

# Globalisation, Cultural Pluralism—On the Need for (Meta)analytical Assumptions of the Career Theory for Cross-Cultural Career Counselling Practice

**Agnieszka Cybal-Michalska**

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland

## ABSTRACT

The qualitative aspects of the evolution of relations between globality and locality, society and the individual, and their links, are not without consequence for the multi-contextual changes in the labour market, which present new challenges to employees. This vision implies completely new ways of interpreting the world in which “a career makes a career” – they are problems of “a borderless career”, “a varied career”, “a post-corporate career” as a novum, of sorts, in the planning of a broadly understood career, the rise in importance of having a career and the ability to plan, manage and monitor one’s own career in the perspective of one’s whole life. The consideration discusses the need for (meta)analytical career theory assumptions for the practice of cross-cultural career counselling. The author emphasizes that there is a need to generate new approaches, which will cross the boundaries defined by partial paradigms so that they will be relevant in the 21st century. Moreover, she raises the question of how to “manage” the rich heritage of career theories of the late 20th century, while at the same time increasing their theoretical-cognitive value. Another aspect that justifies the need for critical reflection on the reliability of theoretical perspectives is the study of methodological instrumentation that takes into account culturally shaded social and professional aspects. A special place is given to the constructivist school of thought and theory of career construction by Mark L. Savickas, which is said to focus on the nature of the social world and refer to the domain of life involving career and its proactive construction, by simultaneously presenting a new perspective on the participation in the global changes. Changes in the world of “borderless” careers shine a new light on the problem of individual proactivity – an individual’s proactive behaviours in their career.

**Keywords:** Globalisation, World of “borderless” careers, Cross-cultural career counseling, Heritage of career theory, Career construction theory, Proactivity

## INTRODUCTION

In postmodern reflection, the starting point for considering the notion of contemporary society as a unified and organised space, subject to constant fluctuation, is the assumption that “as society develops, it optimises and transforms the aspirations to control everyday life into aspirations to develop tolerant pluralism and binding particularism; strivings for certainty and predictability in the structures of everyday life into the capacity to cope

discursively with risk and into the desire to create freedom without risk” (Misztal, 2000, p. 64). This process raises implications for societies to better understand their historical extension from the past, through the present, towards the future, anticipating the long-term consequences (the content presented in the article has already been reflected upon by the author; see: Cybal-Michalska A., 2015, p. 57-68; Cybal-Michalska A., 2019, p. 13-27).

The research on time and social space characteristic of career construction combines the analysis of emergence (how people experience time) and relativity (how people experience social space) properties. In this context, it is crucial to know the cognitive status of a theory that would make it possible to understand the phenomenon of historical acceleration and “the triumphant present time” and in this context – the dynamics of change in the world of careers and cross-cultural career counseling practice.

### **GLOBALISATION FOR THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD**

The dialectic of unification and diversification inherent in the phenomenon of globalisation indicates that these are complementary processes, interacting with each other and central to the contemporary phase of development of global society. The paradigm of globalisation, at the socio-cultural level, is revealed in a binary arrangement of extremes: decontextualisation vs. recontextualisation (existence out of context vs. search for a new contextual quality), decomposition vs. recomposition (decomposition of cultural structure vs. formation of new cultural constellations from abstracted pieces of cultural reality), deterritorialisation vs. reterritorialisation (detachment from the local context of cultural content and form vs. search for “accommodation” in another culture), transculturation vs. internalisation (the submission of culture – as a set of interrelated, conditioned and interacting phenomena – to hybrid displacements of cultural content and forms vs. the desire to internalise culture expressed by the individual who processes found cultural material, endows it with meaning, a specific individual significance, and expresses him/herself in behaviour) (Korporowicz [in:] Tyszka, 1999, p. 90-92). Consequently, the analytical value of the phenomenon of globalisation points to the need to distinguish the dichotomous processes of socio-cultural transformation that characterise the experience of the contemporary world.

Faced with the dynamics of the development of the “new locality” and the explosion of the phenomena indicating cultural differentiation with their universality and intensity, globalisation is the result of the processes of differentiation and cultural pluralisation of the contemporary world, hence it implies a “heterogeneity of intercultural dialogues” (Ajrun Appardurai) at local and national levels; and reveals progressive “organising of diversity” (Anthony D. Smith) rather than a replication of unification (Korporowicz [in:] Tyszka, 1999, p. 90).

Marian Golka draws attention to the heterogeneous nature of globalisation processes, writing that “before the advent of globalisation, the human world was made up of more or less isolated cultural “islands”, which in the age of globalisation are, in some aspects merging with each other, in others

becoming similar to each other, and in yet in others simply manifesting their existence and coming into contact with each other, creating in the process the prototypes of a new global identity with a complex multicultural character” (Golka [in:] Blok, 2001, p. 79). The hybridisation of the modern world, understood in this way (Jan N. Pieterse), indicates that counteracting, solving, or controlling global problems must take place at the global level, since the coexistence of individual states appears to be closely interconnected and indivisible (Golka, 1999, p. 160). In the face of global change, “oppositions such as «inside» and «outside», «here» and «there», «near» and «far» defining the degree of tamedness, domestication, and familiarity with various fragments of the surrounding reality (Bauman, 2000a, p. 19) cease to function as “points of reference”, thus indicating an opacity of the perspective and cultural pluralism.

There is no consensus among theorists as to whether we are currently witnessing a “postmodernity”, according to which the future is neither a simple continuation of the present nor a retreat into the past, but constitutes a new social quality, or whether we are still experiencing a “modernity”, albeit “late” and advanced (Sztompka, 2002, p. 570-576; Śleboda, 2003, p. 50-78), in which all its constitutive features take on an extreme form. Zygmunt Bauman popularises the idea of modernity as a finite whole, which is replaced by disordered, ambiguous, ambivalent, and directionless postmodernity, identified with the “impossibility of standing still” and being constantly “on the move”. “The inhabitants of such a world are wanderers by necessity, although they embark on the road to settle down” (Bauman, 2000b, p. 114). An attribute of postmodern social formation is the rupture of cultural continuity and the birth of a “hyperreality” dominated by “chaos of impressions and fantasies”, as Piotr Sztompka puts it.

Society is faced with the task of self-definition in a situation of non-obviousness, risk, fragmentation, and ambiguity. In this context, the question arises: can our order only be replaced by disorder, and not order of a different kind? (Śleboda, 2003, p. 74).

At the level of individual decisions, moving into “postmodernity”, according to which the future is not a simple continuation of the present, or experiencing “late modernity”, in which the constitutive features of modernity take on an extreme form, means that one can and should only live a life of change, where everyone “must become a model for the epoch we wish to create” (Illich [in:] Kwieciński, 2000, p. 269). The existence of multiple systems of reference, with their own criterion of rationality, is an attribute of the present and will be an enduring feature of the future, and “experiencing ambivalence is a lifelong «sentence» or even a curse of modern man” (Kwieciński [in:] Kukołowicz, Nowak, 1997, p. 16). Since cultural pluralism is a reality, it should be seen in terms of a Giddensian “policy of life”, as a challenge and an opportunity to make reflective and responsible use of new possibilities (which will inevitably involve risks) at an individual level that affect the course of local and global events.

The most striking feature of the times that followed the modern era is the accelerated development of civilisation, understood as an organised

and highly pluralised form of life of the human community, which can be understood as the climax or twilight of socio-cultural development. The nucleus of globalisation, as a process of radical and permanent change, consists in such aspects as the cultural diversity of contemporary societies, determining chaos and axionormative emptiness, mass-oriented approach, disorientation, changeability, social anomy, identity crisis, pluralism, and relativism of worldviews. "These issues make a mockery of the boundaries" (Kwieciński [in:] Malewska, Śliwerski, 2002, p. 21). At the individual level, this means a loss of axionormative points of reference, a lack of "rootedness", individualistic alienation, and the need to exist in an ambiguous, contradictory, and non-uniform reality.

### **CAREER THEORY AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO INTER(CULTURAL) CAREER COUNSELLING PRACTICE**

Specific to the career construct, research on time and social space combines the properties of emergence (the way people experience time) and relativity (the way people experience social space) (Arthur, Hall, Lawrence, 2004, p. 12) the issues of the career domain and the indication of the need to generate new paradigmatic approaches taken up in this text contain an extended content range of the theses put forward by the author in the monograph (Cybal-Michalska A., 2013), in the paper (Cybal-Michalska A., 2015, p. 52-63), and in the chapter of (Cybal-Michalska A., 2021). In the face of the dynamics of the global world development and the hard-to-predict direction of social change, there may arise, as Raymond Baudon points out, a tendency "to interim interrogative practices and to provide ad hoc answers to questions about the relationships between various elements of social reality. (...) <Good theory (...) has an exploratory capacity that encompasses a range of relevant facts, including facts not yet known>" (Misztal, 2000, p. 189-190). The logic of change in the organisational configuration of society is not easy to grasp. Many theoretical orientations with heuristic value are subject to devaluation.

A problem of real relevance is the need to generate new approaches that transcend the boundaries defined by partial paradigms so that they will be relevant in the 21st century (Cybal-Michalska A., 2021). Moreover, the question arises of how to "manage" the rich heritage of career theories of the last decades of the 20th century, while at the same time enhancing their theoretical-cognitive value (Savickas, Nota, Rossier, Dauwalder, Duarte, Guichard, Soresi, van Esbroeck, van Vianen, 2009, p. 240).

The past four decades have seen a proliferation and multiplicity of co-occurring theoretical assumptions about career development. The value of career theory debate is evidenced by the fact that it is not free of a lively critical examination from the multiplicity of theoretical perspectives. Interpreters and critics, situating their reflection at different levels of generality, most often refer to the inadequacy, lack of reference to cultural subtleties and the comprehensiveness and coherence of the theory. The problem with the adequacy of career theories becomes even more significant when we consider their content. Ignorance of contextual issues, lack of reference to the problem of

social inequality and overlapping conceptualisations of multiple elements, as well as segmentation, both within individual theoretical models and within the subject matter as a whole (Patton, McMahon, 2006, p. 7; see also Arthur, Hall, Lawrence, 2004, p. 14-17) reflect the problems encountered in the context of analyses of the structure of assertions.

A circumstance supporting the need to undertake a responsible reflection on the similarities and differences in contemporary theoretical orientations is the noticeable multiplicity and diversity of existing theories and the need to refer to more than one theory in order to capture, describe and interpret the complexity of career development (Patton, McMahon, 2006, p. 7).

What seems to go without saying, is that the review and systematization of career development theories clearly follows an established tradition of interest in the issue of career in the United States. As can be seen from the above, most of the theories on career development have been conceptualised and are empirically rooted in the socio-cultural and occupational contexts of the United States reality, making them in a sense allochthonous. It was in the United States that the Big Five Career Theories were born (Leung, 2008, p. 127). Another aspect that justifies the need to think critically about the quality (or rather credibility) of theoretical perspectives is the study of methodological toolkit taking into account shaded cultural, social, and vocational aspects.

In the theoretical-practical implications, the development or adaptation of career measures for a specific culture group should be linked to the elimination of cultural biases. The analysis of socio-cultural-occupational determinants for the indigenusness of career theory (including implementations of cultural adaptation) is also linked to hopes for the development of cross-cultural career counselling (Leung, 2008, p. 128).

In the context of reflections on the need for (meta)analytical assumptions of career theory for the practice of career counselling, perhaps the most important aspect is to move away from theories emphasising and focusing on: a) career choices, b) diagnostics (using the achievements of psychometrics) of the potential for career development and personality of the subject, c) defining “who a person is?” and “who a person has already become?” (Bańka, 2007, p. 48).

The acceleration of social life, the dynamism in a complex and permanently changing world of work, the “constant flow of information and capital”, as Manuel Castells (2007) suggests, contribute to the search for new paradigmatic solutions (Adekola, 2011, p. 100-101) and focus attention on the need for a theoretical-cognitive dimension of career guidance practice (Cybal-Michalska, 2021).

The multiple contexts for capturing the career domain led to changes in “theorising” about it. Thus, as Paul J. Hartung and Phillip S. Jarvis point out, the construct of career development is undergoing an important paradigm shift: from talking about career development to findings emphasising the development through work and other life roles performed (Patton, McMahon, 2006, p. 6). Theorists have explicitly focused on constructivist influences in the career theory. Jean Guichard and Janet Lenz identified three major trends in international reflection on the career theory, namely: “<(a) emphasis on cultural contexts and differences, (b) self-construction or emphasis on

the developmental process, and (c) a constructivist perspective>>” (Patton, McMahon, 2006, p. 3).

The systematization of career development theories referring to traditions and empirically rooted in the socio-cultural and occupational contexts of the US reality, and thus making them allochthonous, contributed to the recognition that an essential part of drawing on the theoretical-cognitive heritage of career studies would be to think about the need for its cultural adaptation or modification. As Alvin Leung points out, there should “be more <<indigenous>> efforts to develop theories and practices that would meet specific needs in different geographical regions. (...) Indigenous character of theory as well as practice should aim to identify universals, as well as unique experiences, constructs and practices that are specific to given cultural groups” (Leung, 2008, p. 127). Studies on the indigeneness of career theory include three groups of conceptual predictions. The first assumption relates to learning about specific cultural phenomena and their specificity in order to answer the question “how culture may intervene, moderate or mediate hypothetical career development and the process of making choices” (Leung, 2008, p. 128). Procedures that would increase the versatility and exploratory value of theories are linked to their critical examination and evaluation of the way in which selected variables (e.g. adaptation to work, interests) are understood and interpreted in a specific cultural context, and the identification of universals and specific elements on their basis. It is not insignificant to verify hypothetical assumptions, more specifically to check the validity of the relationships between hypothetical variables and to examine the impact of a specific cultural context in order to update assumptions, to establish a new configuration of variables, which is intended to lead to theory building and to the development of the indigenous conceptual framework. A critical reflection on the adequacy of theoretical perspectives requires a sound study of the methodological instrumentation, taking into account the socio-cultural-occupational conditions for culturally shaded career theories and even seeking a basis for the development of cross-cultural career counselling. Undoubtedly, the development of culturally reliable measurements is important when testing career development theories in a cross-cultural context. Several levels of modification (through interventions and evaluation) can be distinguished for the adaptation of career theory to specific cultural contexts. Alvin Leung points to three suggestions: (a) an established measure can be adopted with only minimal modification, mainly to establish linguistic equivalence, to translate concepts into a language understood by the target culture; (b) a psychometric evaluation of the target measure can be carried out to decide whether the structure and properties of the instrument correspond to those reported in the literature, so as to establish a single scale for different cultures and, if necessary, modify the content and structure of the measure based on empirical results, (c) the target measure can be revised and adopted by including the main cultural elements that are at the core of the concepts to be measured in the local context and carry out a psychometric evaluation of the modified measure (Leung, 2008, p. 128).

However, an observation arises that, although these hopes are fully justified, there is no need to delude oneself that doubts can be completely

eliminated. The way in which career counselling will be accomplished will depend, to a great extent, on the intercultural competences of the counsellor. In this context, the view of counselling as being “oriented towards the enhancement of the client’s knowledge in a specific field, towards the enhancement of his/her competences and thus, mainly towards the mental support of the counselee struggling with problems” remains extremely valid (Kargulowa, 2010, p. 11). A responsible reflection on the competences of the career counsellor is integrated with considerations on the concept of empowerment. There is no doubt that the key competences covering substantive knowledge in the field of planning, development, career management in the contemporary labour market should be accompanied by the diagnostic competences of the counsellor. The design and implementation of diagnostic procedures involves “not only competences in selecting methods, techniques, and diagnostic tools adequate to the subject and goal of the diagnosis, but also the ability to explain and interpret the data obtained and to give feedback. Also, the competences of designing counselling support on the basis of the data obtained, of facilitating the process of transferring the findings to the counselee’s everyday practices and beliefs, and of enhancing attentiveness and reflexivity are equally important. (...) Diagnosis is oriented towards a simultaneous insightful recognition of the problem and an equally insightful search for resources and possibilities to solve it, (...) frequent recourse to <<soft>>, non-questionnaire diagnostic techniques” (Rosalska, 2020a, p. 167-168). In the end, after all, it is not a matter of using categories derived from one’s own culture to fill them with, at most, new content, but of taking the “indigenous” point of view into account. At this point, in order to add context, it is worth evoking Super’s statement. When asked by Suzanne Freeman: What do You see when You look at the future of career development? and What is Your vision?, the career researcher responded as follows: “we will have more grounded theorising and more tailored methods of implementing theory. For example, most of the work on multicultural counselling was not about career counselling. These works were concerned with the question how a person from one culture understands and relates to a person or people from another culture. There are questions that have not yet been answered, or not answered properly. What is the importance of a career in the mind of a person from culture X, compared to culture Y? For example, career development in some African and South Asian countries I know is really a matter of fitting in with what the family wants and needs. But overall, our notion of career development is a bit different. Plus, of course, there are subcultures, here in the United States where the differences can be real and even as striking as the differences between, say, Nigeria or Kenya on the one hand, and the United States on the other. Do the subcultural differences that exist in the United States make any difference to the legitimacy of general career development theory? Theorists Nadya Fouab and Robert Carter, as well as many other researchers, are currently seeking answers to the questions: How does the theory need to be adapted and How do the methods need to be adapted to people of different subcultures? (...) I really think the future will help us better understand not only the general theory of career development, I think it will give us better data and a better understanding of how the theory relates to minorities”

(Freeman, 1993, p. 263). It is worth mentioning, as pointed out by Michael B. Arthur, Douglas T. Hall, and Barbara S. Lawrence, that the situation in which an established theory proves its value in the light of new challenges and is anchored in practice is indicative of “routinisation”. According to Quinn, a four-stage process is characteristic of a theory, which includes: initiation, uncertainty, transformation and precisely routinisation. For example, “a big part of the contemporary career theory based on psychology and social psychology has already been subjected to considerable empirical research and has been transformed into practice in organisational career programmes. John L. Holland’s model of personality and environment provides the basis for the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory, which is widely used in vocational counselling. Explanations of adult development are reflected in the Donald Super and Edgar Schein questionnaires” (Arthur, Hall, Lawrence, 2004, p. 15).

The need, as highlighted earlier, to integrate microtheory into metatheory creates an opportunity for greater versatility and exploratory value of theoretical resolutions. Thus, career theory is constantly evolving taking as a reference point the maintenance of its relevance in a changing reality.

In the context of the reflections undertaken on “theorising”, an answer is sought to the question: about a possible theoretical-cognitive approach for explaining the broad spectrum of processes responsible for “organising the diversity” of career patterns within a globalised contemporary society. In the process of developing career theories, Mark L. Savickas’ concept of career construction deserves particular attention. This essentially first career development theory, presented in the early 21st century, updates, develops and integrates the segments of Donald Super’s career development theory. After all, it is impossible to overestimate Donald Super’s influence, both in developing the concept of career exploration and in showing the path taken in conceptualising careers – from implementing self-image in the world of work to integrating careers into the life course of an individual. Mark L. Savickas’ work updates the themes previously taken up in content and process theories in the area of career development, focusing on issues of vocational personality and career adaptability. Mark L. Savickas, while referring to constructionism as a metatheory, also referred to Mc Adams’ scheme and incorporated three classic segments of career theory: (1) “individual differences in traits, (2) developmental tasks and coping strategies, and (3) motivation” (Patton, McMahan, 2006, p. 162). It is noteworthy that Mark L. Savickas’ views on the fit between an individual and his or her profession, coinciding with those of Donald Super, broaden and refine the previous scope of approach to this issue. This fact is determined by a strand of considerations that seeks to emphasise that individuals differ in their vocational personality, abilities, needs, value systems, character traits and self-concept. Taking into account the above characteristics, a specific set of personality traits and abilities with a certain degree of tolerance makes each individual predestined for different professions, as well as many different people can perform the same profession (Patton, McMahan, 2006, p. 63). The process of career construction exposes the subject’s work on himself/herself, his/her permanent participation in life projects and multifaceted processes as well as the acquisition of experiences and the capacity for self-awareness (Savickas, 2013, p. 148). Mark L.



Savickas has attempted to combine and integrate three theoretical traditions: the developmental approach, the narrative approach, and the differentiation approach, thus creating a theoretical perspective called vocational behaviour theory. It takes into account the life structures and “life themes” of an individual and their adaptability in a career context, as well as the (vocational) personality of the subject (Maree, 2010, p. 363-364). Thus, the author, as an integrator of the content theory and process theory, bearing in mind that the development of career theory is in fact a permanent process of theoretical transformation of career concepts, emphasises the importance of not only taking a new look at the career issue (fostering new ideas) but also placing the existing positions in perspective with others and re-evaluating them (see: Arthur, Hall, Lawrence, 2004, p. 20).

The individual career pattern identified by the researcher with the career level achieved and the sequence, frequency, and duration of work “is determined by the socio-economic level of the parents and the individual’s education, abilities, character traits, self-concepts and career adaptability, together with the opportunities provided by the society” (Patton, McMahon, 2006, p. 63). According to the distinguished theory reflecting the constructivist view on career development, the career domain is seen as a central part of the subject’s life and an important reference point in the formation of individual identity. Moreover, the career treated as a “property” of the subject, is in a way “incorporated” into him/her (Savickas, 2013, p. 150). What constitutes the core is treating a career choice, adaptability, and development as elements of an integrated process. The author points to the concept of four cores: the structure of individual’s life, his or her vocational personality, the career adaptability, simply called adaptability, and the theme of the subject’s life, for understanding the individualised career behaviour that forms the axis of the career counselling narrative. In Mark L. Savickas’ theory of career construction, vocational behaviour and its development are considered in a process-related way with a view to organising it holistically, permanently, and contextually. An individual’s career development is not considered in isolation from other dimensions and components of the subject’s life. Career (which is not a non-contextual part) is seen as a central dimension of life design and should therefore be integrated into the lifestyles of individuals (Maree, 2010, p. 363-364). Thus, it can be said that vocational personality can be seen as “a desirable set (syndrome, structure) of human characteristics, formulated in the process of vocational training (today we should probably say in the process of career development – A.C-M), which provides him/her with an active contact with the material and socio-cultural work environment, contributing to his/her creative search” (Czarnecki, 1973, p. 13). Moreover, the subjective sense of separateness from the environment takes into account “a consciousness shaped by culture, constituted by society and linguistically narrated” (Savickas, 2013, p. 148).

The career construction theory by Mark L. Savickas states that “individuals construct their careers by giving meanings to their vocational behaviour and experiences” (Patton, McMahon, 2006, p. 63). The construction of an individual’s life course, which has been shaped by social processes (society and its institutions), consists of a core and secondary roles. The essence is

the balance between the social roles of the core. Homeostasis between the professional and family spheres contributes to stability, while its absence creates stressful situations. Personal preferences regarding life roles (work can be considered a core role but can also function as a secondary role) are deeply rooted in social practices (Patton, McMahon, 2006, p. 63).

In the process of career construction, as Mark L. Savickas emphasises, the essence consists in the development and implementation of professional self-concepts in the vocational roles undertaken and performed. Self-concepts “develop through the interaction of inherited abilities (...) to play different roles and the ability to judge to what extent the role performance meets the praise of peers and those who supervise us” (Patton, McMahon, 2006, p. 63). Thus, the realisation of the self-concept in the work environment involves the synthesis (developed from playing one’s role and learning from feedback, and it should be noted that, for the phenomenon of synthesis, it does not matter whether the role is played in a fantasy world or in a conversation with a career counsellor, or in real-life activities, such as hobbies, clubs, part-time work, task completion, etc.) and compromise between individual and social factors (Patton, McMahon, 2006, p. 63). Treating vocational counselling, in Mark L. Savickas’ approach, as life design, is in fact the assumption of a dynamic process of “repeatedly made and changed career choices throughout life, based on an in-depth self-diagnosis of one’s resources (individual and environmental), discovered and defined in the course of, in accordance with the constructivist spirit, the assumption of becoming an individual with a unique experience of the biopsychosocial contexts of growth and development” (Piorunek, Nawój-Połoczańska, 2020, p. 331-332). The author, in order to explain and interpret the phenomenon of career development, taking into account its individualised nature, tries to reach the possibly universal essence of the mechanisms and assumptions to be taken into account when considering the quality of people’s working life, namely: contextual opportunities, dynamic processes, non-linear nature of development, diversity of perspectives and individual patterns (Maree, 2010, p. 363-364). This specific reference to subjective activity and social constructivism, defined by Paul J. Hartung, similarly to what Mark L. Savickas claims, emphasises the development of four dimensions of vocational behaviour, such as: “[a] life structure (the set of professional and other human roles that constitute individual’s life), [b] career adaptation strategies (the copy/imitate mechanism used by individuals to overcome developmental tasks and environmental changes that accumulate over the life course), [c] thematic motives of life stories (the motivations and driving forces that shape life), [d] personality styles (personality traits such as skills, needs, values, interests and other characteristics that make up the self-image)” (Maree, 2010, p. 363). In the view of the distinguished theorists, the theory of career construction and the pursued career practice play the role of a metatheory that combines and integrates three basic theoretical traditions: the developmental approach (the individual development of the individual), the narrative approach (the psychodynamic motivations of the individual and the guiding themes of their life stories) and the difference/diversity approach (individual differences, capturing “difference” in relation to others), thus creating a theoretical perspective called career behaviour

theory. Taken together, the theoretical perspectives of occupational behaviour and career development, when considered as an attempt to point to a metatheory, emphasise the validity of considering the individual's life structure and adaptability in the context of career (how he or she organises his or her life roles and copes with career development tasks) and life themes (why the individual moves in a particular career direction) as well as the subject's vocational personality (characteristics of the individual) (Maree, 2010, p. 363-364). In postmodern career counselling – as emphasised by M. L. Savickas – “depending on the personal needs of the client and the social context, counsellors can apply career interventions using different paradigms: career adaptability, career education for vocational adaptation or life design, or in other words, constructing individual life projects” (Solarczyk-Ambrozik, 2020, p. 264). The postulate in the centre of attention suggests focusing on the synergy at the macro, meso and micro level of counselling activities offered by various statutory entities providing vocational counselling (Rosalska, 2020a, p. 235-326).

## CONCLUSION

The above findings emphasise that the diversity of theoretical approaches to capturing the career phenomenon, has contributed to a paradigmatic shift. It consists in a shift from a traditional to a new paradigm, which in fact means a shift from theories emphasising and focusing on career choices, on the diagnosis (using the achievements of psychometrics) of the potential for career development and the personality of the subject, on defining “who a person is?”, “who a person has already become?”, to theories focused on career design (with the recurrence and reversibility of choice processes), on the self-diagnosis of the opportunities and barriers inherent in the subject (personal) and found in the environment, in the world, on the inquiry “who a person is becoming?”, “how a person is becoming?” depending on the contexts in which he or she is embedded (Bańka, 2007, p. 48). In this context, it is valid to mention the interpretation of the vocational counselling model proposed by the National Career Development Association indicating the need to take into account four areas: “personal and social development, (...) educational achievement and lifelong learning, (...) career management, (...) and the one related to the learning process and its indicators” (Rosalska, 2020b, p. 320). The postulated model emphasises “a moderating attitude in which the counsellor assists the individual in the process of self-discovery and subjective, individualised investment in the construction of successive life scenarios at each stage of experiencing the professional reality” (Piorunek, 2020, p. 137). In this sense, it can be said about the distinguished theory of career construction that, exposing a new perspective on participation in the reality of global change, focuses attention on the nature of the social world (showing the interdependence between inclusiveness and individual dispositions) and refers to the domain of life, which is the career and its construction. Moreover, as Augustyn Bańka emphasises (see Bańka, 2007, p. 60), vocational counselling is a science focused on the development of micro-theory, and a practice anchored in theory and operating a specific metatheory.

**REFERENCES**

- Adekola B. (2011), Career planning and career management as correlates for career development and job satisfaction. A case study of Nigerian Bank Employees [in:] Australian Journal of Business and Management Research, No 2.
- Arthur M. B., Hall D. T., Lawrence B. S. (2004), Generating new directions in career theory: the case for a transdisciplinary approach [in:] Arthur M. B., Hall D. T., Lawrence B. S., Handbook of career theory.
- Bańka A. (2007), Psychologiczne doradztwo karier.
- Bauman Z. (2000a), Globalizacja.
- Bauman Z. (2000b), Ponowoczesność jako źródło cierpienia.
- Blok Z. (ed.) (2001), Społeczne problemy globalizacji.
- Bogunia-Borowska M., Śleboda M. (2003), Globalizacja i konsumpcja. Dwadylematy współczesności.
- Cybal-Michalska A. (2013), Młodzież akademicka a kariera zawodowa.
- Cybal-Michalska A. (2015), (Meta) analityczna wartość założeń teorii kariery – przyczynek do dyskusji na temat teorii konstrukcji kariery Marka L. Savickasa” [in:] Studia Poradczawcze/Journal of Counsellogy 2015, vol. 4.
- Cybal-Michalska A. (2015), La multiplicité et la différence entre les narrations de la modernité – vers un dialogue créatif avec l’altérité, Synergies Pologne.
- Cybal-Michalska A. (2019), “Inność” w dobie płynnej nowoczesności [in:] Miłosierdzie dla INNEGO, Cybal-Michalska A., Pryba A., Twardowska-Rajewska J. (ed.), Edukacja. Teologia i Dialog, vol. 14
- Cybal-Michalska A. (2021), Domena kariery i jej złożoność – o potrzebie (meta) analitycznych założeń teorii kariery dla praktyki doradztwa karier” [in:] Kwiatkowski S. (ed.) Współczesne problemy pedagogiki. W kierunku integracji teorii z praktyką.
- Czarnecki K. M. (1973), Problemy osobowości zawodowej człowieka pracy produkcyjnej.
- Freeman S., Super D. (1993), A Perspective on Career Development [in:] Journal of Career Development, vol. 19 (4).
- Golka M. (1999), Cywilizacja. Europa. Globalizacja.
- Kargulowa A. (2010), Studia nad kondycją poradnictwa w Polsce [in:] Edukacja Dorosłych, nr 1.
- Kukołowicz T., Nowak M. (1997), Pedagogika ogólna. Problemy aksjologiczne.
- Kwieciński Z. (2000), Tropy, ślady, próby.
- Leung S. A. (2008), The Big Five Career Theories [in:] Athanasou J. A., Van Esbroeck R., (eds.) International Handbook of Career Guidance.
- Malewska E., Śliwerski B. (2002), Pedagogika i edukacja wobec nowych wspólnot i różnic w jednoczącej się Europie.
- Maree J. G. (2010), Brief Overview of the Advancement of Postmodern Approaches to Career Counseling [in:] Journal for Psychology in Africa, 20(3).
- Misztal B. (2000), Teoria socjologiczna a praktyka społeczna.
- Patton W., McMahon M. (2006), Career Development and Systems Theory. Connecting Theory and Practice.
- Piorunek M. (2020), Poradnictwo kariery – wyzwania rynkowe i edukacyjne [in:] Tomaszewska R., Praca i kariera w warunkach nowego millennium. Implikacje dla edukacji.
- Piorunek M., Nawój-Położańska J. (2020), Poradnictwo zawodowe w systemie edukacji. Między postulatami a realiami [in:] Christoph M., Wawrzyniak S., Społeczno-edukacyjny potencjał szkoły a rynek pracy.

- Rosalska M. (2020a), Empowerment jako strategia wzmacniania zasobówkarierowych [in:] Solarczyk-Ambrozik E., Christoph M., Konieczna-Woźniak R., Edukacja Dorosłych a planowanie karieredukacyjno-zawodowych.
- Rosalska M. (2020b), Doradztwo edukacyjno-zawodowe w szkole podstawowej—założone cele i rzeczywiste wyzwania [in:] Christoph M., Wawrzyniak S., Społeczno-edukacyjny potencjał szkoły a rynek pracy.
- Savickas M. L. (2013), Career Construction Theory and Practice [in:] Lent R. W., Brown S. D., (eds.) Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work, Hoboken, New Jersey.
- Savickas M. L. (2009), Nota L., Rossier J., Dauwalder J., Duarte M. E., Guichard J., Soresi S., van Esbroeck R., van Vianen A. E. M., Life designing: A paradigm for Career construction in the 21st century [in:] Journal of Vocational Behavior, vol. 75
- Solarczyk-Ambrozik E. (2020), Doradztwo zawodowe – poradnictwo karierowe – w obliczu nowych wyzwań [in:] Christoph M., Wawrzyniak S., Społeczno-edukacyjny potencjał szkoły a rynek pracy.
- Sztompka P. (2002), *Socjologia*.
- Śleboda M. (2003), Dylemat pierwszy: globalizacja [in:] eds. Bogunia-Borowska M., Śleboda M., Globalizacja i konsumpcja. Dwa dylematy współczesności.
- Tyszka A. (ed.), (1999), Róża wiatrów Europy.