currently exists. Savickas reminds us through his distinction between strong and weak objec-

tivity that objectivity per se is not the problem (in this case, objectivity in vocational psychology). The problem is for any single perspective, including my own, to be privileged above others.

I also was grateful that Savickas (1994) chose to emphasize a point I had not elaborated on in my article regarding the importance of establishing the criterion of usefulness for claims of truth as a protection against radical relativism in a world of multiple realities. I did not say much about it in my article because I am not yet sure what I mean by *useful* and what such a criterion might mean among a group of applied psychologists. I think this is a fascinating topic and one about which I am hopeful there will be continuing discussion and dialogue.

Savickas (1994) also was helpful in pointing out yet another reason for preferring the term *work* to that of *career*: Because of the changing nature of the occupational structure, a long-term or lifetime career, even for members of the educated middle and upper classes, seems to be a disappearing phenomenon. Clearly, these and other trends in the occupational structure deserve close monitoring and attention as they affect the work people do.

Finally, Savickas (1994) made a number of interesting comments about the kinds of research that would emanate from the perspective I articulated. I am intrigued by his reference to problematized concepts such as the essentialized self, decontextualized vocational identity, and rational decision making, and I look forward to hearing more on what he means by referring to these concepts as problematized.

Whereas Savickas (1994) wrote from a perspective largely similar to mine, Tinsley's (1994) response clearly differed in perspective. In responding to Tinsley, I will comment on these differences rather than on the similarities that exist. First, his remarks about the necessary and inevitable time lag in incorporating new ideas into vocational psychology, what I referred to as resistance to new ideas, clarified for me the extent to which the nine 20-year retrospectives published in the *Journal of Vocational Behavior* that Tinsley referred to were extremely helpful in my elaboration of the ideas I presented in my article. I agree with Tinsley that this series of articles is rich with ideas and comprehensive in scope and constitutes a major scholarly contribution to the field. There

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mary Sue Richardson, Department of Applied Psychology, New York University, 239 Greene Street, East Building, 4th Floor, New York, New York 10003.

is no doubt in my mind that the comprehensiveness of this series helped me to see more clearly the current state of mind in vocational psychology and to articulate a different state of mind. I appreciate that what looks like resistance from my perspective looks very different from Tinsley's position. In fact, my clinical training tells me that labeling something as resistant is probably not helpful to persons so labeled, is certainly not empathic, and may generate more resistance than anything else. Thinking along these lines leads to the conclusion that Tinsley's comments about how to promote change in vocational psychology, written from within the traditions of contemporary vocational psychology, may be more helpful and facilitative to this process than are my comments, written from somewhat outside these traditions. Put another way, my article may be most persuasive to those who already share my perspective and may be least helpful or persuasive to those who do not.

I also somewhat differ from Tinsley (1994) on the importance of theory. Although we both agree, I think, in our dislike for research that lacks a strong and clear justification, Tinsley prefers to emphasize theoretically grounded research, whereas I am more interested in research that is solidly grounded in a range of possible justifications, including, but not restricted to, theory. Similar to my as yet limited understanding of what I mean, or others might mean, by usefulness, I also am not yet able to fully articulate what I would consider to be good and substantial groundings for research. Ideas that come to mind are research efforts that may lead to the development of theory, research that is useful to practitioners, and research that leads to the development of new questions rather than to the provision of answers to old ones. This question of what is an appropriate and substantial basis for research is one that deserves further attention.

Tinsley (1994) also criticizes me for a tendency to dismiss available theories and literature too easily and superficially. This is a valid point. Certainly he points to a number of theories and to available bodies of literature, such as that on occupations at diverse socioeconomic levels, that merit more consideration and attention. Although Tinsley might attribute this oversight to the wish to be trendy, I think it has more to do with a temperamental difference. I have a good friend who is an antiquarian book dealer. Whenever we talk about books, we easily slip into arguments about what I think is an exciting new idea and what my friend thinks is an old idea that has simply been reinvented. These arguments are usually instructive. I learn more about the history of ideas, and my friend learns more about contemporary thinking. Rather than being dismissive, those of us interested in research and practice regarding work in people's lives may find it more productive to have similar kinds of arguments about what is of value in both the old and new perspectives. I hope that the exchanges in these pages fall into this category of dialogue.

I both agree and disagree with Tinsley (1994) about how to produce knowledge about working-class and minority peoples. I agree that it is essential to do a better job in recruiting persons from diverse backgrounds into counseling psychology training programs. However, I no longer think that we, meaning White, primarily middle-class counseling psychologists, can relegate the production of knowledge about such groups to those who are identified with such groups. And this, in any case, may not be the most important point. Racism and classism affects all of our theories and related research, and all of us in this discipline should have an intrinsic interest in understanding the ways in which race and class permeate the scientific enterprise. This is a far broader and more basic question than are questions concerning diverse groups. The work by Sandra Harding (1992) may be helpful in advancing this level of analysis in our study and intervention regarding work in people's lives.

I also appreciate and agree with Tinsley's (1994) remarks about how difficult it is for theorists and researchers to deal with the social environment in a meaningful way. What is needed here, I think, is a better analysis of why this is so difficult, not just for the field of vocational psychology but for psychology in general. Griscom's (1992) article on power and psychology suggested that the problem lies in the dualistic thinking embedded in our culture and language that splits person and society. The solution she has suggested to develop constructs and concepts that are nondualistic in nature may be an approach that has merit for those involved in the study of work in people's lives.

Finally, it is clear that Tinsley (1994) was offended by the tone of my article, which is, admittedly, emotional. His references to stridency, mob chants, and flamboyant polemics provide evidence to me of his offended reaction. And perhaps there are ways in which I was being offensive that I need to think about more carefully. However, as far as emotionality itself is concerned, I have been much affected by Evelyn Fox Keller's (1985) analysis of gender and science. She has clearly and persuasively documented the extent to which science has been objectified and masculinized, with splits between objectivity and subjectivity, and emotionality and rationality. According to her analysis, these are false and nonhelpful dichotomies that do not serve the best interests of science. I think most clearly about issues when I am emotionally and passionately engaged in them. From George Howard (1992) I have learned that it is possible to put some of this first person and more emotional self into writing. Perhaps this is what the term *perspectivity* best captures: a point of view that integrates both the emotional and the rational, both feelings and cognition. At any rate, I am grateful that Tinsley also allowed some of his emotional reaction to come through in his writing. I hope that it makes for a fuller and more engaged dialogue.

References

Griscom, J. (1992). Women and power: Definition, dualism, and difference. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16,* 389–414.

Harding, S. (1992). *Whose science? Whose knowledge?: Thinking from women's lives.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Howard, G. (1992). Behold our creation! What counseling psychology has become and might yet become. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39,* 419–442.

Keller, E. F. (1985). *Reflections on gender and science.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Richardson, M. S. (1993). Work in people's lives: A location for counseling psychologists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40,* 425–433.

Savickas, M. L. (1994). Vocational psychology in the postmodern era: Comment on Richardson (1993). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41,* 105–107.

Tinsley, H. E. A. (1994). Construct your reality and show us its benefits: Comment on Richardson (1993). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41,* 108–111.